

Appendix E

Public Correspondence and Consideration by Project Team

Appendix E1

Public Liaison Committee Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

1.0 Background

Windlectric Inc. (Windlectric) is proposing to develop, construct, and operate the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project (the Project) within Loyalist Township in the County of Lennox and Addington in eastern Ontario, in response to the Government of Ontario's initiative to promote the development of renewable electricity in the province.

The Project Study Area includes Amherst Island, a corridor stretching between the Island and the mainland where the submarine electrical power cable is proposed to be located and a portion of the mainland for an interconnection point with Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI).

The Project will include approximately 28 - 42 wind turbine generators with a total installed nameplate capacity of approximately 56 - 75 MW, a 34.5 kilovolt (kV) underground and/or overhead electrical power line collector system, fibre optic data lines from each turbine and/or wireless technology for the communication of data, a submarine power cable, an operations and maintenance building, a substation with a main power transformer on the island, a switching station on the main-land, a meteorological tower (MET tower), an access road to the met tower site, and turbine access roads with culvert installations, as required, at associated watercourse crossings.

Temporary components during construction may include a temporary dock, storage and staging areas at the turbine locations, crane pads or mats, staging areas along access roads, delivery truck turnaround areas, central laydown areas, crane paths and associated watercourse crossings. The electrical power line collector system would transport the electricity generated from each turbine to the substation. A submarine cable will then carry the electrical energy to the mainland and then to an interconnecting switching station located adjacent to an existing HONI 115 kV transmission line.

Windlectric has retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. to prepare the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application, as required under O. Reg. 359/09.

2.0 Purpose of the Liaison Committee

The Amherst Island Wind Energy Project Liaison Committee (LC) is being created to serve a role in providing two-way communications between the local community, Windlectric/Algonquin Power (the project owner/developer).

3.0 Liaison Committee (LC) Function/ Objectives

- 3.1 The LC shall serve as a forum between the parties to review and exchange general information related to the development of the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project, general project development, construction and operation schedule issues, local unique features of the Project Study Area, and cultural resources potentially impacted by the project. Windlectric Inc. will assess items brought forward in the exchange and incorporate them into the REA process as appropriate.
- 3.2 The LC shall not exercise any supervisory, regulatory, legal, approval or other decision-making role and will not serve as a reviewer of individual management decisions or as arbiters of individual landowner negotiations, business transactions, or other stakeholder interactions with respect to the development of the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project.
- 3.3 The LC will provide constructive feedback and advice on local items of interest to the project owner, developer and operating manager, on an as needed basis.
- 3.4 The LC does not replace other means for citizens, agencies or other organizations to express their observations and ideas.

4.0 Structure and Membership

- 4.1 The LC will include:
- One Lead Facilitator (Owner's management representative)
 - 4 Members - Local community representatives
- 4.2 Local community representatives will be selected based on their ability and willingness to bring a variety of perspectives from/to the local community.
- 4.3 A Stantec Consulting Ltd. representative(s) will provide support to the Lead Facilitator for the meetings.
- 4.4 Members of the LC will be solicited by direct invitation to community stakeholders. All committee members will be appointed by the project proponent. Membership on the committee shall be without liability.
- 4.5 Membership on the LC does not constitute support, endorsement, or opposition of the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project.
- 4.6 Participation on the LC is a voluntary activity and its members serve without remuneration.
- 4.7 The LC may terminate any member's position on the LC based on a recommendation from any member and based on the person(s) acting in a manner that is disruptive or not contributing to the process.

5.0 Lead Facilitator's Role and Responsibilities:

- 5.1 Shall be the spokesperson for the LC. The Lead Facilitator will represent the LC as a whole, and be a liaison for relaying information to the LC from various other project stakeholders.
- 5.2 Provide LC members with adequate background and timely information on relevant issues.
- 5.3 Respond in a timely manner to LC member's questions and comments.
- 5.4 Respond directly to citizen questions or comments received from LC members in a timely manner and report back to the LC on the outcome.
- 5.5 Provide administrative support as required.
- 5.6 Must have knowledge and understanding of the construction and operations of the wind project.

6.0 Meetings

- 6.1 The LC will meet on a schedule agreed upon by the Lead Facilitator and the other members.
- 6.2 The LC shall meet a minimum of 4 times during the development stage of the project. The LC shall cease to meet after submission of the application for the issuance of a renewable energy approval to the Ministry of the Environment.
- 6.3 Meetings will be held in the local community at a location to be agreed upon by LC members. Meetings will be closed to parties other than LC members and meeting facilitators.
- 6.4 The LC members may provide to the Lead Facilitator agenda topics for the consideration of the content of the agenda.
- 6.5 The Lead Facilitator may call special meeting(s) of the LC as needed, from time to time.
- 6.6 A meeting record should be printed and distributed to committee members and to a representative of Windlectric Inc. (or designated representative).
- 6.7 At the end of each meeting, the LC shall establish a proposed agenda for the next meeting and submit it to the Lead Facilitator. LC members who wish to add items to a meeting agenda shall advise the Lead Facilitator of the item(s) at least fifteen (15) business days before a scheduled meeting.
- 6.8 Meetings will normally include the following regular agenda items.
- Review of draft agenda
 - Review of previous meeting record and any action items
 - Topics of particular interest (e.g. learning about and discussing specific issues)
 - Schedule of upcoming meetings and broad topic areas to be discussed

7.0 Meeting Record

- 7.1 Will provide an overview of the discussions, highlighting action items as appropriate.
- 7.2 Will not be a detailed record of all discussions.
- 7.3 Will not normally include attribution of specific remarks to members of the committee.
- 7.4 Will normally be prepared and distributed to LC members within a week of the particular meeting. The record will be reviewed at the subsequent meeting.
- 7.5 Members may share meeting records with members of their constituency for the purpose of keeping the constituency informed and obtaining feedback.

8.0 Other Procedures

8.1 Members will:

- Regularly prepare for and attend scheduled meetings
- Respect fellow members and their personal and potentially varying views.
- Recognize that all members have an equal right to speak, and will not dominate the discussion.
- Operate in a spirit of cooperation and partnership
- Channel input and opinion from the community and reporting back to the LC on relevant issues. It is not expected that members will undertake any formal process to solicit input.
- Report back to the community as appropriate on LC discussions and activities. It is not expected that members will undertake any formal process of reporting

9.0 Revisions to the Terms of Reference

- 9.1 These Terms of Reference are guidelines and can be revised as desired by the LC, by the Lead Facilitator or by the proponent.

Appendix E2

Public Liaison Committee Meeting Agendas, Presentations and Minutes

Agenda



Stantec

Liaison Committee - Meeting #1

Location: St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, 2045 Stella 40 Foot Road

Date: Wednesday, July 20, 2011

Time: 5:30 to 6:30 p.m.

Desired Outcomes:

- To familiarize members with each other, the project and the Renewable Energy Approval process
- To create a common understanding of the Liaison Committee, including the Terms of Reference
- To review key issues and priorities for future discussion

Agenda:

1. Welcome and introductions 5:30
2. Confirm agenda 5:35
3. Review Terms of Reference for the Liaison Committee 5:40
4. Review project details 5:50
 - Overview of Algonquin Power
 - Role of Stantec Consulting Ltd.
 - Overview of the Project
 - Overview of the Renewable Energy Approvals process
 - Review of work completed to-date
 - Review timeline and schedule
5. Review of key issues and priorities for future discussion 6:15
6. Discuss next steps 6:20
7. Other business 6:25
8. Confirm date of next Liaison Committee meeting and adjourn 6:30



Liaison Committee Meeting #1

Amherst Island Wind Energy Project
~ July 20, 2011 ~



Agenda

1.	Welcome and Introductions	5:30
2.	Confirm agenda	5:35
3.	Review of Terms of Reference and the Liaison Committee	5:40
4.	Review project details	5:50
	Overview of Algonquin Power	
	Role of Stantec Consulting Ltd.	
	Overview of the Project	
	Overview of the Renewable Energy Approvals Process	
	Review of work completed to-date	
	Review timeline and schedule	
5.	Review of key issues and priorities for future discussion	6:15
6.	Discuss next steps	6:20
7.	Other business	6:25
8.	Confirm date of next Liaison Committee meeting and adjourn	6:30

Welcome to Our First Meeting

Desired Outcomes

- To familiarize members with each other, the project and the Renewable Energy Approval process
- To create a common understanding of the Liaison Committee, including the Terms of Reference
- To review key issues and priorities for future discussion

Welcome to Our First Meeting - Introductions

Lead Facilitator

- Sean Fairfield, Algonquin

Members

- Minister Zander Dunn
- Nancy Pearson
- Janet Scott
- Tom Sylvester

Consultation and Technical Support

- Amanda Kennedy, Stantec Consulting Ltd.
- Kerrie Skillen, Stantec Consulting Ltd.

Review Ground Rules

- One person speaking at a time
- So that we can hear from as many participants as possible, please limit the length of comments and questions
- Listen with respect; learn from each other
- Limit the use of acronyms and jargon
- Any others to add?



Review of Terms of Reference

Review Terms of Reference

1.0 Project Background

- Windlectric Inc. (a subsidiary of Algonquin Power and Utilities Corp.) is proposing to develop, construct, and operate the 56 - 75 megawatt (MW) Amherst Island Wind Energy Project (the Project).
- The Project is located within Loyalist Township in the County of Lennox and Addington in eastern Ontario, in response to the Government of Ontario's initiative to promote the development of renewable electricity in the province.
- Windlectric has retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. to prepare the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application, as required under O. Reg. 359/09.

Review Terms of Reference

2.0 Purpose of the Liaison Committee (LC)

- The Amherst Island Wind Energy Project Liaison Committee (LC) is being created to serve a role in providing two-way communications between the local community, Windlectric/Algonquin Power (the project owner/developer).

Review Terms of Reference

3.0 Liaison Committee (LC) Function/Objectives

- ... a forum between the parties to review and exchange general information... (3.1)
- ... Windlectric Inc. will assess items brought forward in the exchange and incorporate them into the REA process as appropriate. (3.1)
- ... The LC shall not exercise any supervisory, regulatory, legal, approval or other decision-making role... (3.2)
- ... The LC will provide constructive feedback and advice on local items of interest to the project owner, developer and operating manager, on an as needed basis. (3.3)
- ... The LC does not replace other means for citizens, agencies or other organizations to express their observations and ideas. (3.4)

Review Terms of Reference

4.0 Structure and Membership

- ... Local community representatives will be selected based on their ability and willingness to bring a variety of perspectives from/to the local community. (4.2)
- ... Membership on the LC does not constitute support, endorsement, or opposition of the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project. (4.5)
- ... Participation on the LC is a voluntary activity and its members serve without remuneration. (4.6)
- ... The LC may terminate any member's position on the LC based on a recommendation from any member and based on the person(s) acting in a manner that is disruptive or not contributing to the process. (4.7)

Review Terms of Reference

5.0 Lead Facilitator's Role and Responsibilities

- ... The Lead Facilitator will represent the LC as a whole, and be a liaison for relaying information to the LC from various other project stakeholders. (5.1)
- ... Provide LC members with adequate background and timely information on relevant issues. (5.2)
- ... Respond directly to citizen questions or comments received from LC members in a timely manner and report back to the LC on the outcome. (5.4)

Review Terms of Reference

6.0 Meetings

- ... The LC shall meet a minimum of 4 times during the development stage of the project. (6.2)
- ... The LC shall cease to meet after submission of the application for the issuance of a renewable energy approval to the Ministry of the Environment. (6.2)
- ... Meetings will be held in the local community at a location to be agreed upon by LC members. Meetings will be closed to parties other than LC members and meeting facilitators. (6.3)
- ... A meeting record should be printed and distributed (6.6)
- ... Meetings will normally include the following regular agenda items.
 - Review of draft agenda
 - Review of previous meeting record and any action items
 - Topics of particular interest (e.g. learning about and discussing specific issues)
 - Schedule of upcoming meetings and broad topic areas to be discussed

Review Terms of Reference

7.0 Meeting Record

- Will provide an overview of the discussions, highlighting action items as appropriate. (7.1)
- Will not be a detailed record of all discussions. (7.2)
- Will not normally include attribution of specific remarks to members of the committee. (7.3)
- Will normally be prepared and distributed to LC members within a week of the particular meeting. The record will be reviewed at the subsequent meeting. (7.4)
- Members may share meeting records with members of their constituency for the purpose of keeping the constituency informed and obtaining feedback. (7.5)

Review Terms of Reference

8.0 Other Procedures

8.1 Members will:

- Regularly prepare for and attend scheduled meetings
- Respect fellow members and their personal and potentially varying views.
- Recognize that all members have an equal right to speak, and will not dominate the discussion.
- Operate in a spirit of cooperation and partnership
- Channel input and opinion from the community and reporting back to the LC on relevant issues. It is not expected that members will undertake any formal process to solicit input.
- Report back to the community as appropriate on LC discussions and activities. It is not expected that members will undertake any formal process of reporting



Questions & Comments?



Review Project Details

Review Project Details – Overview of Algonquin Power

- Publicly traded company
- Owns direct interest or equity in renewable and thermal power generating facilities and regulated utilities
- 46 renewable energy facilities in North America
- 300 MW of installed capacity
- Head office located in Oakville, Ontario
- For more information see the company website:
www.algonquinpower.com


Review Project Details – Overview of Stantec Consulting Ltd.

- Windlectric has retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) to prepare the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application, as required under O. Reg. 359/09.
- Includes:
 - completion of required technical studies
 - public consultation support
 - completion and submission of REA application



Review Project Details – Overview of the Project

- Windlectric Inc. (a subsidiary of Algonquin Power and Utilities Corp.) is proposing to develop, construct, and operate the 56 - 75 megawatt (MW) Amherst Island Wind Energy Project (the Project).
- The Project is located within Loyalist Township in the County of Lennox and Addington in eastern Ontario, in response to the Government of Ontario's initiative to promote the development of renewable electricity in the province.
- The Project Study Area includes Amherst Island, an approximately 3 - 15 kilometre wide corridor stretching between the Island and the mainland where the submarine cable is proposed.
- The mainland portion of the Project Study Area stretches from the mainland shoreline, north to the Invista Transformer Station and is generally bounded by i) County Road 4 to the West; ii) the Canadian National Railway line to the North; and iii) approximately 500 m West of Jim Snow Drive to the East.



Legend

- Project Study Area
- Road
- Railway
- Watercourse
- Property Boundaries
- Wooded Area
- Waterbody
- Unevaluated Wetland
- Provincially Significant Wetland
- ANSI Boundary

Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.



Stantec

May 2011
10060356

Client/Project
WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.
1

Title
PROJECT STUDY AREA

Review Project Details – Overview of the Project

The basic components of the Project include:

- approximately 28 – 42 model wind turbine generators with a total installed nameplate capacity of approximately 56 - 75 MW,
- a 34.5 kilovolt (kV) underground and/or overhead electrical power line collector system,
- fibre optic data lines from each turbine and/or wireless technology for the communication of data,
- a submarine cable,
- auxiliary buildings including: an operations and maintenance building, a substation, and a switching station,
- a meteorological tower (met tower), an access road to the met tower site,
- turbine access roads with culvert installations, as required, at associated watercourse crossings.

The electrical power line collector system would transport the electricity generated from each turbine to the substation, along the submarine cable to the mainland and then to an interconnecting switching station located adjacent to an existing Hydro One Networks Inc. 115 kV transmission line.

Review Project Details – Overview of the Project


Temporary components during construction may include:

- a temporary dock,
- storage and staging areas at the turbine locations,
- crane pads or mats,
- staging areas along access roads,
- delivery truck turnaround areas,
- central laydown areas,
- crane paths and associated watercourse crossings.



Overview of the Renewable Energy Approvals Process

Key Steps in Ontario's REA Process



* Source: Ontario Ministry of the Environment

Standardized Setbacks

- A key component of the REA process is the establishment of common setbacks for all renewable energy facilities in the Province.
- Where Project related infrastructure will be located within the setback distances, additional analysis (i.e., Environmental Impact Study) will be provided in the REA application and summarized in the final Project Description Report.

Feature	Setback Distance	Study Alternative When Within Setback
Non-participating receptor	550 m (from turbine base)	N/A
Public road right-of-way and railway right-of-way	Turbine blade length + 10 m (from turbine base)	N/A
Property line	Turbine height (excluding blades) (from turbine base)	Does not apply to parcels of land if the abutting parcel of land is a participant in the Project or if it is demonstrated that the wind turbine will not result in adverse impacts on nearby business, infrastructure, properties or land use activities.
Provincially significant southern wetland	120 m	Development not permitted within feature. Development and site alteration may be possible within setback area; EIS required.
Provincially significant ANSI (Earth Science)	50 m	Development and site alteration may be possible within natural feature and setback area; EIS required.
Provincially significant ANSI (Life Science)	120 m	
Significant valleyland	120 m	
Significant woodland	120 m	
Significant wildlife habitat	120 m	
Lake	120 m from the average annual high water mark	Development and site alteration may be possible within setback area; additional report required. No turbine, solar panel or transformer located within a lake or within 30 m of the average annual high water mark.
Permanent or intermittent stream	120 m from the average annual high water mark	Development and site alteration may be possible within setback area; additional report required. No turbine, solar panel or transformer located within a permanent or intermittent stream or within 30 m of the average annual high water mark.
Seepage area	120 m	Development and site alteration may be possible within setback area; additional report required. No turbine, solar panel or transformer located within 30 m of a seepage area.

REA Required Reports

- The following reports will be prepared and submitted as part of the REA application:
 - Project Description Report
 - Construction Plan Report
 - Design and Operations Report (includes Environmental Noise Impact Assessment for the wind and substation component of the Project)
 - Natural Heritage Assessment
 - Environmental Impact Study (if necessary)
 - Consultation Report
 - Archaeological and Built Heritage Reports
 - Water Report
 - Wind Turbine Specifications Report
 - Decommissioning Plan Report
 - All reports, with the exception of the Consultation Report, will be made available in draft form for review and comment. Notification of the release of the draft reports will be provided.

REA Process – Community Consultation and Engagement

- Stakeholder and agency consultation will take place throughout the REA process.
- Input from Aboriginal Communities is an integral part of the REA process and specific rules have been developed for proponents regarding aboriginal consultation.

Review Project Details – Work Completed to Date

We are in the process of completing the detailed studies, analysis and work required to obtain a Renewable Energy Approval (REA) for the Project.

Natural Heritage Assessment

- Field studies initiated April 2011 (i.e., bird surveys, ecological land classification surveys, wetland delineation, fisheries)
- Anticipated to continue through to early 2012

Water Assessment

- Field studies initiated in May 2011. Anticipated to continue through to Fall 2011

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and Built Heritage Assessment

- Both studies have been initiated. Report expected to be submitted to the Ministry of Tourism and Culture by early Fall 2011

Draft Project Description Report

- Submitted to MOE – May 10, 2011

Other

- Drafting layout of project components

Review Project Details – Work Completed to Date

The environmental studies are being completed to fully understand the local environment and will be utilized in the development of the Project design. The technical studies will include, but may not be limited to, in-depth analysis of the following features:

- Wildlife and wildlife habitat including Significant Wildlife Habitat
- Bird breeding, wintering and migration
- Water bodies and aquatic resources
- Woodlands, vegetation and other significant natural features
- Wetlands and Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest
- Archaeological and heritage resources
- Land use and socio-economic features
- All of the technical studies will be provided within the REA Required Reports in draft form for review and comment.

Review Project Details – Consultation and Engagement

- Consultation is an important part of the REA process
- The first Open House is anticipated to be held in late Fall or Early winter 2011. The first Open House will provide conceptual information on the Project
- A second Open House will be held when all the Draft REA reports are completed. Notification of the release of the draft REA reports for review and comment will be provided.

Review Project Details – Current Project Schedule

Milestone	Approximate Date
Initiate REA Process	May 2011
REA technical studies	Ongoing through to December 2011
Public Open House #1	Anticipated late Fall or Early winter 2011
Draft REA Reports to Public	June 2012
Public Open House #2	August 2012
REA Approval	December 2012
Start of Construction	January 2013
Commercial Operation Date (COD)	Approximately February 2014
Repowering/Decommissioning	2034 (approximately 20 years after COD)



Questions & Comments?



Review of Key Issues and Priorities for Future Discussion

Other Business

Our Next Meeting

Review of Key Issues and Priorities

- Are there additional items that you would like to review or discuss at future Liaison Committee Meetings?

Other Business

- Are there additional items to be discussed this evening?

Next Liaison Committee Meeting

- Fall 2011 (to be confirmed)





Thank You

Sean Fairfield
Algonquin Power
2845 Bristol Circle
Oakville, ON L6H 7H7
Tel: 905-465-4518
Email: sean.fairfield@algonquinpower.com

Meeting Record



Liaison Committee – Meeting #1

Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Date: Wednesday, July 20, 2011
Place: St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, 2045 Stella 40 Foot Road, Amherst Island
Time: 5:30 to 7:40 p.m.
Next Meeting: To be determined
Attendees: Janet Scott, Nancy Pearson, Tom Sylvester, and Zander Dunn (Members)
Sean Fairfield (Algonquin Power)
Amanda Kennedy and Kerrie Skillen (Stantec)
Absentees: n/a

Discussion Item	Action
Welcome and Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Confirm agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Review of Terms of Reference and the Liaison Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Follow up with members after emails are sent to ensure attachments are received.
Review Project Details <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reviewed the project details including: the role of Algonquin Power and Stantec Consulting Ltd., an overview of the project and work completed to date, overview of the Renewable Energy Approval process, and current project schedule.• A few questions from members were clarified including:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The turbine manufacturer and type have not yet been selected.○ All turbines will be the same size.○ A baseline noise study will be completed.○ The layout for the turbines (and all other project components) has not been finalized. Micro-siting is ongoing in consultation with the natural environment, water, noise and archaeological assessment technical leads.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Email members a copy of the setbacks which will be applied throughout the design of the project.
Review of Key Issues and Priorities for Future Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Members relayed a series of key issues they have heard from community members about the Project, including:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ A lack of information about the	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Algonquin Power is developing a project website (with email address, mailing address and phone number) through which stakeholders can review general project information and communicate with the Project team. Provide information to members so they can

<p>project from the developer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A lack of reliable high speed wireless Internet connections on the island. ○ The ongoing “split” in the community about wind power; wind power is dividing the community. ○ Concerns the project will impact property values. ○ Concerns the project will impact groundwater. ○ Concerns about bird mortality during operations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed the number and width of access roads. • Discussed the 550m set-back from non-participating noise receptors. • Discussed the 120m setback from certain natural features. • Discussed the upcoming election and potential impacts on the Renewable Energy Approval process. 	<p>share it with community members who have questions and/or concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project website will include the current project schedule, frequently asked questions, third party information and meeting records from the Liaison Committee meetings. • A call to Ian Murray (Amherst Island Beacon newspaper) will be coordinated to ask if he would allow information on the project (which would include a short meeting summary, project timeline and the project website address) to be printed in the newspaper. If the request is not granted then inquire if the project website address could be printed in the newspaper. • Members to forward Sean printed information about the project or wind power that they receive from other sources. • Algonquin Power will be assessing if wireless technology will be used for monitoring the turbines. If this technology will be used, perhaps the company will assess the concept of investigating high speed wireless Internet connection and ability for residents to connect to it. • A geotechnical study will be completed to confirm subsurface information to design an appropriate style of foundation for each turbine. • Stantec to follow-up with a phone interview with Janet Scott about avian species on the island. • Will provide an update about the election in relation to potential impacts to the Renewable Energy Approvals process at our next Liaison Committee meeting.
<p>Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group discussed the date of the next Liaison Committee meeting. It will be in advance of the first Open House, likely in the Fall of 2011. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next date to be confirmed with members as soon as possible.

The meeting adjourned at 7:40pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.



Wednesday, July 20, 2011
Liaison Committee – Meeting #1
Page 3 of 3

Algonquin Power Co.

Sean Fairfield
Manager – Environmental Planning
Algonquin Power Co. (on behalf of Windlectric Inc.)

Agenda



Liaison Committee - Meeting #2

Location: Conference Call

Date: Oct 5, 2011

Time: 5 pm

Desired Outcomes:

- To review action items from Liaison Committee (LC) Meeting #1
- To update LC members on the Project
- To discuss next steps for the Project and LC
- To discuss key priorities and concerns raised by the local community and from LC members

Agenda:

Discussion Item	Approximate Time
1. Confirm Agenda	5 mins
2. Review Action Items from LC Meeting #1	5 mins
3. Current Status of the Project <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Notice to Engage• Website• Field work completed to date• Layout• Review timeline and schedule	15 mins
4. Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inter-agency meeting• Meeting with Township, County and CA to discuss draft layout• Meet with landowners to discuss draft layout and plans for Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment• Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Process• Public Information Session #1 – Schedule and Process• Fall/Winter Technical Work	15 mins
5. Review of priorities and concerns	15 mins
6. Discuss/Confirm date of next LC meeting and adjourn	5 mins

Meeting Record



Liaison Committee – Meeting #2

Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Date: Wednesday, October 5, 2011
Place: Via Conference Call
Time: 5:00 to 5:45 p.m.
Next Meeting: To be determined
Attendees: Janet Scott, Nancy Pearson, Tom Sylvester, and Zander Dunn (Members)
Sean Fairfield (Algonquin Power)
Amanda Kennedy and Rob Rowland (Stantec)
Regrets: Kerrie Skillen (Stantec)

Discussion Item	Action
Welcome and Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
Confirm agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• For our next Liaison Committee meeting, we will circulate the previous meeting notes along with the new agenda.
Review Action Items from LC Meeting #1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Follow up with members after emails are sent to ensure attachments are received.• Email members a copy of the setbacks which will be applied throughout the design of the project.• Algonquin Power is developing a project website (with email address, mailing address and phone number) through which stakeholders can review general project information and communicate with the Project team. Provide information to members so they can share it with community members who have questions and/or concerns.• The project website will include the current project schedule, frequently asked questions, third party information and meeting records from the Liaison Committee meetings.• A call to Ian Murray (Amherst Island Beacon newspaper) will be coordinated to ask if he would allow information on the project (which would include a short meeting summary, project timeline and the project website address) to be printed in the newspaper. If the request is not granted then inquire if the project website	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Complete• Complete• Complete, will be updated as project progresses• Complete, will be updated as project progresses• Complete

Discussion Item	Action
<p>address could be printed in the newspaper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members to forward Sean printed information about the project or wind power that they receive from other sources. • Algonquin Power will be assessing if wireless technology will be used for monitoring the turbines. If this technology will be used, perhaps the company will assess the concept of investigating high speed wireless Internet connection and ability for residents to connect to it. • A geotechnical study will be completed to confirm subsurface information to design an appropriate style of foundation for each turbine. • Stantec to follow-up with a phone interview with Janet Scott about avian species on the island. • Will provide an update about the election in relation to potential impacts to the Renewable Energy Approvals process at our next Liaison Committee meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing • Ongoing • Ongoing • Andrew Taylor (Stantec) left a message with Janet Scott on Thursday, October 6 • Update to be provided at next meeting
<p>The team also reviewed additional suggestions submitted between meetings by a member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you clarify whether the existing poles can be used or replaced to handle both purposes? Can you clarify whether the easement (corridor?) for the hydro and telephone poles that run behind some homes (e.g. on the South Shore Rd.) can be used? • Forwarding information - perhaps at the next meeting we can agree that members with information forwarded to Sean would also go to the other committee members. • Can you tell where to find data for Wolfe Island bird and bat kills? • Article by Jerry Agar (QMI agency) - Money Blows Away in the Wind 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete – Sean responded via email on Friday, August 12 • Ongoing • Complete – Sean responded via email on Friday, August 12 • Complete – Sean responded via email on Friday, August 12

Discussion Item	Action
<p>Current Status of Project</p> <p>Sean provided a status update on the project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Notice to Engage was distributed to landowners on Amherst Island and the mainland and through media outlets. This has triggered a questions and comments. • The project website is up and running (www.amherstislandwindproject.com). • A copy of the draft Project Description Report is available online as well. This is a living document that will be revised as we gather more information about the project. • Field work on bird habitat, waterfowl, aquatics and Stage 1 archeology has been completed. • Agencies such as the Kingston Field Naturalists and the Conservation Authority have been contacted. • Stantec, Algonquin and Hatch are working on a preliminary layout of the turbine locations, access roads, etc. This will only be released after discussions with landowners, likely at the first Open House. • Overall, the project is progressing well and the timeline is in good shape. • An inter-agency meeting is planned for after the election with key provincial and federal agencies. The intent of this meeting will be to provide updates, coordinate activities and raise any issues of concern. • Separate conversations will be held with other agencies such as Hydro One. • A meeting is planned with the Township, County and Conservation Authority to discuss the draft layout. • Meetings are planned with landowners to discuss the draft layout and plans for Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment • The first Open House will likely be held in late November/ early December 2011. Two nights will be planned – one on the Island and one on the mainland. Exact locations are to be determined. Notification will follow by mail and in local newspapers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sean to double-check about bookmarking challenges from the south shore.

Discussion Item	Action
<p>Next Steps</p> <p>Sean provided an overview of the next steps the project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Open House planned for late November/early December 2011. • Stage 2 archeological field work is weather dependent and will commence in late October/November. Residents will likely notice plowing in potential component and access road areas. A member reminded field workers to be cautious of deer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
<p>Review of Priorities and Concerns</p> <p>Members raised the following topics related to the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final arguments for the Wolfe Island property values hearing are today. No one was sure of when the final decision will be made. • An all-candidates meeting was held on the Island. The inequality of ferry service was raised, but wind energy was the number one topic. • A member asked whether the existing ferry and dock will be used for this project. No, Windlectric is not envisioning using the existing ferry; planning on building a temporary loading/unloading structure to deliver and complete the project. The location of this structure is not 100% certain. • A member stated a concern about owl woods and bird migration; awaiting more information as the project progresses. The “Friends of the Owl Woods” Management Strategy was mentioned. • A member mentioned two recent conversations of note: one about the importance of good installation on reducing noise from turbines in Thamesville and another about concerns about whom to follow-up with if you have an issue after the turbines are erected. Sean stated that the proponent (Windlectric) would be the first point of contact. <p>Rob asked if the Stantec field workers had been well-perceived. The members noted that they have been courteous and respectful.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members will continue to circulate articles and publications to the Liaison Committee. • Windlectric to obtain copy of the Friends of the Owl Woods” Management Strategy. In a follow-up meeting, Stephen Knechtel of the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority indicated that he will provide an electronic copy of the Owl Woods Management Strategy

Discussion Item	Action
<p>Other Items A member brought the group's attention to two additional publications that have been circulated on the island:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A mail-out on the position of four political parties on wind turbines • The Stantec Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members to fax or scan a copy to Sean
<p>Next Meeting Date and Adjourn The group discussed the date of the next Liaison Committee meeting. It will be about two weeks prior to the first Open House, likely in November 2011.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next date to be confirmed with members as soon as possible.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

Algonquin Power Co.

Sean Fairfield
 Manager – Environmental Planning
 Algonquin Power Co. (on behalf of Windlectric Inc.)

Agenda



Liaison Committee – Meeting #3

Location: St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, 2045 Stella
40 Foot Road

Date: November 16, 2011

Time: 5:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Desired Outcomes:

- To review action items from Liaison Committee (LC) Meeting #2
- To update LC members on the Project
- To discuss key priorities raised by the local community and by LC members to integrate into material for the first round of Public Open Houses

Agenda:

Discussion Item	Approximate Time
1. Confirm Agenda	5 mins
2. Review Action Items from LC Meeting #2	5 mins
3. Current Status of the Project <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Website• Completed field work• Ongoing technical work• Layout• Review timeline and schedule	15 mins
4. Discuss Upcoming Open Houses <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Schedule• Intent• Suggested ideas and priorities to address	15 mins
5. Review of other priorities and concerns	15 mins
6. Discuss/confirm date of next LC meeting and adjourn	5 mins

Meeting Record



Stantec

Liaison Committee – Meeting #3 Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Date: Wednesday, November 16, 2011
 Place: St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, 2045 Stella 40 Foot Road, Amherst Island
 Time: 5:00 to 7:45 p.m.
 Next Meeting: To be determined
 Attendees: Janet Scott, Nancy Pearson, Tom Sylvester, and Zander Dunn (Members)
 Sean Fairfield (Algonquin Power)
 Amanda Kennedy and Kerrie Skillen (Stantec)

Discussion Item	Action
Confirm agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
Review Action Items from LC Meeting #2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All have been completed Election update: Tim Hudak appointed Vic Fedeli (former Mayor of North Bay as energy critic). Confirmed bookmarking challenges regarding the website and these were solved. No follow up required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andrew Taylor (Stantec) to arrange an in-person meeting with Janet Scott this winter to discuss avian species on the island. Algonquin to provide links on the Project website to relevant documents (such as the Owl Woods Management Strategy - www.kingstonfieldnaturalists.org/reports/owlwoodsmgmt.pdf).
Current Status of Project Sean and Kerrie provided a status update on the project, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting notes, agendas and the Terms of Reference for the Liaison Committee will be made available on the Project website in the near future. A revised Project Description Report (dated Nov, 2011) is available on the website. It is a living document and will continue to be revised. Public Open Houses will be held on December 6 and 7. Notification has occurred through mail-outs, newspaper ads and the website. Migratory bird surveys will continue through beginning of 2012. This will include winter raptor surveys this winter. Prepared preliminary draft layout after discussions with signed landowners, and applying environmental constraints. Layout will evolve as project proceeds. It will be presented at the Public Open Houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For our next meeting, Stantec will develop a short presentation on the Wolfe Island Wind Project, including a review of the studies completed as part of the Environmental Screening.

One Team. Infinite Solutions.

Discussion Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algonquin met with the Township in October to discuss the preliminary layout and potential municipal constraints. • Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and Built Heritage and Protected Property Assessment reports are drafted. Will be updated based on current layout. • Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment underway. • Preparing for Public Open House #1. • Consulting with Loyalist Township and the County of Lennox and Addington • Expect to conduct a marine archeology assessment in the spring of 2012. <p>Questions and comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If artifacts are found during the archeological studies, can they be used in local museums? • An owl was killed on the wires associated with a met tower just west of the Owl Woods. Can the tower come down? Algonquin will consider this request as the project moves forward. • Will the municipality be involved with the Public Open Houses? No, however Algonquin has met with them two or three times to review the Project. Algonquin is interested in entering into a Pre-Servicing Agreement with the municipality for upgrades to roads. • Five additional questions were provided in hard copy. These include questions about met towers, the Owl Woods, hunting, availability about the layout and the turbines. • Perhaps the company could assess the wireless internet on the island in relation to the project requirements. Could this service be improved on the island? • Will the emergency heli-pad be affected by the Project? • Are there going to be turbines on the mainland? No. The study area extends to the mainland because of the interconnection to the Hydro One network. The final location of the submarine cable crossing has not yet been determined. • How will Algonquin bring equipment to the island? The current plan is to utilize a barging system and install temporary docks, on the mainland and the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algonquin to circulate response to similar question asked about artifacts to the Liaison Committee. • Algonquin to provide responses to additional questions via email to members and update the list of Frequently Asked Questions for the project website. • A member of the Liaison Committee will send a photo of the existing cell tower to Algonquin. (Completed.) • Algonquin to follow-up about the heli-pad with appropriate authorities and report back at upcoming meeting.

Discussion Item	Action
<p>island, to allow for the transportation of equipment and project components between the island and the mainland. The details regarding the dock, including the final location, have not yet been determined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the turbines will be on the island, but the tax revenue will be going to Loyalist Township, not the island itself. Will the Township receive money in addition to the tax revenue? And will the tax revenue and/or additional monies be made available or used on the island? Algonquin has not discussed this with Council. Algonquin suggests the community speak with members of Council. If the Township approached Algonquin, they would enter into discussions. • How many turbines will there be on the Island? The project will have a total installed nameplate capacity of approximately 56 - 75 MW. Using the Siemens SWT-2.3-113 2.3 MW model wind turbine generators, there will be a maximum of 33 turbines located on the Island. The turbines will be direct drive with no gear boxes (note, the turbines will be quieter than if they had gear boxes). • The project is currently assessing the location of 37 turbine locations (4 more than the maximum 33 turbine locations). The additional 4 potential turbine locations will be removed prior to finalizing the layout. How will you eliminate the redundant turbine locations? The results of the technical studies (considering all regulatory constraints), such as the Stage 2 Archeological Assessment results, will help us determine the final layout. • We have heard that the wind on Amherst Island is marginal. Is this true? Will this be addressed at the Public Open House? Algonquin believes the Island has a good wind regime and the Project will be economically viable. • Will wayside pits be set up for gravel? Will a concrete batch plant be developed on the Island? These details have not yet been determined. • How deep will the pits need to be to stabilize the height of the turbines? At this time, this is uncertain; the answer will depend on the results of a geotechnical assessment, completed by a qualified subject matter expert, which will occur in the future. As the project progresses engineering details will be made available to the public in the Design and Operations Report. • Would you consider installing an interpretation 	

Discussion Item	Action
<p>centre on the Island? Algonquin will take this comment under consideration.</p>	
<p>4. Discuss Upcoming Open Houses</p> <p>The group discussed the upcoming Public Open Houses scheduled for December 6 and 7. Comments and suggestions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the preliminary draft layout map is legible and include as much contrast as possible. This will be important for the Open Houses as well as maps posted to the website. • Could you put wind energy in context with other sources of energy (coal, nuclear, etc.)? • Can you illustrate the distance between the turbines and houses (perhaps the percentage that exceed the setbacks)? • Could you arrange for a shuttle between the ferry dock and the mainland Open House? • Could you include QR (Quick Response) codes on the panels to link the information at the Public Open House to available information on the Project website? • Some of the major issues of concern in the community include: effect of the Project on birds and bats, human health, decommissioning/repowering, and property values. • The community would appreciate as much information as Algonquin can share about the project to reduce their anxiety • Information about construction including the type of stone anticipated for use on the project, details of road construction and upgrades, choice of erectors and damage deposit would be well-received • Information about the Siemens 2.3MW turbines would be appreciated: Does it require a bigger generator? How much more cement? Is it just 2.3 x 33 = 75.9 thus eliminating 4 sites? How will Siemens support the project? What impact does the larger turbine have on road sizes, designs? • Some other questions that community members may want answered are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Where will the turbines be made? Is there domestic content? ○ The economic case for building wind farms in Ontario. ○ What work has already been completed to date as part of the Renewable Energy Approval process? ○ Will the lights on the turbines affect the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeing as Nancy Pearson had to leave the meeting early, Stantec will call Nancy to discuss her thoughts and ideas about the upcoming Public Open Houses. (Completed and additional comments have been included in these meeting notes.) • Algonquin/ Stantec to review the suggestions and consider updating the display material for the Public Open Houses to integrate suggestions from the Liaison Committee, where possible.

Discussion Item	Action
<p>views at night?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Where are the Owl Woods? Could show the distance on the maps. ○ Will the private landing strip on the Island be affected? ○ Have these turbines been installed elsewhere (by Algonquin or other firms)? ○ Is there an opportunity for the municipality to upgrade water infrastructure during road construction? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some potential community benefits that could be illustrated are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An estimated range of township taxes ○ Improved road construction ○ Opportunities for local employment 	
<p>5. Review of Priorities and Concerns Members raised the topics related to the project during the discussion of agenda items #3 and #4.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None
<p>6. Next Meeting Date and Adjourn The group discussed the date of the next Liaison Committee meeting. It will be after the Public Open Houses, likely in late January or early February 2012.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Next date to be confirmed with members as soon as possible.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

Algonquin Power Co.

Sean Fairfield
Manager – Environmental Planning
Algonquin Power Co. (on behalf of Windelectric Inc.)

Agenda



Liaison Committee – Meeting #4

Location: St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, 2045 Stella 40 Foot Road

Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2012

Time: 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

Desired Outcomes:

- To review action items from Liaison Committee (LC) Meeting #3
- To review the feedback received at the Public Open House
- To update LC members on the Project
- To discuss key community priorities
- To review the Wolfe Island Wind Project

Agenda:

Discussion Item	Approximate Time
1. Confirm Agenda	5:00
2. Review Action Items from LC Meeting #3 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Refer to meeting notes from LC Meeting #3 (distributed on December 21, 2011)	5:05
3. Discuss Outcomes of the Public Open Houses <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Feedback and questions received• Follow-up	5:15
4. Current Status of the Project <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Website• Completed field work• Ongoing technical work• Layout• Review timeline and schedule	5:30
5. Presentation and Discussion: Wolfe Island Wind Project <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overview and review of the studies completed as part of the Environmental Screening	6:00
6. Review of Other Priorities and Concerns	6:30
7. Confirm Date of Next Liaison Committee Meeting and Adjourn	6:55

Meeting Record



Stantec

Liaison Committee – Meeting #4 Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2012
 Place: St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, 2045 Stella 40 Foot Road, Amherst Island
 Time: 5:00 to 6:50 p.m.
 Next Meeting: To be determined
 Attendees: Janet Scott, Nancy Pearson, Tom Sylvester, and Zander Dunn (Members)
 Sean Fairfield (Algonquin Power)
 Amanda Kennedy and Kerrie Skillen (Stantec)

Discussion Item	Action
<p>1. Confirm agenda</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
<p>2. Review Action Items from Liaison Committee Meeting #3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All action items have been completed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Algonquin to post the latest version of the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) to the Project website. (continuing) Algonquin to update typo on website: Wood → Woods (completed) Stantec to adjust the meeting notes from November 2011 to reflect “high speed wireless tower”, not “cell tower.” Algonquin to continue to follow-up with Ornge – waiting for a written response.
<p>3. Discuss Outcomes of the Public Open Houses Amanda provided a short overview of the results of the Public Open Houses, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attendance: approximately 400 people attended the Public Open Houses: ~225 on December 6th, 175 on December 7th. Some of the key themes and comments raised were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property values Health Impacts to roads Flicker effect/shadows Decommissioning/project lifespan Birds/bats/owls Wells/water table Maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Algonquin to continue to respond to questions and comments from the Public Open Houses and ongoing correspondence.

One Team. Infinite Solutions.

Discussion Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noise ○ Lighting ○ Construction effects (noise, dust, trees, etc.) • The Stantec team has compiled all of the written comments, letters and emails from the Public Open House and the ongoing correspondence. Along with Algonquin Power and other subject matter experts, a list of Frequently Asked Questions has been developed and Algonquin has started responding directly to questions and comments • In terms of follow-up, a thank you letter was sent to all Public Open House attendees who provided their contact information • The Liaison Committee raised the following additional concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Please try to avoid the stone walls as much as possible. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments received at Public Open House. Will address in REA reports, as appropriate, and in FAQ. ○ Concerned about impacts to roads. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Algonquin proposing to enter into a Road Use Agreement with the Municipality. ○ The Island does have rush hour traffic when people need to access the ferry. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A Traffic Management Plan will be developed. Information about the Traffic Management Plan will be included in the REA reports, as appropriate. ○ Has Algonquin looked at the possibility of installing lights that go off and on in the presence of aircraft? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lights are mandated for aviation requirements. Algonquin is in correspondence with the appropriate agencies. Algonquin will investigate this type of system. ○ What about decommissioning the turbines? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Algonquin will be responsible for decommissioning. A Decommissioning Plan Report will form part of the REA submission. The draft Decommissioning Plan Report will be available for public review 60 days prior to the final 	

Discussion Item	Action
<p>Public Open House.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ During the construction, where will workers stay? Eat? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No workers camp is envisioned. Construction employment numbers have been estimated at 25 – 45 (includes various contractors and this number could increase or decrease depending on the work being conducted). Some Islanders have offered accommodation and catering services. ○ Property values continue to be a question. In southwest Ontario, farmland prices are rising. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Windlectric is committed to keeping informed on the most recent findings and reports related to impacts on property values from operating wind farms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● When the reports are released, members and Algonquin will share the results.
<p>4. Current Status of Project</p> <p>Kerrie and Sean provided an update on the project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Website - updated regularly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reorganized public information files ○ Added information from Public Open House ○ Clarification on Estimated Tax Payments to Loyalist Township ○ Posted the Draft Site Plan map and report (Feb 2, 2012) ● Natural Heritage Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Migratory bird surveys will continue through beginning of 2012 ● Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment underway. ● Drafting Water Body Report ● Held meetings with the Ministry of the Environment (MOE), Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) ● Prepared Draft Site Plan map and report ● Tracking and responding to stakeholder comments ● Comments received from the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority on February 13, 2012 ● Algonquin has been in regular contact with the municipality. 	

Discussion Item	Action
<p>A number of comments, questions and concerns were raised including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that some of the turbines are located close to the Owl Woods where trees are dying. Algonquin noted that the layout is compliant with regulation and is noise compliant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In developing the preliminary layout, the significance of the Owl Woods was considered. The closest turbine (from blade tip) was established 100m from the Owl Woods and 500m from the pine plantation where the majority of owls can be found. • Concern about passerine migration in the fall. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Algonquin noted that migratory birds are considered during completion of the Natural Heritage Assessment (NHA). The draft NHA Report will be made available to the public 60 days before the final Public Open House. • What is a receptor? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noise receptors are defined in Ontario Regulation 359/09 as: “the centre of a building or structure that contains one or more dwellings” or “buildings used for an institutional purpose including an educational facility, day nursery, health care facility, community centre or place of worship”. A dwelling is further defined in O.Reg. 359/09 to mean “one or more habitable rooms used or capable of being used as a permanent or seasonal residence by one or more persons and usually containing cooking, eating, living, sleeping and sanitary facilities”. Examples of buildings that the Ministry of the Environment would consider dwellings include residences, hotels/motels, and nursing/retirement homes. Public or privately owned campsites or campgrounds are also included in the definition of noise receptors. ○ In addition to existing buildings, those that are planned for construction and have been issued a building permit under the Building Code Act or received site plan approval under the Planning Act, are also considered to be noise receptors. 	

Discussion Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are receptors located on the mainland? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The regulation asks that receptors be plotted within a 2km radius from the study area boundary. • What is UTM? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) is a geographic coordinate system that uses a 2-dimensional coordinate system to give locations on the surface of the Earth. (Wikipedia) • An article called “Important Bird Areas of Canada” in the Winter 2012 edition (Number 58) of <i>Bird Watch</i> was highlighted. • There have been a number of power outages on the Island. Is it possible to upgrade local infrastructure at the same time as the turbine installation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Algonquin encouraged members to speak to the local utility (Hydro One Networks) and Council to initiate these sorts of discussions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algonquin to acquire a copy of the article.
<p>5. Presentation and Discussion: Wolfe Island Wind Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group received a presentation on the Wolfe Island Wind Project, with a focus on the studies completed as part of the Environmental Screening. The presentation slides were distributed in hard copy and will be available on the Project website. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algonquin to post Liaison Committee meeting agenda, presentation slides and meeting notes to the Project website.
<p>6. Review of Other Priorities and Concerns</p> <p>Members raised the topics related to the project during the discussion of agenda items #3, and 5.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
<p>7. Next Meeting Date and Adjourn</p> <p>The group discussed the date of the next Liaison Committee meeting. It will likely be held in late April, 2012 (pending member schedules).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next date to be confirmed with members as soon as possible. • Questions and comments from Liaison Committee members and the community are welcome at any time.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

Algonquin Power Co.

Sean Fairfield
 Manager – Environmental Planning
 Algonquin Power Co. (on behalf of Windlectric Inc.)

Wolfe Island

Natural Environment Studies Completed for the Environmental Screening

- Migratory Raptors
- Winter Raptors
- Waterfowl studies including field usage, movement patterns and offshore staging behavior
- Migratory Passerines
- Breeding birds
- Bat and bat movement surveys using radar
- Ecological Land Classification and vegetation
- Amphibian surveys
- Deer and deer habitat surveys

Wolfe Island

Post Construction Surveys

- Bird and bat mortality surveys
 - Turbines surveyed twice a week for 52 weeks within a radius of 50m from the turbine base.
 - Each bird or bat is collected and its location, condition and species recorded.
 - Mortality data accounts for search efficiency and scavenging.
 - Reports are produced twice a year and submitted to the MNR, Environment Canada and Natural Resources Canada.
 - Last report completed in December 2011.
 - Results and reports are available to the public.

Wolfe Island

Post Construction Survey Results and Ongoing Work

- Bird mortality is below Ontario regulatory thresholds and lower than a number of other north American projects.
- Bat mortality exceeds regulatory thresholds.
- No significant impact to raptor abundance. Winter raptors, including species at risk such as Short-eared Owls, continue to be common on the island within the project area.
- Bobolinks have experienced fatalities but remain abundant and widespread on the island within the project area.
- Operational mitigation studies are currently underway to reduce bat mortality.

Agenda



Liaison Committee – Meeting #5

Location: St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, 2045 Stella 40 Foot Road

Date: Wednesday, September 12, 2012

Time: 4:30 to 7:30 p.m.

Desired Outcomes:

- To review action items from Liaison Committee (LC) Meeting #4
- To review project activities since our last meeting
- To review next steps

Agenda:

Discussion Item	Approximate Time
1. Confirm Agenda	4:30
2. Review Action Items from LC Meeting #4 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Refer to meeting notes from LC Meeting #4 (distributed on April 4, 2012)	4:35
3. Provide Project Status Update <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reviewed comments from public in relation to project layout• Discussions with Ministry of the Environment• Engineering and design for project component locations• Additional ploughing• Notice of Revised Draft Site Plan and Revised Study Area Communication with municipality<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Submitted Community Vibrancy Agreement and Draft Road User Agreement to Township○ Indemnity Agreement	5:15
4. Discuss Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review timeline and schedule• Working toward submission of draft REA application.• Negotiate the Draft Road User Agreement and provide additional road information to Township	6:15
5. Other	7:00
6. Discuss Date of Next Liaison Committee Meeting and Adjourn	7:30

Meeting Record



Stantec

Liaison Committee – Meeting #5

Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Date: Wednesday, September 12, 2012
Place: St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, 2045 Stella 40 Foot Road, Amherst Island
Time: 4:30 to 7:30 p.m.
Next Meeting: To be determined
Attendees: Janet Scott, Nancy Pearson, Tom Sylvester, and Zander Dunn (Members)
Sean Fairfield (Algonquin Power)
Kerrie Skillen (Stantec)

Discussion Item	Action
1. Confirm agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
2. Review Action Items from Liaison Committee Meeting #4 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Algonquin followed-up with Ornge – Ornge has no significant concerns with the proposed project layout.• Obtained article called “Important Bird Areas of Canada” in the Winter 2012 edition (Number 58) of <i>Bird Watch</i>.• Algonquin to share draft REA reports and results with LC when they are ready for release.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Algonquin to post the latest version of the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) to the Project website. (ongoing)• Stantec to adjust the meeting notes from November 2011 to reflect “high speed wireless tower”, not “cell tower.” (completed)• Algonquin to continue to respond to questions and comments from stakeholders. (ongoing)• Algonquin to post Liaison Committee meeting agenda, presentation slides and meeting notes to the Project website. (ongoing)• Continue to share information via email. (ongoing)
3. Provide Project Status Update <p>Provided an overview of the project since the last meeting, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Algonquin has been reviewing the proposed project layout relative to all environmental constraints, civil engineering requirements, and public input.• Work completed from Spring 2012 onward to re-assess the proposed project layout. Works included Stage 2 archaeological assessment on lands potentially required for the project. The Stage 2 archaeological assessment was schedule around the breeding bird season. The MNR was consulted prior to and during the Stage 2	

Discussion Item	Action
<p>archaeological assessment work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultation with Loyalist Township has been ongoing. Loyalist Township approved Stage 2 archaeological assessment work to be conducted within an unopened road allowance on the Island.• Marine archaeological assessment has included sonar scanning of the proposed submarine cable route, docks, shoreline and bubbler line.• Consulting with the MTO regarding crossing the bubbler line with the submarine cable.• Consulting with DFO regarding design concepts for the proposed docks.• Meteorological (met) towers on the island were re-equipped to gather data on the wind regime on the island.• In addition to the existing met towers, a mobile Lidar System is being used on the Island to collect wind data. The mobile unit reduces the number of met towers required to collect data.• In June 2012 Algonquin Power requested (from the MOE) a one year extension for submission of the project Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application and approval to revise the Draft Site Plan (originally issued in February 2012) by moving potential locations for Turbines S24, S15, S21 and S01.• The MOE approved the extension in July 2012. The revised REA application submission deadline is August 2, 2013.• The MOE approved the movement of the turbine locations in August 2012. As a result, Algonquin Power issued a revised Draft Site Plan in September 2012.• When the revised Draft Site Plan was issued, Algonquin Power also updated the Project Study Area (PSA). The MOE was consulted prior to Algonquin Power revising the PSA. The PSA was updated as follows: A small area on the mainland was added to accommodate the potential location of project components on the mainland adjacent to the east side of the original PSA. No wind turbine generators will be located in this area. All required environmental and technical studies will be conducted on the area as required by O. Reg. 359/09.• A Notice of Revised Draft Site Plan and Revised Study Area was published in the local newspaper and issued to local stakeholders.	

Discussion Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Algonquin Power submitted a Community Vibrancy Agreement and Draft Road User Agreement to Loyalist Township.Algonquin Power and Loyalist Township negotiated an Indemnity Agreement which provides the Township with financial support to pay for the review of the REA application.	
<p>4. Discuss Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The revised approximate project schedule was presented.The project team is working towards submitting the draft REA application.At this time Public Open House #2 is being proposed for January 2013.Algonquin Power will negotiate the Draft Road User Agreement with the Township.	
<p>5. Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">None	<ul style="list-style-type: none">None
<p>7. Next Meeting Date and Adjourn</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Next date to be confirmed with members as soon as possible.Questions and comments from Liaison Committee members and the community are welcome at any time.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

Algonquin Power Co.

Sean Fairfield
Manager – Environmental Planning
Algonquin Power Co. (on behalf of Windlectric Inc.)

Meeting Record



Stantec

Liaison Committee – Meeting #6 (conference call)

Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Date: Thursday, December 13, 2012
Place: Conference call
Time: 5:00 pm to 5:45 p.m.
Next Meeting: To be determined
Attendees: Janet Scott, Nancy Pearson, Tom Sylvester, and Zander Dunn (Members)
Sean Fairfield (Algonquin Power)
Alex Tsopelas (Algonquin Power)
Rob Rowland (Stantec)

Discussion Item	Action
1. Confirm agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
2. Introduction of Alex Tsopelas (Project Manager for the project) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alex introduced himself to the group• If members have any questions they can also contact Alex (he provided his phone number: (905) 829-6388)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None
3. Provide Project Status Update <p>Provided an overview of the project since the last meeting, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Algonquin updated members on the work that has been ongoing in developing the project draft Renewable Energy Approval (REA) technical documents.• Algonquin has delivered to Loyalist Township the project draft REA technical documents for their review. The Township has 90 days for review of the documents, prior to the final project open house(s), and to complete the Municipal Consultation form and submit to the Ministry of Environment.• Draft Natural Heritage Assessment and Cultural Heritage and Archaeological reports have been submitted to the MNR and MTCS.• Algonquin has signed an Indemnity Agreement with the Township to pay for their staff to hire a 3 party consultant to review the draft REA technical documents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• PLC member inquired if a hard copy draft REA technical reports could be placed on the island in a location where the public could review. <p>Algonquin had no issues with this suggestion and asked the members if they had any ideas where the document could be placed. The one suggestion by members was perhaps the ferry office on the island. Algonquin committed to asking the Township senior management representative if this could be possible.</p>

Discussion Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algonquin is working with Stantec to coordinate the dates for the final public open house(s). It is estimated that the first week of March would be the period, pending the booking of venues. The plan would be to submit to the public notice letters of the dates of the public open house(s). • Additional information in the public notices will inform the public about the delivery of a hard copy of the draft REA technical report to the County, First Nations and the Township for public review. The draft REA technical reports will also be posted on the project web site (www.amherstislandwindproject.com). • The REA regulations require that the public have 60 days period to review the draft REA technical documents. • A PLC member inquired about the use of island roads. Algonquin submitted to the Township transportation and conceptual route plans with typical engineering information for review and comment. Several discussions have been held with Township staff to discuss further information they require. Question – the road work at certain corners will that be permanent or temporary. The plan is this civil work would be temporary. • Algonquin is communicating with the Township regarding the draft Community Vibrancy Agreement and draft Road Use Agreement. 	
<p>5. Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
<p>7. Next Meeting Date and Adjourn</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD 	

The conference call adjourned at approximately 5:45 pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

Algonquin Power Co.

Sean Fairfield
 Manager – Environmental Planning
 Algonquin Power Co. (on behalf of Windlectric Inc.)

Appendix E3

Generic Letters Accompanying Mailouts



Stantec

Stantec Consulting Ltd.
Suite 1 - 70 Southgate Drive
Guelph ON N1G 4P5
Tel: (519) 836-6050
Fax: (519) 836-2493

September 13, 2011
File: 160960595

**Reference: Amherst Island Wind Energy Project
Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Project**

Dear Landowner,

Windlectric Inc. (Windlectric) would like to take this opportunity to provide you with information on their proposed Amherst Island Wind Energy Project (the Project) within Loyalist Township in the County of Lennox and Addington, Ontario.

Please find attached the Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Project for the above-mentioned project. As described in the Notice, the Draft Project Description Report is available on the project website: www.amherstislandwindproject.com.

Windlectric is initiating the environmental approvals for the proposed Project. Presently, this includes a Renewable Energy Approval (REA) as required under Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the *Environmental Protection Act*. Windlectric has retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) to assist in the preparation of the REA application for the Project.

To provide the project team with your comments or for further information, please contact us at the address below. For more information about the project, please visit the website: www.amherstislandwindproject.com.

Sean Fairfield
Manager, Environmental Planning
Algonquin Power Co.
2845 Bristol Circle,
Oakville, ON L6H 7H7
Tel: 905-465-4518
Sean.Fairfield@algonquinpower.com

Rob Rowland
Senior Project Manager
Stantec Consulting Ltd.
Suite 1 - 70 Southgate Drive
Guelph, ON N1G 4P5
Tel: 519-836-6966 ext 550
Rob.Rowland@Stantec.com

Sincerely,

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Rob Rowland
Senior Project Manager
Tel: (519) 836-6050
Fax: (519) 836-2493
rob.rowland@stantec.com

Attachments: Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Project

cc. Sean Fairfield, Algonquin Power Co. (for Windlectric Inc.)



Stantec Consulting Ltd.
70 Southgate Drive Suite 1
Guelph ON N1G 4P5
Tel: (519) 836-6050
Fax: (519) 836-2493

Stantec

November 1, 2011
File: 160960595

**Reference: Amherst Island Wind Energy Project
Notice of Public Meeting**

Dear Landowner:

Please find attached the Notice of Public Meeting for the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project. The Notice of Public Meeting will be published in local newspapers on November 3rd, November 5th and November 10th. As described in the notice, Windlectric Inc. is proposing to develop the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project. All project infrastructure will be located within Loyalist Township in the County of Lennox and Addington, Ontario, as shown on the map embedded in the notice (Project Study Area).

Meeting Locations:

DATE:	December 6, 2011	DATE:	December 7, 2011
TIME:	5:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M.	TIME:	5:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M.
LOCATION:	Amherst Island Public School 5955 Front Road Stella, ON	LOCATION:	St. Johns Memorial Hall 216 Church Street (County Road 7) Bath, ON

You have been included on the Project's consultation distribution list as you live or own property within 550m of the Project location, have expressed interest in the Project, or have received previous correspondence in connection with the Project. If our contact information should be updated, please contact the undersigned at your earliest convenience.

We look forward to working with you, and obtaining your valuable input, as this Project progresses through the regulatory approvals process. To provide the project team with your comments or for further information, please contact us at one of the addresses below.

Sean Fairfield
Manager, Environmental Planning
Algonquin Power Co.
2845 Bristol Circle,
Oakville, ON L6H 7H7
Tel: 905-465-4518
Sean.Fairfield@algonquinpower.com

Rob Rowland
Senior Project Manager
Stantec Consulting Ltd.
Suite 1 - 70 Southgate Drive
Guelph, ON N1G 4P5
Tel: 519-836-6966 ext. 550
Rob.Rowland@Stantec.com

For more information about the project, please visit the website: www.amherstislandwindproject.com.

Respectfully,
STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Rob Rowland
Senior Project Manager
Tel: (519) 836-6966 x550
Fax: (519) 836-2493
Rob.Rowland@stantec.com

Attachment: Notice of Public Meeting

cc. Sean Fairfield, Algonquin Power Co. (for Windlectric Inc.)



Stantec Consulting Ltd.
70 Southgate Drive Suite 1
Guelph ON N1G 4P5
Tel: (519) 836-6050
Fax: (519) 836-2493

Stantec

February 1, 2012
File: 160960595

**Reference: Amherst Island Wind Energy Project
Notice of Draft Site Plan**

Dear Landowner/Resident:

Windlectric Inc (Windlectric) would like to take this opportunity to provide you with information on their proposed Amherst Island Wind Energy Project (the Project) within Loyalist Township in the County of Lennox and Addington, Ontario.

Please find attached the Notice of Draft Site Plan for the above-mentioned project. As described in the Notice, the Draft Site Plan is available on the project website: www.amherstislandwindproject.com and in hard copy at the following locations:

County of Lennox & Addington
97 Thomas Street East
Napanee, ON
K7R 4B9

The Corporation of the Township of Loyalist
263 Main Street
Odessa, ON
K0H 2H0.

Windlectric is initiating the environmental approvals for the proposed Project. Presently, this includes a Renewable Energy Approval (REA) as required under Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the *Environmental Protection Act*. Windlectric has retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) to assist in the preparation of the REA application for the Project.

To provide the project team with your comments or for further information, please contact us at the address below.

Sean Fairfield
Manager, Environmental Planning
Algonquin Power Co.
2845 Bristol Circle,
Oakville, ON L6H 7H7
Tel: 905-465-4518
Sean.Fairfield@algonquinpower.com

Rob Rowland
Senior Project Manager
Stantec Consulting Ltd.
Suite 1 - 70 Southgate Drive
Guelph, ON N1G 4P5
Tel: 519-836-6966 ext. 550
Rob.Rowland@Stantec.com

For more information about the project, please visit the website: www.amherstislandwindproject.com.

Respectfully,

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Kerrie Skillen
Project Manager
Tel: (905) 631-3923
Fax: (905) 631-8960
Kerrie.Skillen@stantec.com

Attachment: Notice of Draft Site Plan
cc. Sean Fairfield, Algonquin Power Co. (for Windlectric Inc.)



Stantec Consulting Ltd.
70 Southgate Drive Suite 1
Guelph ON N1G 4P5
Tel: (519) 836-6050
Fax: (519) 836-2493

Stantec

August 22, 2012
File: 160960595

**Reference: Amherst Island Wind Energy Project
Notice of Revised Draft Site Plan and Revised Study Area**

Dear Landowner/Resident:

Windlectric Inc (Windlectric) would like to take this opportunity to provide you with information on their proposed Amherst Island Wind Energy Project (the Project) within Loyalist Township in the County of Lennox and Addington, Ontario.

Please find attached the Notice of Revised Draft Site Plan and Revised Study Area for the above-mentioned project. As described in the Notice, the Revised Draft Site Plan is available on the project website: www.amherstislandwindproject.com and in hard copy at the following locations:

County of Lennox & Addington
97 Thomas Street East
Napanea, ON
K7R 4B9

The Corporation of the Township of Loyalist
263 Main Street
Odessa, ON
K0H 2H0.

Windlectric is initiating the environmental approvals for the proposed Project. Presently, this includes a Renewable Energy Approval (REA) as required under Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the *Environmental Protection Act*. Windlectric has retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) to assist in the preparation of the REA application for the Project.

To provide the project team with your comments or for further information, please contact us at the address below.

Sean Fairfield
Manager, Environmental Planning
Algonquin Power Co.
2845 Bristol Circle,
Oakville, ON L6H 7H7
Tel: 905-465-4518
Sean.Fairfield@algonquinpower.com

Rob Rowland
Senior Project Manager
Stantec Consulting Ltd.
Suite 1 - 70 Southgate Drive
Guelph, ON N1G 4P5
Tel: 519-836-6966 ext. 550
Rob.Rowland@Stantec.com

For more information about the project, please visit the website: www.amherstislandwindproject.com.

Respectfully,

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Kerrie Skillen
Project Manager
Tel: (905) 631-3923
Fax: (905) 631-8960
Kerrie.Skillen@stantec.com

Attachment: Notice of Revised Draft Site Plan
cc. Sean Fairfield, Algonquin Power Co. (for Windlectric Inc.)

Appendix E4

First Public Open House Display Boards

Welcome

to the
First Public Open House
under the
Renewable Energy Approval (REA) Process
for the
Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Thank you for coming!

- We are happy to share with you information about this clean, renewable energy project.
- Please take some time to review the display boards and feel free to ask the Project Team any questions you may have.
- We want to hear from you! If you would like to be added to the Project mailing list, please sign up at the welcome table. Please also feel free to take a questionnaire to make sure your comments and questions are received by the Project Team.

Objectives of this Public Open House

- Provide information about the Project, including the current status.
- Provide an overview of the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) process.
- Share information about the environmental studies which have been completed to date.
- Answer questions and outline next steps.
- Receive the community's input and feedback for consideration by the Project team.



Who Are We

Algonquin Power & Utilities Corp. ("APUC") is a respected and socially responsible participant in the renewable energy and sustainable infrastructure sectors and with generating stations across North America including wind energy and hydroelectric facilities. The Amherst Island Wind Energy Project is being developed by Windlectric Inc., a subsidiary of Algonquin. Gaia Power Inc. (Kingston, Ontario) is the original developer of the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project.

Windlectric has retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. to prepare the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application, as required under O. Reg. 359/09. For this project, Stantec is providing professional consulting services in environmental sciences, consultation and project management.

The entire study team for the Project includes:



Stantec Consulting Ltd. – Renewable Energy Approval Process
HATCH Consulting – Engineering
Intrinsik – Health



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Project Overview

- 56 – 75 megawatt (MW) Wind Energy Project.
- Within Loyalist Township in the County of Lennox and Addington in eastern Ontario.



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N). All areas provided are for reference only. All rights reserved. © Windtec Inc. 2011.
2. Ontario Municipal Resources & Services Printer for Ontario, 2011.



Stantec
ClimateProject

May 2011
10202016

WINDTECH INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No. 1

Title
PROJECT STUDY AREA

www.amherstislandwindenergyproject.com/Assets/AMHERST_ISLAND_WIND_ENERGY_PROJECT_STUDY_AREA_MAP_20111016.mxd
D:\amherst\GIS\2011\Map\Map_20111016.mxd



Project Components

Basic project components include:

- Approximately 31-37 Siemens SWT-2.3-113 2.3 MW model wind turbine generators (total installed nameplate capacity of approximately 56 - 75 MW);
- A 34.5 kilovolt (kV) electrical power line collector system (will be buried where possible);
- Fibre optic data lines from each turbine and/or wireless technology for the communication of data;
- A submarine cable;
- An operations and maintenance building;
- A substation (on the island);
- A transformer station (on the mainland);
- Meteorological tower(s) (met tower);
- An access road to the met tower site; and,
- Access roads to turbine components and infrastructure.

Temporary components during construction may include a temporary dock, storage and staging areas at the turbine locations, staging areas along access roads, delivery truck turnaround areas, central laydown areas, crane paths and associated watercourse crossings.

The electrical power line collector system would transport the electricity generated from each turbine to the substation, along the submarine cable to the mainland and then to a transformer station located adjacent to an existing Hydro One Networks Inc. 115 kV transmission line.



Site Selection

Why choose Amherst Island?

- Good wind regime;
- Electrical interconnection – the Project has access to connect to existing transmission capacity on the Hydro One provincial grid;
- Landowner interest;
- Compatible land uses – agricultural land requiring a small footprint for Project components;
- Flat topography for the Project Study Area; and
- Site access – good existing road infrastructure.



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Study Area - Overview



Legend

Project Study Area

Project Components


- Turbine
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Station (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock

Existing Features

- Road
- Railway
- Watercourse
- Waterbody
- Property Boundaries
- Mapbook Page

The preliminary location of project components on the mainland and the location of the submarine cable landing area and temporary dock are provided in the draft REA reports and during the Final Public Open House. The draft REA documents will be made available in draft form for public review on the project website at www.amherstislandwindproject.com and in public venues. The Final Public Open House is planned for August 2012.

- Notes**
1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N)
 2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
 3. Imagery Source: Aerial Base Solutions © 2011.
 4. The Location of Project Components on the Mainland is Preliminary and Subject to Change



Stantec
Number: 2011-08-08
100000000

Client/Project
**WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT**

Figure No. 1
Title
**Preliminary Draft Layout-
Overview**



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Study Area - Western Portion



Legend

- Project Study Area
- Project Components
 - Turbine
 - Access Road
 - Collector Lines
 - Turn Around Path
 - Laydown Area and Crane Pad
- Existing Features
 - Road
 - Railway
 - Watercourse
 - Waterbody
 - Property Boundaries

The preliminary location of project components on the mainland and the location of the submarine cable crossing have not been finalized at this time. The preliminary location of these components will be finalized in the Final Public Open House documents. The draft REA documents will be made available in draft form for review and comment a minimum of 60 days before the Final Public Open House, online and in public venues. The Final Public Open House is planned for August 2012.

- Notes**
1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N)
 2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer, Ontario, 2011.
 3. Imagery Date: 2008
 4. The Location of Project Components on the Mainland is Preliminary and Subject to Change

Stantec
 Number: 2011-02-03
 Date: 2011-02-03
 Project: WINDLECTRIC INC. AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT


Figure No. 1A
 Title

Preliminary Draft Layout - Western Portion



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Study Area - Central Portion



Legend

Project Study Area

Project Components

- Turbine
- Access Road
- Collector Lines
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Pled
- Potential Laydown and Storage Area
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock

Existing Features

- Road
- Railway
- Watercourse
- Waterbody
- Property Boundaries

The preliminary location of project components on the mainland and the location of the submarine cable crossing have not been finalized at this time. The preliminary location of these components will be finalized during the public review process. The Final Public Open House documents will be made available in draft form for review and comment a minimum of 60 days before the Final Public Open House, online and in public venues. The Final Public Open House is planned for August 2012.

- Notes**
1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N)
 2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer, Ontario, 2011.
 3. Imagery Source: GeoEye, 2008
 4. Imagery Date: 2008
 5. The Location of Project Components on the Mainland is Preliminary and Subject to Change



Stantec
 Number: 2011-07-00000000
 Date: 2011-07-01

WINDLECTRIC INC.
 AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No. 1B
 Title: Preliminary Draft Layout - Central Portion

Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Study Area - Eastern Portion



- Legend**
- Project Study Area
 - Project Components
 - Turbine
 - Access Road
 - Collector Lines
 - Turn Around Path
 - Laydown Area and Crane Pad
 - Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
 - Existing Features
 - Road
 - Railway
 - Watercourse
 - Waterbody
 - Property Boundaries

The preliminary location of project components on the mainland and the location of the submarine cable crossing have not been finalized at this time. The preliminary location of these components will be finalized after the completion of the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and the Final Public Open House. The draft REA documents will be made available in draft form for review and comment a minimum of 60 days before the Final Public Open House, online at www.ontario.ca/energy and in public venues. The Final Public Open House is planned for August 2012.

- Notes**
1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N)
 2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer, Ontario, 2011.
 3. Imagery courtesy of Earth Base Solutions © 2011. Imagery Date: 2008
 4. The Location of Project Components on the Mainland is Preliminary and Subject to Change



Stantec
 Client/Project
 WINDLECTRIC INC.
 AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT


Number: 2011-00000000
 Date: 2011-02-03

Figure No. 1C
 Title Preliminary Draft Layout - Eastern Portion

Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Wind Turbine Details

Approximate Dimensions



Note: not to scale



Renewable Energy Approval Process - An Overview

- The Green Energy and Green Economy Act (GEA), and related amendments to other provincial legislation, received Royal Assent in the Ontario Legislature on May 14, 2009.
- The Project will require a REA according to Ontario Regulation 359/09 (Renewable Energy Approvals under Part V0.1 of the Act) under the Environmental Protection Act. This regulation became law on September 24, 2009, was amended on January 1, 2011, and replaces the previous Ontario Environmental Assessment Act process for wind projects.
- REA is a stringent environmental approval process that Windlectric Inc. needs to satisfy before construction.
- The REA application for the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project will include a comprehensive assessment and plan related to Project design, construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning.



Public, Municipal and Aboriginal Consultation

Renewable Energy Approval Process - Setback Distances

A key component of the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) process is the establishment of common setbacks for all renewable energy facilities in the Province.

Within the regulation, there are some setbacks for which studies that identify potential adverse environmental effects and mitigation measures can be conducted if it is not possible to meet the setback requirements.

For example, in some instances, development and site alteration may be possible within a setback area if an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) is completed to assess potential impacts and mitigation measures.



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Key Setbacks

Key setbacks which will be applied throughout the design of the Project are as follows:

Feature	Setback Distance	Study Alternative When Within Setback
Non-participating receptor	550 m (from turbine base)	An Environmental Noise Impact Assessment will be completed for the Project according to MOE Noise Guidelines.
Public road right-of-way and railway right-of-way	Turbine blade length + 10 m (from turbine base)	N/A
Property line	Turbine height (excluding blades) (from turbine base)	Does not apply to parcels of land if the abutting parcel of land is a participant in the Project or if it is demonstrated that the wind turbine will not result in adverse impacts on nearby business, infrastructure, properties or land use activities.
Provincially significant southern wetland	120 m	Development not permitted within feature. Development and site alteration may be possible within setback area; Environmental Impact Study required.
Provincially significant Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (Earth Science)	50 m	Development and site alteration may be possible within natural feature and setback area; Environmental Impact Study required.
Provincially significant Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (Life Science)	120 m	
Significant valleyland	120 m	
Significant woodland	120 m	
Significant wildlife habitat	120 m	
Lake	120 m from the average annual high water mark	
Permanent or intermittent stream	120 m from the average annual high water mark	Development and site alteration may be possible within setback area; additional report required. No turbine or transformer located within a permanent or intermittent stream or within 30 m of the average annual high water mark.
Seepage area	120 m	Development and site alteration may be possible within setback area; additional report required. No turbine or transformer located within 30 m of a seepage area.



Stantec



Windlectric Inc.

Renewable Energy Approval Reports

- Draft Project Description Report (available)
- Construction Plan Report
- Design & Operations Report
 - Property Line Setback Assessment Report
 - Noise Assessment Report
- Decommissioning Plan Report
- Consultation Report
- Natural Heritage Assessment (and Environmental Impact Study, if required)
 - Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan
- Water Assessment Report (and Water Body Report, if required)
- Protected Properties and Heritage Assessment
- Archaeological Assessment (Stage 1 and 2, Marine)
- Wind Turbine Specifications Report

All reports, with the exception of the Consultation Report, will be made available in draft form for review and comment a minimum of 60 days before the Final Public Open House online at www.amherstislandwindproject.com and in public venues.

Technical Studies

Environmental studies are being completed to fully understand the local environment and assist with the development of the Project Layout.

The technical studies have included, to date, the analysis of:


- Wildlife and wildlife habitat, including Species at Risk and Significant Wildlife Habitat;
- Bird breeding and migration areas;
- Waterbodies and aquatic resources;
- Woodlands, vegetation, and other significant natural features (e.g. wetlands and Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest);
- Preliminary Noise Analysis; and
- Archaeological Features, Built Heritage Features and Protected Properties.

The Natural Heritage Assessment (NHA), Water Assessment, Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessments, and Protected Properties and Heritage Assessment reports, with more information on the natural environment in the Study Area, will be provided in draft form for public review and comment a minimum of 60 days before the Final Public Open House.



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

NHA and Water Body Assessment



- Legend**
- Project Study Area
 - Road
 - Railway
 - Watercourse
 - Property Boundaries
 - Wooded Area
 - Waterbody
 - Provincially Significant Wetland
 - Area of Natural and Scientific Interest Boundary
 - Waterbody Status
 - REA Waterbody
 - Not a REA Waterbody

Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Province of Ontario Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.



Client/Project
 WINDLECTRIC INC.
 AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No. 1
 Title

**Natural Features
 Map**

W:\a\60000000\00000000\GIS\MXD\00000000\Map\0011\00000000_NaturalFeatures_201110.mxd
 Revised on: 2011-05-03 By: chawny



Built Heritage, Protected Properties and Archaeological Assessment


- Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessments
- Marine Archaeology
- Heritage Impact Assessment
- Protected Properties Assessment

Heritage, Protected Properties, and Archaeological Assessments include a review of heritage and archaeological resources.

- These studies are underway with completion anticipated for mid-2012



Environmental Noise



- There are two potential sources of sound typically associated with wind turbines:
 - Aerodynamic: Blades pass through the air and create a “swishing” sound
 - Mechanical: Originates from the gearbox and generator that are often housed in the nacelle. The turbines selected for this project are direct drive and do not have gearboxes.
- An Environmental Noise Impact Assessment will be completed to ensure compliance with the Ministry of the Environment (MOE)'s regulatory requirements. The report will be included in the Design and Operations Report.
- Ontario use an internationally accepted sound model, which is supported by experiences in the province and in other jurisdictions.
- Current regulatory requirements are intended to limit sound levels outside the nearest dwelling to 40 dBA. This sound level is equal to the World Health Organization Europe (2009) night-time noise guideline that is a health-based value designed to allow good conditions for sleeping.
- The assessment will also take into consideration other operational and proposed wind facilities within a 3 km radius of noise receptors. This will help to ensure a conservative (cautious) approach is being used which considers cumulative noise effects.



Health and Wind Power

Public health and safety will be considered during all stages of the Project.

- Many studies have been conducted world-wide to examine the relationship between wind turbines and possible human health effects.
- In Ontario

• *“Ontario doctors, nurses, and other health professionals support energy conservation combined with wind and solar power – to help us move away from coal”*

Ontario College of Family Physicians, Registered Nurses Association of Ontario, Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, Physicians for Global Survival, the Asthma Society of Canada, and the Lung Association

- In “The Potential Health Impact of Wind Turbines” (May 2010), Ontario's Chief Medical Officer of Health recently examined the scientific literature related to wind turbines and public health, considering potential effects, such as dizziness, headaches, and sleep disturbance. The report concluded that:

• *“...the scientific evidence available to date does not demonstrate a direct causal link between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects. The sound level from wind turbines at common residential setbacks is not sufficient to cause hearing impairment or other direct health effects, although some people may find it annoying.”*

- The report also concluded that low frequency sound and infrasound from current generation upwind model turbines are well below the pressure sound levels at which known health effects occur. Further, the report states that there is no scientific evidence to date that vibration from low frequency wind turbine noise causes adverse health effects.
- Overall, health and medical agencies agree that sound from wind turbines is not loud enough to cause hearing impairment and is not causally related to adverse effects*.
- Scientists and medical experts around the world continue to publish research in this area. Through our health consultants, Windlectric is committed to keeping informed on the most recent findings.

*e.g., Chatham-Kent Public Health Unit, 2008; Minnesota Department of Health, 2009; Australian Government, National Health and Medical Research Council, 2010; Australian Government, 2011.
(all referenced documents can be found on the project website at: www.amherstislandwindproject.com).



Stantec



Windlectric Inc.

Benefits of the Project

- Helps to meet forecasted energy demand while reducing greenhouse gas levels;
- New supply of safe and clean energy; and
- Helps to meet Ontario's commitment to renewable energy and phasing out of coal-fired power plants.

Community Benefits

Windlelectric will be a good neighbour in your community. The Project would also be a positive benefit to the community:

- Potential employment opportunities for local residents (during pre-construction, construction and operations);
- Tax payments to Loyalist Township. Calculated at \$40,000/MW x an assessed mill rate. Estimate, at this time, from \$300,000 to \$400,000 per year;
- Supplemental income for participating landowners; and
- Improvement to some local roadways.



Property Values

Windlelectric acknowledges public comments and concerns related to potential property value impacts. Recent studies have shown that neither the view of the turbines nor the proximity of turbines has any consistent measurable or statistically significant effect on property values.

- Canadian Wind Energy Association (CanWEA) hired independent consultants to review property values in Chatham Kent and the study also indicated that in some cases, local impacts of increased tourism and economic stimulus from wind farms can actually drive up property values in host communities (February 2010).
- A publicly funded study on this subject conducted in the U.S. by Ben Hoen and Ryan Wiser of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (December 2009) found:
 - No evidence that homes near wind facilities are stigmatized by those facilities as compared to other homes in the region.
 - No statistical evidence that homes with a view of wind turbines have different values than homes without such views.
 - No statistical evidence that homes within ¼, ½ and 1 mile of turbines sell for different values than those further away.

All documents can be found on the project website at:
www.amherstislandwindproject.com



Liaison Committee

Windlectric has established an Amherst Island Wind Energy Project Liaison Committee. The purpose of this Committee is: “To serve a role in providing two-way communications between the local community, Windlectric/Algonquin Power (the project owner/developer). ”

This Committee, comprised of four interested Amherst Island residents, has met three times, and will continue to meet at key milestones during the REA process.

Terms of Reference, meeting notes and meeting agendas are posted on the Project website.

Decommissioning

At the end of the Project's life, Windlectric Inc. will repower or decommission the Project.

- Decommissioning would include the dismantling and removal of facility components, and restoring the land.
- Components would be recycled or reused wherever possible.
- A site restoration plan would be developed based on the standards and best practices at the time of decommissioning.

A Decommissioning Plan Report is required as part of the Renewable Energy Approval application package, and will be made available for public review a minimum of 60 days prior to the final open house for the Project.

Project Schedule

Tasks and Proposed Dates

Ongoing consultation with government agencies and local community members, Aboriginal communities, Loyalist Township (in the County of Lennox and Addington).

If project approved.

2011

Initiate Public Renewable Energy Approval Process – May 2011

REA Technical Studies
- ongoing through to December 2011

We Are Here

Public Open House #1 - December 2011

2012

Draft REA Reports to Public – June 2012

Public Open House #2 - August 2012

REA Approval (estimated) - December 2012

2013

Start of Construction - January 2013



2014

Commercial Operation Date (COD)
- approximately February 2014

Repowering/Decommissioning
2034 (approximately 20 years after COD)


Amherst Island Wind Energy Project Preliminary Layout





Legend

- Noise Receptor - Existing
- Noise Receptor - Vacant
- ⊠ Substation
- ⊠ Turbine S#
- Ferry Connection
- Road
- Watercourse
- Parcel
- Waterbody
- Evaluated Wetland
- Wetland
- Woodland



HATCH
Windelectric Inc.
**Preliminary Draft Layout
for Wind Turbine Pads
and Noise Contours**

Approximately 77% of existing receptors are at 750 m or greater distance from wind turbines.



Legend

- Project Study Area
- Project Components
 - Turbine
 - Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
 - Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
 - Substation (Potential Location)
 - Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Existing Features**
 - Road
 - Railway
 - Watercourse
 - Waterbody
 - Property Boundaries
- Mapbook Page

The preliminary location of project components on Mainland and the location of the submarine cable crossing have not been finalized at this time. The proposed turbine locations and other features will be provided in the draft REA. The draft REA, including the Final Public Open House, the draft REA documents will be made available in draft form for review and comment a minimum of 60 days before the Final Public Open House, online at www.hamherstislandwindproject.com and in public venues. The Final Public Open House is planned for August 2012.

Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queens Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011.
4. Imagery Date: 2008
5. The Location of Project Components on the Mainland is Preliminary and Subject to Change




Client/Project
 WINDLECTRIC INC.
 AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

November 2011
 10/06/09/05/05

Figure No. 1
 Title

**Preliminary Draft Layout-
 Overview**



W:\stave\090609\09drawing\018\MXD\Display Maps\PH1\06060906_Preliminary01.mxd
 Revised on: 2011-06-03 By: chrisrwy

Legend

- Study Area
- 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
 - REA Waterbody
 - Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
 - PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Stantec


Client/Project: November 2011
160906058

WIND ELECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No. Title 1 of 19

The

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT



W:\active\160906058\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\SitePlanning.aprx: area: 160906058: SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111126_C.EV.mxd
Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: jvworrell

Legend

- Study Area
- 1 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
- REA Waterbody
- Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
- PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Stantec

November 2011
10290255

Client/Project

WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT


Figure No.

Title 2 of 19

Title

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT





Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Client/Project
 November 2011
 160900585

WINDLECTRIC INC.
 AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.
 Title 3 of 19

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT

W:\active\160900585\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\area\160900585_SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111126_CEV.mxd
 Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: jwvonesl

Legend

- Study Area
- 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
- REA Waterbody
- Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
- PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008




Stantec

Client/Project
November 2011
162926255

WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.
Title 4 of 19

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT



Legend

- Study Area
- 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
- REA Waterbody
- Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
- PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Stantec

Client/Project
November 2011
10200255

WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.
Title 5 of 19

Title
PRELIMINARY LAYOUT



W:\active\100000000\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\area\100000000_SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111120_CEV.mxd
Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: jwvossell

Legend

- Study Area
- 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
- REA Waterbody
- Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
- PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Stantec


Client/Project: November 2011
160900585

WINDLETTIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT



Figure No. Title 6 of 19

The

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT



W:\active\160900585\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\area\160900585_SitePlanning\Mapbook_Openhouse\Version_20111126_CEDV.mxd
Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: jvworrel



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Client/Project
 WINDLECTRIC INC.
 AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.
 Title
 The 7 of 19

Title
PRELIMINARY LAYOUT

W:\active\69069595\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\GIS area\180906068_SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111126_CEDV.mxd
 Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: jvw001

Legend

- Study Area
- 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
- REA Waterbody
- Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
- PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Stantec

November 2011
160260255

Client/Project

WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.




Title 8 of 19

Title

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT



W:\active\160260255\Drawings\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\SitePlanning\area\160260255_SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111126_CEDV.mxd
Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: j.watson



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT


Figure No.
Title 9 of 19

The
PRELIMINARY LAYOUT

W:\active\160900956\drawing\GIS\MXD\Display\Map\POH11\160900956_SitePlan.mxd\book_OpenHouse\Version_20111130_CEW.mxd
Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: j.watson

Legend

- Study Area
- 1 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
 - REA Waterbody
 - Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
 - PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Stantec


Client/Project: November 2011
160900956

WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No. Title 10 of 19

The

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT



Legend

- Study Area
- 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
- REA Waterbody
- Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
- PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Stantec

Client/Project: November 2011
160906058


WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No. Title 11 of 19

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT




W:\active\160906058\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\SitePlanning\area\160906058_SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111126_CEV.mxd
Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: j.watson



Legend

- Study Area
- 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
 - REA Waterbody
 - Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
- PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Client/Project
 November 2011
 160260255

WINDLECTRIC INC.
 AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT


Figure No.
 Title 12 of 19
 The

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT

W:\active\160260255\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\3rd area.mxd\160260255_SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111126_CEDV.mxd
 Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: j.watson

Legend

- Study Area
- 1 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
- Waterbody
- REA Waterbody
- Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
- PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Stantec

November 2011
10290255

Client/Project


WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.

Title 13 of 19

Title


PRELIMINARY LAYOUT



\\active\69069595\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\6_ area.mxd\10290255_ SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111120_CEDV.mxd
Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: j.watson

Legend

- Study Area
- 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
- REA Waterbody
- Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
- PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Stantec

Client/Project: November 2011
160260255

Client/Project: WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.: Title 14 of 19

Title: PRELIMINARY LAYOUT

W:\active\160260255\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\SitePlanning\area\160260255_SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111126_CEDV.mxd
Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: jvworrel

Legend

- Study Area
- 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
- REA Waterbody
- Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
- PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Stantec

Client/Project: November 2011
160900535

WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No. _____


Title 15 of 19

Title


PRELIMINARY LAYOUT



W:\active\160900535\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\SitePlanning\area\160900535_SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111126_CDEV.mxd
Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: jvworrel



- Legend**
- Study Area
 - 1 120m Zone of Investigation
 - Turbine
 - Turbine Blade Tips
 - Collector Lines
 - Access Road
 - Turn Around Path
 - Laydown Area and Crane Path
 - Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
 - Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
 - Substation (Potential Location)
 - Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
 - Unopened Road Allowance
 - Road
 - Watercourse
 - Waterbody Status
 - Waterbody
 - REA Waterbody
 - Not a REA Waterbody
 - MNR Identified Wetlands
 - PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Client/Project
 WINDLECTRIC INC.
 AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT


Figure No.
 Title 16 of 19

The
PRELIMINARY LAYOUT

W:\active\69069595\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\area-enr\180905086_SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111126_CEV.mxd
 Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: jvworrel



- Legend**
- Study Area
 - 120m Zone of Investigation
 - Turbine
 - Turbine Blade Tips
 - Collector Lines
 - Access Road
 - Turn Around Path
 - Laydown Area and Crane Path
 - Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
 - Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
 - Substation (Potential Location)
 - Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
 - Unopened Road Allowance
 - Road
 - Watercourse
 - Waterbody Status
 - REA Waterbody
 - Not a REA Waterbody
 - MNR Identified Wetlands
 - PSW



Notes

- Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
- Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
- Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Client/Project
 November 2011
 100200235

WINDLETRIC INC.
 AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.
 Title 17 of 19
 Title

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT

W:\active\100200235\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\area\100200235_SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111120_C.EW.mxd
 Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: j.watson

Legend

- Study Area
- 120m Zone of Investigation
- Turbine
- Turbine Blade Tips
- Collector Lines
- Access Road
- Turn Around Path
- Laydown Area and Crane Path
- Laydown and Storage Area (Potential Location)
- Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
- Substation (Potential Location)
- Potential Cable Landing Area and Temporary Dock
- Unopened Road Allowance
- Road
- Watercourse
- Waterbody Status
- REA Waterbody
- Not a REA Waterbody
- MNR Identified Wetlands
- PSW



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Stantec

November 2011
100200255

Client/Project

WINDLECTRIC INC.


AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.



Title 18 of 19

Title

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT



W:\active\100200255\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\area.mxd\100200255_SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111120_C.EV.mxd
 Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: jwvonesl



Notes

1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2011.
3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2011. Imagery Date: 2008



Client/Project
 November 2011
 100200255
 WINDLECTRIC INC.
 AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.
 Title 19 of 19
 The

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT

W:\active\100200255\drawing\GIS\MXD\SitePlanning\SitePlanning\area.mxd\100200255_SitePlanning\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_20111120_CEV.mxd
 Revised on: 2011-10-07 By: jvworrel



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project
Public Meeting – December 7, 2011
5:00pm – 8:00pm, St. John’s Memorial Hall
PUBLIC MEETING QUESTIONNAIRE



Comments are appreciated, and help the Project Team identify topics that are most important to the community so we can consider them in our studies and future consultation activities. Completed questionnaires can be dropped off at the welcome table. Pre-paid envelopes are also available if you would like additional time to consider your comments.

1. How did you hear about today’s Public Meeting?

- Newspaper Advertisement
- Letter
- Word of Mouth
- Project Website
- Other, please specify: _____

2. What was your main reason for attending?

3. Did the Public Meeting meet your information needs?

- Yes
- No

Please Comment:

4. What do you think are the key issues that need to be addressed through public consultation and the Renewable Energy Approval process?

5. Do you have any information about the local environment that we should consider? If yes, please describe:

6. Do you or your employer provide services that might be useful during construction or operation of the wind facility?

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this questionnaire. Please share additional comments or request follow up on the back of this form. Your feedback will be considered by the Project Team as we complete our studies.

If you would like to be added to the Project mailing list to receive Project updates, please provide your contact information below.

Do you have a question about the Project that you need answered, or do you need further information? Please complete the following and we will contact you with an answer as soon as possible.

Your Question or Information Request:

Please Print Clearly

Name: _____

Address: _____

Town/City: _____

Postal Code: _____

E-mail: _____

Phone: _____

Information will be collected and used to assist Windlectric Inc. in meeting applicable environmental approval requirements. This material will be maintained on file for use during the study and may be included in project documentation. All comments will become part of the public record.



**AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
Public Open House(s)**

Amherst Island P.S.
12-06-2011

St. Johns Memorial Hall
12-07-2011

Comments:

Comments recorded by: _____

Follow Up Required: **YES** **NO**

Details:

Contact Information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Email Address: _____

Telephone No: _____

Appendix E5

Final Public Open House Display Boards

Welcome

to the
Final Public Open House
for the
Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Thank you for coming. We are happy to share with you information about this clean, renewable energy project.

Please take some time to review the display boards and feel free to ask the Project Team any questions you may have.

We invite you to complete a questionnaire providing your questions and comments.

Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Who Are We

Algonquin Power Co. ("APCo") is a respected and socially responsible participant in the renewable energy and sustainable infrastructure sectors - APCo owns and operates generating stations across North America including wind energy and hydroelectric facilities. The Amherst Island Wind Energy Project is being developed by Windlectric Inc., a subsidiary of Algonquin. Gaia Power Inc. (Kingston, Ontario) is the original developer of the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project.

Windlectric has retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. to prepare the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application, as required under O. Reg. 359/09. For this project, Stantec is providing professional consulting services in environmental sciences, consultation and project management.

The entire study team for the Project includes:


Stantec Consulting Ltd. - Renewable Energy Approval Process
HATCH Consulting - Engineering
Intrinsic - Health



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Project Overview

- The Project has been awarded a Power Purchase Agreement (FIT contract) with the Ontario Power Authority.
- Proposed project includes up to 36 wind turbines.
- The final layout will result in a total installed nameplate capacity of approximately 56 - 75 MW.



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Project Overview

Basic project components include:

- Up to 36 wind turbines. The layout includes 34 Siemens SWT-2.3-113 2300 kW and two (2) Siemens SWT-2.3-113 2221 kW model wind turbines.
- A 34.5 kilovolt (kV) underground and/or overhead electrical power line collector system;
- Fibre optic data lines from each turbine and/or wireless technology for the communication of data and control of the wind turbines;
- A 115kV transmission line;
- Truck turnaround areas;
- A submarine cable;
- An operations and maintenance building;
- Permanent dock on the island;
- A substation on the island and a switching station on the mainland;
- An un-serviced storage shed;
- One connection point to the existing electrical system;
- Cable vaults;
- Meteorological tower(s) (met tower(s));
- Access road(s) to the met tower site(s); and
- Turbine access roads with culvert installations, as required, at associated watercourse crossings and entrances.

Temporary components during construction may include staging areas for the turbines, access roads, met tower(s), collector lines and a transmission line as well as crane paths, a temporary dock, site office(s), batch plant, central staging areas, and associated water crossings.

All Project components are on privately owned land and/or within municipal road allowances.



Alternative Project Configurations

The Proponent has elected to assess and seek approval for some alternative Project configurations. The REA application process will consider:

- two alternative mainland transmission line routes;
- two alternative switching station locations and corresponding point of common coupling with the Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI) line;
- three alternative temporary dock locations along the mainland;
- a submarine cable with three alternative submarine cable routes near the mainland;
- three alternative mainland submarine cable landing locations and corresponding cable vault locations;
- up to three alternative met tower locations; and,
- up to four potential locations for an operations and maintenance building.

Final selection of the sites to be used would be based on the results of consultation activities, detailed design / engineering work, and the conditions experienced during construction.



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Renewable Energy Approval Process

- The *Green Energy and Green Economy Act* (GEA), and related amendments to other provincial legislation, received Royal Assent in the Ontario Legislature on May 14, 2009.
- The Project will require a Renewable Energy Approval (REA) according to Ontario Regulation 359/09 (REA under Part V0.1 of the Act) under the *Environmental Protection Act*. This regulation became law on September 24, 2009, was amended on January 1, 2011, and replaces the previous Ontario Environmental Assessment Act process for wind projects.

Permitting and Approvals

- All non-REA approvals (Conservation Authority, Municipal, *Endangered Species Act*, if required) will be obtained prior to construction.
- Application for permits and approvals occurs outside of the REA process.



Public, Municipal and Aboriginal Consultation

Site Selection


Why choose Amherst Island?

- Good wind regime;
- Electrical interconnection – the Project has access to connect to existing transmission capacity on the Hydro One provincial grid;
- Compatible land uses – agricultural land requiring a small footprint for Project components; and
- Flat topography for the Project Study Area.



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Project Location - Mainland Portion



- Legend**
- Study Area
 - 120m Zone of Investigation
 - 12m Study Area
 - Project Components
 - Turbine
 - Met Tower (Potential Location)
 - Access Road
 - Collector Lines
 - Laydown Area and Crane Path
 - Submarine Cable Path
 - Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
 - Storage Shed
 - Turbine Blade Tips
 - Substation (Potential Location)
 - Potential Culvert Coupling
 - Point of Common Coupling
 - Mainland Cable Vault (Potential Location)
 - Island Cable Vault
 - Constructible Area
 - Mainland Dock (Potential Location)
 - Island Dock
 - Batch Plant (Potential Location)
 - Site Office (Potential Location)
 - Transmission Lines
 - Mainland Option 1
 - Mainland Option 2
 - Island Transmission Line
 - Land Use
 - Central Staging Area
 - Switching Station (Potential Location)
 - Existing Features
 - Road
 - Unopened Road Allowance
 - Railway
 - Watercourse (modified by Stantec)
 - Property Line

- Notes**
1. Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
 2. This report was prepared using the latest available data and information. The information is provided as is and without warranty. The user assumes all liability for any use of the information.
 3. Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2012. Imagery Date: 2008



Client/Project
WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.
2.0 (4 of 4)

Title
Study Area Layout

February 2013
 10000005




W:\000000005\00000005\00000005\00000005_StudyArea_20130314.mxd
 Revised: 2013-03-14 By: cswan



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Project Location - Western Portion



Legend

	Study Area
	120m Zone of Investigation
	Project Components
	Turbine
	Met Tower (Potential Location)
	Access Road
	Collector Lines
	Laydown Area and Crane Path
	Submarine Cable Path
	Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
	Storage Shed
	Turbine Blade Tips
	Substation (Potential Location)
	Potential Culvert Location
	Point of Common Coupling
	Marine Cable Vault (Potential Location)
	Island Cable Vault
	Constructible Area
	Marine Dock (Potential Location)
	Island Dock
	Batch Plant (Potential Location)
	Site Office (Potential Location)
	Transmission Lines
	Marine Option 1
	Marine Option 2
	Island Transmission Line
	Land Use
	Central Staging Area
	Switching Station (Potential Location)
	Existing Features
	Road
	Unopened Road Allowance
	Railway
	Watercourse (modified by Stantec)
	Property Line

Notes

- Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N).
- Map is a preliminary design and is for informational purposes only. It is not to be used for construction or other purposes without the approval of the project engineer.
- Printer for Ontario, 2012 - Project layout: S19 - revision 3.
- Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2012.
- Imagery Date: 2008



Client/Project
WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.
2.0 (1 of 4)


Title
Study Area Layout

W:\wind\0000000000\amherst\0000000000\0000000000_S19\Amherst_20130314.mxd
 Revised: 2013-03-14 By: cswan



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Project Location - Central Portion



Legend

- Study Area
- 120m Zone of Investigation
- Project Components
 - Turbine
 - Met Tower (Potential Location)
 - Collector Lines
 - Access Road
 - Laydown Area and Crane Path
 - Submarine Cable Path
 - Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
 - Storage Shed
 - Turbine Blade Tips
 - Substation (Potential Location)
 - Potential Culvert Location
 - Point of Common Coupling
 - Mainland Cable Vault (Potential Location)
 - Island Cable Vault
 - Constructible Area
 - Mainland Dock (Potential Location)
 - Island Dock
 - Batch Plant (Potential Location)
 - Site Office (Potential Location)
- Transmission Lines
 - Mainland Option 1
 - Mainland Option 2
 - Island Transmission Line
- Land Use
 - Central Staging Area
 - Switching Station (Potential Location)
- Existing Features
 - Road
 - Railway
 - Unopened Road Allowance
 - Watercourse (modified by Stantec)
 - Property Line

Notes

- Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N). All elevations are in meters above sea level.
- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources & Forestry. Printer for Ontario, 2012. Project layout S19 - revision 3.
- Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2012. Imagery Date: 2008



Client/Project
WINDLECTRIC INC.
AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

February 2013
 10000000

Figure No. 2.0 (2 of 4)

Title **Study Area Layout**



W:\wind\60060505\wind\60060505\Map\Amherst\PC12\100000000_StudyArea_20130314.mxd
 Printed: 2013/03/14 11:57:00 AM
 User: jason

Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Project Location - Eastern Portion



Legend

- Study Area
- 120m Zone of Investigation
- Project Components
 - Ac turbine
 - Met Tower (Potential Location)
 - Access Road
 - Collector Lines
 - Laydown Area and Crane Path
 - Submarine Cable Path
 - Operation and Maintenance Building (Potential Location)
 - Storage Shed
 - Turbine Blade Tips
 - Substation (Potential Location)
 - Potential Culvert Location
 - Point of Common Coupling
 - Marine Cable Vault (Potential Location)
 - Island Cable Vault
 - Constructible Area
 - Marine Dock (Potential Location)
 - Island Dock
 - Batch Plant (Potential Location)
 - Site Office (Potential Location)
- Transmission Lines
 - Marine Option 1
 - Marine Option 2
 - Island Transmission Line
- Land Use
 - Central Staging Area
 - Switching Station (Potential Location)
- Existing Features
 - Road
 - Unopened Road Allowance
 - Railway
 - Watercourse (modified by Stantec)
 - Property Line

Notes

- Coordinate System: UTM NAD 83 - Zone 18 (N). Images provided by Google Earth and the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.
- Printer for Ontario, 2012 - Project layout S19 - revision 3.
- Imagery Source: First Base Solutions ©, 2012. Imagery Date: 2008

Stantec

Client/Project
 WINDLECTRIC INC.
 AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No.
 2.0 (3 of 4)

Title
 Study Area Layout

February 2013
 10080055

Renewable Energy Approval Process Reports

The following reports have been prepared in draft and will be submitted in final version as part of the REA application:

- Project Description Report
- Construction Plan Report
- Design and Operations Report
- Natural Heritage Assessment & Environmental Impact Study (includes technical studies for wildlife and wildlife habitat)
- Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Reports
- Underwater Archaeological Assessment Report
- Property Line Setback Assessment Report
- Protected Properties Report and Heritage Assessment Report
- Water Body Assessment Report
- Wind Turbine Specifications Report
- Noise Impact Assessment Report
- Decommissioning Plan Report
- Consultation Report (will be prepared for final submission)

All reports, with the exception of the Consultation Report and Property Line Setback Assessment Report, have been made available in draft form for public review and comment at least 60 days before this Final Public Meeting. The approach used to release the Property Line Setback Assessment Report was approved by the MOE. Notification of the release of the draft reports was provided by mail, in newspapers, and on the Project website.

Changes Since Release of the Draft REA Report

Since the release of the Draft REA Reports in December 2012, changes have been made to the Project and/or the Draft REA Reports. Key changes are described below:

Topic	Information in Draft REA Reports (December 2012)	Updated Information to be included in REA Application	Available Information
Property Line Setbacks	Description of adherence to property line setbacks was not included.	Draft Property Line Setback Assessment Report.	Report posted to Project website on February 6, 2013. Hard copy of report distributed to Township and County for public viewing. Report available tonight for public viewing.
Natural Heritage Assessment/Environmental Impact Study	A written comment from MNR, required by O.Reg 359/09 for inclusion in the REA application, had not been received for addenda to the NHA/EIS, and was therefore not included in the Draft REA Reports.	MNR has provided written comments which will be included in the REA application.	Written confirmation letter was provided by the MNR on December 14, 2012.



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Project Schedule

Tasks and Proposed Dates

Ongoing consultation with government agencies and local community members, Aboriginal communities, Loyalist Township (in the County of Lennox and Addington).

If project approved.



Construction

- Anticipated to begin in Q3 2014.
- Generally, the areas that would be directly impacted during construction are:
 - **Turbine locations:** Approximately 100 m x 100 m around each turbine location encompassing the turbine tower, foundation, crane pad (approximately 25m and 60m) and temporary construction area. Each turbine will have a 6-19m diameter, poured-in-place reinforced concrete foundation (dependent on ground conditions), buried to a depth of approximately 2-5m.
 - **Access roads:** Up to 6m wide during construction, reduced to 5 m for operations. The construction area for access roads will be approximately 10 m wide including additional area for access road movement and workspace for construction purposes.
 - **Access road entrances:** The entrances off Township or County roads will have a radius of approximately 50 m, reduced to 10-15 m for operations.
 - **Electrical collector lines:** 10m wide corridor wherever possible. New 34.5kV collector lines (underground and/or overhead) from transformers at the base of each turbine to the substation. Located within access road corridors and road allowances wherever possible.
 - **115 kV On land and Submarine Transmission Line:** Will carry electricity from the substation to a switching station on the mainland. The on-land transmission line will be underground and/or overhead.
 - **Substation:** Prepared area of approximately 80 m x 100 m in size including the grounding grid, protection and control buildings, sound attenuation wall, stormwater management features, and temporary construction area.
 - **Switching Station:** Prepared area of 2500m² in size including the grounding grid, protection and control buildings, stormwater management features, and temporary construction area.
 - **Operations and Maintenance Building:** Situated on a building area of approximately 1100m². The entire operation and maintenance building footprint is approximately 4900 m² including onsite storage and parking space.
 - **Temporary Batch Plant:** Prepared area will be approximately 120 m x 150 m.
 - **Temporary Site Offices:** The prepared area for the site office(s) will be approximately 50 m x 50 m. The area surrounding the site office(s) will serve as an area for parking.
 - **Temporary Crane Paths:** 10m wide corridor between some turbine locations.
 - **Temporary Staging Areas:** Vary in size from as small as approximately 30 m x 50 m to as large as approximately 25 acres.
 - **Met Towers:** The constructible area to install a 100 m met tower would be approximately 150 m x 150 m. The constructible area to install a 60 m met tower would be approximately 100 m x 100 m.

For the local community, the majority of potential disturbance during construction would relate to dust, noise, and traffic.

Dust - Windlectric will use industry best practices which may include dust suppressants, protecting stockpiles, and enforcing low speed limits for trucks on site.

Noise - Construction activity will take place generally during regular construction hours with extended hours as necessary.

Traffic - A Traffic Management Plan (with Public Safety considered) will be developed which will identify and deal with specific traffic planning issues including the management of traffic and the delivery of materials.

Operations and Maintenance

- Windlectric may hire a specialized Contractor to undertake on-going operations and maintenance of the wind turbines but will have full-time staff overseeing the activities.
- Operation activities include daily monitoring of the wind turbines and function of the substation and switching station, maintenance activities, and monitoring of meteorological data.
- An on-line system will monitor the Project 24 hours a day to identify any issues for quick response.
- An Emergency Response and Communications Plan will be developed prior to operation.

Decommissioning

- Project components are expected to be in service for the term of the 20 year Ontario Power Authority Feed-In Tariff contract. At that point, a decision will be made to continue operations, update equipment (called 'repowering'), or decommission.
- Decommissioning involves removal of all project components, as appropriate, for reuse or recycling wherever possible, and restoring the land to pre-construction conditions, using relevant environmental protection and mitigation measures.
- Windlectric is responsible for all aspects of the decommissioning of the Project including the associated costs.

Natural Heritage Assessment (NHA)

The Natural Heritage Assessment included comprehensive field studies of vegetation, woodlands, wetlands, wildlife, and wildlife habitat.

The following natural features were identified as significant in the Project Location, requiring an Environmental Impact Study:

- 20 Significant Wetlands
- 15 Significant Woodlands
- Raptor Wintering Areas
- Turtle Overwintering Area
- Migratory Land bird Stopover Areas
- Old Growth Forest
- Amphibian Breeding Areas (Woodland and Wetland)
- Marsh Breeding Bird Area
- Woodland Area-Sensitive Breeding Bird Habitat
- Open Country Breeding Bird Habitat and Short-eared Owl Habitat
- Shrub/Early Successional Bird Breeding Habitat



The Environmental Impact Study identified impact to significant natural heritage features from construction and operation of the facility. Mitigation measures are detailed in this report.

Confirmation of the NHA was received from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) on December 14, 2012.



Important Bird Area

Windlectric recognizes the distinct nature of the area, which has been identified as an Important Bird Area (IBA). The significance of the IBA was considered in developing the field studies that were completed for the Project. The extensive field investigations of breeding, migratory and wintering bird life within the IBA were used to identify potential impacts and to develop avoidance and mitigation measures.

MNR has prescriptive guidelines for post-construction monitoring of bird and bat mortality, including thresholds. Mandatory mitigation is required for facilities that exceed thresholds which may include temporary turbine shutdown. The Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan includes post-construction monitoring for birds and bats.

Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Significant Natural Features and Waterbodies



Notes

1. Coordinates System: UTM NAD 83, Zone 18 (N)
2. Base features produced under license with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources © Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2012.



Client/Project
 WINDLECTRIC INC.
 AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT

Figure No. 3

Title
 Significant Natural Features,
 Wildlife Habitat and Waterbodies

DRAFT



Post-construction Monitoring at the Wolfe Island Wind Plant

The post-construction monitoring program, which assessed the impacts to birds and bats on Wolfe Island, was conducted for over three years starting in the spring of 2009 and concluding in the fall of 2012. The study represents one of the most extensive post-construction monitoring programs at a wind farm in North America. Studies completed included:

- Mortality to birds and bats;
- Disturbance to breeding grassland, marsh and forest birds;
- Disturbance to breeding, migratory and wintering raptors
- Disturbance to migratory and breeding waterfowl.

Results of the mortality monitoring found mortality rates of birds and bats that are not of concern at the population level. Specifically,

- Annual bird mortality ranged from 13.1 to 5.4 bird fatalities per turbine per year. Although higher compared to other wind farms in Ontario, this level of mortality is very low compared to other sources (e.g. window strikes, cats) of avian mortality on Wolfe Island and not a concern to the provincial or local population.
- For example, the level of Bobolink mortality at wind turbine equates to approximate 0.5% of the population that breeds within the wind farm and 0.005% of the Ontario breeding population.
- Annual raptor mortality ranged from 0.45 to 0.27 raptor fatalities per turbine per year. This level of mortality is average for wind farms in North America outside of California.
- Annual bat mortality ranged from 19.9 to 6.4 bat fatalities per turbine per year, which is in the middle of the range of bat fatality rates at other wind farms in North America.

The result of disturbance monitoring indicates that the Wolfe Island project area continues to support a healthy and vibrant bird community throughout the year.

- Bobolinks and other grassland birds continue to be abundant within the wind farm, nesting in close proximity to operational wind turbines.
- Marsh and forest birds continue to breed in wetlands and forest beside wind turbines. Sensitive species, such as Least Bittern, have been recorded in wetlands next to wind turbines.
- Raptors continue to nest within the wind farm, including Red-tailed Hawks, Ospreys and Northern Harriers, a sensitive grassland species. Short-eared Owls, a species of special concern, have also been recorded nesting within the wind farm.
- Wintering raptors continue to use the wind farm area in large numbers. For example, a one-day total of 67 Short-eared Owls were recorded within the wind farm in 2012. Regardless of the high numbers of owls within the wind farm, no owl fatalities have been observed.
- Waterfowl continue to breed in wetlands adjacent to wind turbines and, during migration, continue to feed in large numbers in fields amongst the turbines, as well as in the offshore bays surrounding the island.

Water Body Assessment

Scope of Assessment:

- Background information review;
- Site investigation to determine location and boundaries of water bodies; and,
- An aquatic habitat assessment.

Key Findings:

- Project Location was described according to the following subwatersheds:
 - *Northern Drainage*, i.e. All watercourses/ tributaries flowing to the north side of the island
 - *Southern Drainage*, i.e. All watercourses/ tributaries flowing to the south side of the island
 - *Western Drainage*, i.e. All watercourses/ tributaries flowing to the west end of the island
 - *Eastern Drainage*, i.e. All watercourses/ tributaries flowing to the east end of the island
 - *Mainland Drainage*, i.e. All watercourses/ tributaries flowing south to Lake Ontario
- In addition to watercourses and tributaries on land, Lake Ontario is within the Project Location.



Based on the current Wind Project layout and proposed environmental mitigation measures, there will be no net effects to water bodies within the Project Location.

All required permits and approvals will be obtained in consultation with the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. A Construction Contractor representative will be on-site during construction to ensure compliance with specifications, site plans and permits.

Public, Health and Safety

- Traffic Management Plan for safe management of traffic and delivery of materials along public roads and roads near the school.
- Limiting access to construction sites to minimize hazards to the public
- Implement an Emergency Response and Communications Plan with spill response plans and training, notification procedures, and necessary cleanup materials and equipment.
- Implement operations and maintenance protocols to minimize risks to public health and safety
- Install turbines that have undergone rigorous testing and analysis during design and certification to ensure safety
- Train operations staff on control systems to minimize accidents and malfunctions




Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Assessment

Heritage, Protected Properties, and Archaeological Assessment included a review of heritage and archaeological resources.


Key findings:

- Three designated protected properties are located within the Study Area.
- 24 significant built heritage resources and 4 significant cultural heritage landscapes were identified that meet the criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest.
- Potential negative impacts were identified for 8 significant built heritage resources and 3 of the significant cultural heritage landscapes. Mitigation will occur through monitoring of vibration levels during construction, appropriate siting of the Collector System and minimizing removal of trees along roads.
- Based on the results of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment, a majority of the Study Area has been identified as having elevated potential for previously undiscovered archaeological resources requiring the completion of a Stage 2 archaeological assessment.
- The Stage 2 archaeological assessment identified 7 sites for further archaeological assessment (Stage 3) prior to construction work beginning at the Site
- If archaeological resources are found during construction, they will be documented and/or removed from the area in accordance with Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport guidelines.



Wind Turbine Details


- Siemens 2.3 -113
- Maximum nameplate capacity:
34 Siemens SWT-2.3-113 2300 kW and
two (2) Siemens SWT-2.3-113 2221 kW
- Tower height:
 - Hub: 99.5 m,
 - Blade length: 55 m
- Rotor sweep area: 10,000 m²
- Rotational speed: 6-13 rpm



Environmental Noise Impact Assessment

- There are two potential sources of sound typically associated with wind turbines:
 - Aerodynamic: Blades pass through the air and create a “swishing” sound
 - Mechanical: Originates from the gearbox and generator that are often housed in the nacelle. The turbines selected for this project is direct drive and do not have gearboxes.

- A Noise Assessment Report has been completed for the Project to ensure it complies with the MOE requirements. The report is included in the Design and Operations Report.



- Ontario uses an internationally accepted sound model, which is supported by experiences in the Province and in other jurisdictions.

- The local area is considered a rural site by the MOE - maximum allowable sound level of 40 dBA. Current MOE regulations require a turbine to be 550m or more from a non-participating receptor (for this area, a residential dwelling occupied by individuals or families who do not have an agreement with Windlectric to host Project infrastructure on their property), to achieve a maximum noise level of 40 dBA.

Key Findings:

- Sound levels are predicted to be at or below the 40 dBA maximum criterion for all non-participating receptors.
- All turbines sited more than 550 m from all non-participating receptors.
- The only sound components of the project are the turbines and transformers.

The Noise Assessment Report concluded that sound to be produced by the Project will be within the limits established by the MOE at all non-participating noise receptors.

Health and Windpower

- Many studies have been conducted world-wide to examine the relationship between wind turbines and possible human health effects (e.g., audible/inaudible noise, shadow flicker, electromagnetic fields (EMF)).
- **Audible / Inaudible Noise:** Ontario's Chief Medical Officer of Health (May 2010) conducted a review of the scientific literature related to wind turbines and public health. The review concluded that:

"while some people living near wind turbines report symptoms such as dizziness, headaches, and sleep disturbance, the scientific evidence available to date does not demonstrate a direct causal link between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects. The sound level from wind turbines at common residential setbacks is not sufficient to cause hearing impairment or other direct health effects, although some people may find it annoying."

- **Shadow flicker:** Scientific evidence suggests that shadow flicker from wind turbines does not pose a risk of photo-induced seizures; modern wind turbines simply don't rotate at a speed that has been linked to this condition (generally less than 20 rpm vs. over 60 rpm).
- **EMF:** Health Canada (2012) has stated: *"Health Canada does not consider that any precautionary measures are needed regarding daily exposures to EMFs at ELF. There is no conclusive evidence of any harm caused by exposures at levels found in Canadian homes and schools, including those located just outside the boundaries of power line corridors"*.
- Overall, health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects*.
- Reports of annoyance by people living around wind turbines appear to be more related to variables like personal attitude and whether a person can see a turbine from their home and not a turbine-specific variable like noise.

*"Ontario doctors, nurses, and other health professionals support energy conservation combined with wind and solar power – to help us move away from coal"**.*

- Scientists and medical experts around the world continue to publish research in this area. In fact, Health Canada will be undertaking a study of wind turbine projects across the country, with results expected in 2014. It is important to note that Health Canada has not called for a moratorium on new wind projects across Canada while they undertake their research. Through our health consultants, Windlectric is committed to keeping informed on this issue.


* Chatham-Kent Public Health Unit, 2008; Australian Government, National Health and Medical Research Council, 2010; Australian Government, 2011; Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) and Massachusetts Department of Public Health (MDPH), 2012. **Ontario College of Family Physicians, Registered Nurses Association of Ontario, Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, Physicians for Global Survival, the Asthma Society of Canada, and the Lung Association.

Wind Industry Then and Now

ICE THROW - Modern turbines are designed to sense blade imbalances, so a build-up of ice will shut down the turbine and prevent ice throw.

SHADOW FLICKER - Shadow flicker, or recurring shadows, can only occur under certain conditions. Depending on a number of factors, including location, time of day/year and weather conditions, shadows may be produced by the sun shining behind a turbine. It is possible to determine where flickering can occur near a wind project, to estimate how many hours per year each location may be affected.

A shadow flicker study has been completed by Windlectric's consulting engineers.



NACELLE FIRES - Modern turbines have braking mechanisms that shut down the turbines when wind speeds are too high, or in the event of a short-circuit, reducing potential for electrical fires.

REPOWERING - Many of the older and smaller turbines in Europe are being replaced with larger, more efficient models to increase efficiency while reducing land requirements and noise.

Property Values

The RE/MAX Market Trends Report - Farm Edition 2011 released September 12, 2011, found that agricultural property value has increased throughout Ontario, including areas such as Chatham-Kent where wind turbines have been installed for some time.

Other recent studies have concluded:

"In the study area, where wind farms were clearly visible, there was no empirical evidence to indicate that rural residential properties realized lower sale prices than similar residential properties within the same area that were outside of the viewshed of a wind turbine."

Canning Consultants Inc. and John Simmons Realty Ltd. (February 2010). Wind Energy Study - Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent. Report prepared for the Canadian Wind Energy Association. Prepared for the Canadian Wind Energy Association in accordance with the Practice for the Appraisal Institute of . Canadian Uniform Standards for Professional Appraisal

"Research collected data on almost 7,500 sales of single family homes situated within 10 miles of 24 existing wind facilities in nine different US states. The conclusions of the study are drawn from eight different hedonic pricing models, as well as both repeat sales and sales volume models.

The various analyses are strongly consistent in that **none of the models uncovers conclusive evidence of the existence of any widespread property value impacts that might be present in communities surrounding wind energy facilities.** Specifically, **neither the view of the wind facilities, nor the distance of the home to those facilities, is found to have any consistent, measurable, and statistically significant effects on home sale prices.**

Although the analysis cannot dismiss the possibility that individual homes or small numbers of homes have been, or could be negatively impacted, it finds that if these impacts do exist, they are either too small and/or too infrequent to result in any widespread, statistically observable impact."

Hoen, B., R. Wiser, P. Cappers, M. Thayer, and G. Sethi (December 2009). The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: A Multi-Hedonic Analysis. Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Prepared for the US Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. Prepared for the US Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy using a Hedonic Pricing Model used by economists and real estate professionals to assess the impacts of house and community characteristics on property values by investigating the sales prices of homes.

Liaison Committee

Windlectric has established an Amherst Island Wind Energy Project Liaison Committee. The purpose of this Committee is: "To serve a role in providing two-way communications between the local community, Windlectric/Algonquin Power (the project owner/developer)."

This Committee, comprised of four interested Amherst Island residents, has met a number of times, and will continue to meet at key milestones during the REA process.

Terms of Reference, meeting notes and meeting agendas are posted on the Project website.



Other Consultation Activities

Windlelectric is consulting with the Ontario Ministry of Transport and the Ministry of Natural Resources with respect to the placement of project components on their lands. Specifically:

- Ministry of Natural Resources - Land Tenure (Disposition of Crown Land Authorization)
 - Permanent/ Temporary Docks/ Submarine Cable:
- Ministry of Transportation (MTO) – Encroachment Permit and Easement Agreement:
 - Land option for submarine cable, underground vault, and access to temporary dock (south of Jim Snow Drive and Highway #33).
 - Crossing of MTO ferry bubbler easement.

Authorizations from the MTO and MNR will be obtained prior to the commencement of construction.

- Drawings of the proposed activities that have been submitted to the MTO are provided at this open house.



Building Local Economy and Supporting Community

Municipal Agreements:

- Windlectric has voluntarily submitted a draft commitment agreement to the Township to contribute monies on an annual basis to provide a continuous, reliable source of income for the Township.
- The original draft agreement contribution to the fund will be based on a proposed fixed rate multiplied by the total size of the project.
- Township and Windlectric are currently negotiating the draft agreement.
- The original draft agreement proposed that the Township would receive an estimated \$7.5 million from the Community Benefit Fund over the lifespan of the project which could be allocated to new roads, repairs to old buildings or schools, upgrading community centres, refurbishing parking lots, building new parks or restoring the old ones. Windlectric proposes a portion of the Fund be allocated to Amherst Island specifically.
- An indemnity Agreement was signed with Township to reimburse their cost for hiring a third party consultant to review the Project REA documents.
- Windlectric is working with the Municipality on a draft Road User Agreement that will ensure the repair (if required) and maintenance of roads utilized by Windlectric on Amherst Island.



Creating Jobs:

- Local businesses may be supported through goods and services procured by construction contractor workers (restaurants, accommodation, etc.).
- Windlectric and its contractors will employ maintenance staff in eastern Ontario.
- Locally-provided trades could include heavy equipment operators, truck drivers, pipefitters, electricians, ironworkers, millwrights and carpenters.
- The Project assists in Ontario's goal to create over 50,000 "green-collar" jobs.

Supporting Farmers and the Municipal Economy:

- Landowners with Project infrastructure on their property will receive lease payments from Windlectric (turbines, substations, access roads, etc.).
- Farm operations can continue adjacent to Project infrastructure.
- Following decommissioning, agricultural areas will be restored, and normal farming practices can resume.
- Subject to landowner approval and private property restrictions, hunting and other recreational uses can continue adjacent to Project infrastructure.
- Tax payments to the municipality of approximately \$100,000 to \$150,000 annually in new tax revenues to Loyalist Township.

Amherst Island Wind Energy Project Visual Simulations



DISPLAY COPY ONLY




Vantage Point Locations





Vantage Point 1






Vantage Point 2



Vantage Point 3





Existing




Proposed

Vantage Point 4



Vantage Point 4



Vantage Point 5



Vantage Point 5



Existing




NorthWest Wind


Proposed



Vantage Point 6





NorthWest Wind





Vantage Point 7



Vantage Point 8





Vantage Point 8


Existing



NorthWest Wind

Proposed

Vantage Point 9



Vantage Point 9



Existing



NorthWest Wind

Proposed


Vantage Point 10



Vantage Point 10



NorthWestWind



Vantage Point 11



Vantage Point 11



Existing





NorthWest Wind

Proposed

Vantage Point 12



Vantage Point 12





StanTec



Windelectric Inc.


W:\swt\0806095\Drawing\Cover\Cover\0806095_Visual\Sheet\Mapbook_OpenHouse\Version_COVER_20130227.cdr

Economic Opportunities created by the Renewable Energy Sector

The wind energy sector in Ontario will generate a significant amount of both electricity and economic activity over the course of 2011 through 2018. Specifically, during this timeframe, the sector is expected to:

- The wind energy sector in Ontario will generate a significant amount of both electricity and economic activity over the course of 2011 through 2018. Specifically, during this timeframe, the sector is expected to:
- Install over 5.6 GW of wind energy capacity, bringing Ontario's total wind energy capacity to 7.1 GW by 2018;
- Create 80,328 job years (Person-Years of Employment or PYE);
- Attract \$16.4 billion of private investments of which \$8.5 billion will be invested locally in Ontario; this investment is entirely private investment, and is only to be paid back upon the production of power over the lifespan of the turbines; and
- Contribute over \$1.1 billion of revenue to local Ontario municipalities and landowners in the form of taxes and lease payments over the 20-year lifespan of projects installed in 2011-2018.

(Source: The Economic Impacts of the Wind Energy Sector in Ontario 2011-2018; May, 2011)



Endangered Species Act **and Species at Risk Permit**

Windlectric is committed to contributing to the protection and recovery of species at risk in the area.

Consideration and assessment of endangered species has been undertaken for the Amherst Island Wind Project, including:

- An assessment of historic presence of species at risk within the regional landscape
- Targeted field study programs including an assessment of species presence and habitat for species at risk found within the Project Area
- Detailed assessments of the potential effects of project activities on species at risk
- Ongoing consultation with MNR

In consultation with the MNR, Windlectric will prepare the necessary permit applications for submission to the MNR in conjunction with the submission of the REA application and supporting documents to the MOE.

Permits will only be granted by MNR where the conditions outlined in the permit will result in an **overall benefit** to the species. This means more than simply steps to minimize adverse effects, but undertaking actions that contribute to **improving the circumstances** for the species.

Actions that may be included in overall benefit permit applications can include (but are not limited to):

- Habitat restoration, protection and/or management;
- Education and outreach; and
- Support of research.


Windlectric will work with MNR to ensure an overall benefit is achieved for any species for which a permit is required.

Additional Approvals

At the federal, provincial and municipal level multiple permits, licenses and authorizations may be required to facilitate the development of the proposed Project, in addition to the REA. The ultimate applicability of all permits, licenses and authorizations will be determined and based on the Project's detailed design.

Examples of permits and licenses that may be required include:

Key Permit / Authorization	Administering Agency	Rationale
Federal Permits and Authorizations		
Aeronautical Obstruction Clearance	Transport Canada – Aviation Division	Turbine lighting and marking
Land Use Clearance	NavCanada	Aeronautical safety mapping and designations
Navigational Clearance	Transport Canada – Marine Division	Crossing a navigable watercourse Installation of temporary dock Installation of permanent dock
Fisheries Act Authorization	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Watercourse crossings. Harmful alteration, disruption, or destruction of fish and/or fish habitat
Provincial Permits and Authorizations		
Approval of Connection	Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO)	Electrical interconnect with IESO regulated network
Connection Assessment	IESO	Integration of project with IESO-controlled transmission system.
System Impact Assessment	IESO	Integration of project with IESO-controlled transmission system.
Customer Impact Assessment	Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI)	Integration of project with Hydro One and effects to customers
Connection Cost Recovery Agreement (CCRA)	HONI	Recovery of costs to grid operator of changes to allow connection.
Development, Interference with Wetlands, and Alterations to Sho and Watercourses Permit	Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority	Work within floodplains, water crossings, river or stream valleys, hazardous lands and within or adjacent to wetlands. Projects requiring review, <i>Fisheries Act</i> authorization and/or assessment under the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act</i> are forwarded to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO)
Certificate of Inspection	Electrical Safety Authority (ESA)	A record that electrical work complies with the requirements of the Ontario Electrical Safety Code.
Generator's License	Ontario Energy Board (OEB)	Generation of electrical power for sale to grid.
Leave to Construct	OEB	Authorization to construct power transmission lines.
Notice of Project	Ministry of Labour	Notify the Ministry of Labour before construction begins.
Special vehicle configuration permit	Ministry of Transportation (MTO)	Use of non-standard vehicles to transport large components.
Transportation Plan	MTO	Adherence to road safety and suitability.
Highway Entrance Permit	MTO	Entrance permit for new or upgraded road entrances onto a provincial highway Interference or obstruction of the highway.
Change of Access and Heavy/Oversize Load Transportation Permit	MTO	Compliance with provincial highway traffic and road safety regulations.
Wide or excess load permit	MTO	Transportation of large or heavy items on provincial highways.
Endangered Species Act permit	Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)	If provincially listed species at risk or their habitat are present.
Disposition of Crown Land Authorization	MNR	Project components crossing a navigable watercourse subject to the Public Lands Act.
Municipal Permits and Authorizations		
Municipal Consent, Work within the R.O.W	Township/County	Required for works in municipal road allowances or unopened road allowances.
Consent/Severance Application	Township/County	Required if easements over private lands required.
Consent – Tree Cutting	Township/County	If required, authorization from the Township/County as necessary for pruning or removal of trees within road allowances.
Road Cut Permit	Township/County	May be required for access roads off of county roads or works to county roads.
Pre-Condition Survey	Township/County	Assessment of pre-construction conditions for engineering staff.
Building Permit	Township/County	Compliance with building codes.
Entrance Permit	Township/County	Entrance from county roads.
Transportation Plan	Township/County	Adherence to road safety and suitability.
Additional Plans related to general engineering (e.g. siltation control, lot grading, plan of services, etc.), installation of temporary and/or permanent dock, water, wastewater, storm water, transportation, and geotechnical	Township/County	Required supporting information/plans required by the Township and the County.



Legend

- Rail
- Road
- Utility Line
- Parcel
- Waterbody

Project Infrastructure

- Component Transportation Routing Option

Land Use

- Dock, Vault & Cable Area
- Dock Footprint
- Laydown, Storage, Parking & Office
- Proposed Rail and Unloading Crane Pad
- Road Improvement Necessary

Notes:

- Produced by Hatch under licence from Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Copyright (c) Queens Printer 2011.
- Spatial referencing UTM NAD 83, Zone 18.
- Satellite imagery courtesy of USGS and Google Earth Pro.
- Preliminary layout, not for construction.



DRAFT

Scale: 0, 100, 200, 400 Metres

North Arrow

Windlectric Inc.
 Amherst Island Wind Project
**Mainland
 Public Road Allowance -
 Transportation Roads**

HATCH™





COMPONENT CARRIERS TURN HWY 401 TOWARDS RR 4
SCALE: 1:1000

PRELIMINARY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

THIS DRAWING IS FOR ESTIMATING USE ONLY
DO NOT USE FOR CONSTRUCTION

NOTES:
1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO CENTERLINE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
2. THIS DRAWING IS FOR ESTIMATING USE ONLY. IT IS NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

LEGEND:

 DIRECTION OF TRUCK
 FRONT TREES
 REAR TREES
 BLADE EXTENT
 MTO ROW

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE

REFERENCE DRAWINGS

DRAWING NO.	DRAWING TITLE

ISSUED FOR	DATE	BY
ISSUED FOR	DATE	BY
ISSUED FOR	DATE	BY

DESIGNED BY	DATE	BY
J. SHOROUS		E. POJAZ
CHECKED BY	DATE	BY
D. PARKES		J. SHOROUS
APPROVED BY	DATE	BY
C. MICHENER		R. SKINNER


HATCH

Amberst Island Wind Energy Project

Turns of Turbine Component Carriers Off Hwy 401 Towards RR 4


PROJECT NO.	H340642-2000-10-015-0007
AS SHOWN	H340642
SCALE	AS SHOWN
DATE	
ISSUE	B

Windetric Inc.



<p>HATCH</p> <p>Windscribe Inc. Amherst Island Wind Energy Project</p>																																																						
<p>PROJECT: INVISTA WIND ENERGY PROJECT CLIENT: INVISTA PROJECT NO.: 1540642-2000-10-015-0021</p>																																																						
<p>DESIGNER: J. SOMOGYI CHECKED: J. SOMOGYI APPROVED: J. SOMOGYI</p>																																																						
<p>ISSUE AUTHORIZATION</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th>NO.</th> <th>REVISION</th> <th>DESCRIPTION</th> <th>DATE (M/D/Y)</th> <th>BY</th> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </table>										NO.	REVISION	DESCRIPTION	DATE (M/D/Y)	BY																																								
NO.	REVISION	DESCRIPTION	DATE (M/D/Y)	BY																																																		
<p>PROJECT NO.: 1540642-2000-10-015-0021</p>						<p>DATE: 04/29/2012 12:05 PM</p>																																																

THIS DRAWING IS FOR ESTIMATING USE ONLY.
DO NOT USE FOR CONSTRUCTION.




- LEGEND**
- CON. CONTRACTOR WORK SPACE
 - SITE ACCESS ROAD
 - SUBMARINE CABLE REPAIR WORK SPACE
 - WATER MAIN
 - PROPERTY LINE
 - ROW
 - UNDERGROUND CABLE
 - SUBMARINE CABLE
 - NEW UNDERGROUND COMMUNICATION CABLE
 - EXISTING UNDERGROUND COMMUNICATION CABLE
 - EXISTING OVERHEAD COMMUNICATION CABLE
 - EXISTING DISTRIBUTION LINE
 - ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN METERS

SITE PLAN
SCALE 1:250



<p>Amherst Island Wind Energy Project</p>			
<p>SITE PLAN NORTH ACCESS DOCK AT FOOT OF JIM SNOW DRIVE</p>			
<p>DATE: 10/17/12 DRAWN BY: J. BOGGS CHECKED BY: J. BOGGS SCALE: AS SHOWN</p>	<p>PROJECT NO: 10-015-0017 SHEET NO: 10-015-0017-01</p>	<p>PROJECT: NORTH ACCESS DOCK AT FOOT OF JIM SNOW DRIVE</p>	<p>DATE: 10/17/12 DRAWN BY: J. BOGGS CHECKED BY: J. BOGGS SCALE: AS SHOWN</p>
<p>THIS DRAWING IS FOR EXTERNAL USE ONLY. IT IS NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION. DO NOT USE FOR CONSTRUCTION.</p>			
<p>REFERENCE DRAWINGS</p>			



PREPARATION PLAN
SCALE 1:200



THIS DRAWING IS FOR EXPLANATORY USE ONLY. IT IS NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	10/15/2014	ISSUE FOR PERMIT
2	11/10/2014	ISSUE FOR CONSTRUCTION

Windelectric Inc.
ATWENTH, MAINE WIND ENERGY PROJECT

SITE PREPARATION PLAN
NORTH ACCESS DOCK AT FOOT OF JIM SNOW DRIVE

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	CHECKED BY
1	10/15/2014	ISSUE FOR PERMIT	J. BOON	J. BOON
2	11/10/2014	ISSUE FOR CONSTRUCTION	J. BOON	J. BOON

AS SHOWN: H34-0542-2000-10-015-0016



Windlectric Inc.

Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Public Meeting – March 5 and 6, 2013

March 5, 2013 5:00pm – 8:00pm, Amherst Island Public School

March 6, 2013 5:00pm – 8:00pm, St. John’s Memorial Hall



Stantec

PUBLIC MEETING QUESTIONNAIRE

Comments are appreciated, and help the Project Team identify topics that are most important to the community so we can consider them in our studies and future consultation activities. Completed questionnaires can be dropped off at the welcome table. Pre-paid envelopes are also available if you would like additional time to consider your comments. All comments received by March 15, 2013 will be included in the Consultation Report to be submitted to the MOE.

1. Which public meeting did you attend?

March 5, 2013 Amherst Island Public School (5:00- 8:00 pm)

March 6, 2013 St. John’s Memorial Hall (5:00- 8:00 pm)

2. How did you hear about today’s Public Meeting?

Newspaper Advertisement

Letter

Word of Mouth

Project Website

Other, please specify: _____

3. What was your main reason for attending?

4. Did the Public Meeting meet your information needs?

Yes

No

Please Comment:

5. What do you think are the key issues that need to be addressed through public consultation and the Renewable Energy Approval process?

6. Do you have any information about the local environment that we should consider? If yes, please describe:

7. Do you or your employer provide services that might be useful during construction or operation of the wind facility?

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this questionnaire. Please share additional comments or request follow up on the back of this form. Your feedback will be considered by the Project Team as we complete our studies.

If you would like to be added to the Project mailing list to receive Project updates, please provide your contact information below.

Do you have a question about the Project that you need answered, or do you need further information? Please complete the following and we will contact you with an answer as soon as possible.

Your Question or Information Request:

Please Print Clearly

Name: _____

Address: _____

Town/City: _____

Postal Code: _____

E-mail: _____

Phone: _____

Information will be collected and used to assist Windlectric Inc. in meeting applicable environmental approval requirements. This material will be maintained on file and may be included in project documentation. All comments will become part of the public record.



AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT Public Meeting Project Team Notes

*Amherst Island Public School
March 5, 2013
5:00 – 8:00 pm*

*St. Johns Memorial Hall
March 6, 2013
5:00 – 8:00 pm*

Comments:

Comments recorded by: _____

***Follow Up Required:** YES NO*

Details:

Contact Information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Email Address: _____

Telephone No: _____

Appendix E6

Townhall Meeting Materials

CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC PLANNING



Issues and Concerns

- Will the ferry be tied up by construction equipment and workers?
- Will road closures prevent access to areas of the island?
- Will component delivery trucks be waiting on the road, either block it or create idling noise outside homes?
- Will delivery or construction traffic block the road and delay travel to the ferry or generally around the island?

Plans, Resolutions and Solutions

- Construction of the island dock may require transporting equipment and workers using the ferry (discussions with Township would be required).
- Any temporary road closures will be communicated well in advance to minimize impact on daily users.
- A staging area will be used to park any shipments awaiting delivery to each wind turbine so loads will not be parked along the roadway.
- Deliveries will go straight from the staging area to the turbine location.
- Road construction work will be carried out in the same manner as Township road works.
- All road upgrades will be performed to minimize road closures.
- During construction, a weekly roads update will be communicated using notices placed in mailboxes, posted in public places and available on the Project website.
- Advance warning on the routes (portable road signs) will be placed around affected areas.
- Construction management will be available throughout construction to address concerns.



IMPACTS TO THE ROADS

Issues and Concerns

- Will roads be permanently damaged by the frequent and heavy construction loads and will the Township will be on the hook for the repairs?
- Will the roads will be a mess during construction?
- Will there be an impact on roadside ditches, culverts and drainage?

Plans, Resolutions and Solutions

- Assessment of the present road conditions and planned upgrades to enable safe transport of turbine components are ongoing.
- The road plans will be reviewed and approved by the Township and will form part of the Roads Use Agreement.
- An independent engineer will be hired by the Township at Windlectric's expense to ensure that the roads plan and Road Use Agreement are followed.
- The roads will be repaired during and after construction.
- The roads will be left in 'the same or better' condition in accordance with the Road Use Agreement.
- Steps will be taken to minimize construction mud and stone on the public roads and prompt cleaning will be performed.
- On site construction manager will be available during construction.



HEALTH AND SAFETY



Issues and Concerns

- What will the impact be to delivery of emergency services, such as fire and ambulance response?
- Concern about the noise and dust created by trucks and equipment.

Plans, Resolutions and Solutions

- Plans will be developed, in consultation with the Township, to ensure emergency response services have adequate access at all times between all properties, the fire hall and the ferry dock through preferred and (occasionally) alternative routes.
- Emergency Response mock runs will be completed during early stages of construction to review effectiveness of the Construction Emergency Response Plan.
- Prudent industry practice will be followed to minimize potential effects arising from the construction activities, e.g. noise and dust.
- No movement of large components or materials during regular school bus activity (pick up and drop off of students).
- Strict adherence to speed limits will be required.



PRESERVATION OF IMPORTANT AREAS



Issues and Concerns

- Will there be any possible impact on the school, church, and stone fences?

Plans, Resolutions and Solutions

- Special attention has been and will continue to be given to important areas on the Island. Construction activities will avoid such areas wherever possible and/or ensure measures are followed to avoid any potential detrimental effects.
- Construction activities will not disturb the stone walls:
 - The stone fences will be assessed periodically by a qualified individual.
 - Construction activities will cease immediately if vibrations are found to be resulting in damage until the wall can be adequately reinforced or supported.
 - The stone wall will be evaluated following construction activities to ensure that no damage has occurred and any damage to the wall should be repaired immediately following construction activities.
- Implement buffer zones, monitoring of vibration near identified areas and periodic inspection of identified areas to avoid and mitigate detrimental effects mandatory requirements of the project's renewable energy approval.



PRESERVATION OF THE
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT



Issues and Concerns

- How will the road upgrades impact trees, wetlands, and grasses within the road allowance?

Plans, Resolutions and Solutions

- Construction activities will be completed within the requirements of the Ministry of Environment Renewable Energy Approval and Township Bylaws.
- Care is to be taken to ensure that all protected areas are unaffected by the construction activities.
- Tree trimming and removal, if required within road allowances, will be performed in accordance with the Loyalist Township's Tree Bylaw and supervised by a professional arborist.

EXISTING ROAD CLASSIFICATION



Roads	Current Conditions	Proposed Upgrade
<p>Class 1 Examples are Stella 40 Foot Rd. north of 3rd Concession Rd. and Front Rd from Stella 40 Foot Rd. to the bridge, approximately 1-km west of Marshall 40 Foot Rd.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Includes asphalt/asphalt-gravel roads with widths of approximately 4 m to 5 m or greater •Exhibit adequate drainage •Certain areas contain small potholes and 'alligator' cracking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Granular A fill material will be deposited prior to the construction to fill in cracks and create an additional wearing surface. In these instances, a geo-textile separator layer will be placed on top of the asphalt material. •Hatch's opinion is that, according to the current condition, the road can handle the loads required for the transportation once it is upgraded as indicated. •Maintenance will be required during the construction period to retain this condition.
<p>Class 2 An example is Front Rd, 1 km west of Marshall 40 Ft. Rd. to 300 m west of Marshall 40 Foot Rd.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Semi-compacted gravel roads with widths of approximately 4 m to 5 m or greater •Exhibit adequate drainage •Certain areas contain some potholes and cracks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Prior to construction, a layer of compacted Granular A material is proposed to be laid and compacted, as well as poor drainage areas corrected (infill and/or culverts). •Additionally, in some cases, Granular B material may be necessary for a filtering sub-grade base. •Hatch's opinion is that, according to its current condition, the road can handle the loads required for the transportation once it is upgraded as indicated. •Maintenance will be required during the construction period to retain this condition.
<p>Class 3 Example: Front Rd. east of Marshall 40 Foot Rd. and 3rd Concession Rd.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Loose gravel road with road widths of approximately 4 m to 5 m or greater •Varying drainage characteristics, ranging from poor to adequate. •Potholes and cracks more frequent than Class 1 or Class 2 roads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Typically, these roads will require widening. If that is the case, the area will either be part of the right-of-way, or belong to participating owners. •Deposit of both Granular B (as a base sub-grade) and Granular A materials, to act as the wearing surface. •Additionally, Granular A material may be required in select locations for resurfacing of the road to upgrade the compaction of the existing gravel and improve drainage performance. •Hatch's opinion is that, according to its current condition, the road can handle the loads required for the transportation once it is upgraded as indicated. •Maintenance will be required during the construction period to retain this condition.
<p>Class 4 Example: Lower 40 Foot Rd. and South Shore Rd.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Loose gravel road with road widths less than 4 m to 5 m. •Varying drainage characteristics ranging from poor to adequate. In some cases, shoulders of the road appear to be higher than the edge of the road, causing water accumulation (pooling) •Potholes and cracks more frequent than Class 1 or Class 2 roads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •This classification of road will require stripping of the organic topsoil in the shoulder areas for general widening of the roads and construction of a strong Granular B sub-grade. •Granular A material will be used for resurfacing and to improve the drainage properties of the road. •Hatch's opinion is that, according to its current condition, the road can handle the loads required for the transportation once it is upgraded as indicated. •Maintenance will be required during the construction period to retain this condition.
<p>Class 5 Example: Unmaintained roads (i.e. Dump Road)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Constructed using sand and mud material with road widths less than approximately 4 m to 5 m •Very poor to poor drainage properties. In some cases, shoulders of the road appear to be higher than the edge of the road, causing water accumulation (pooling) •Abundant potholes were present on the road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •This classification of road will require stripping of the organic topsoil in the shoulder areas for general widening of the roads and construction of a strong Granular B sub-grade. •Granular A material will be used for resurfacing and to improve the drainage properties of the road. •Hatch's opinion is that, according to its current condition, the road can handle the loads required for the transportation once it is upgraded as indicated. •Maintenance will be required during the construction period to retain this condition.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND PROJECT

EXISTING ROAD CLASSIFICATION




LEGEND:


-  ROAD CLASS 1
-  ROAD CLASS 2
-  ROAD CLASS 3
-  ROAD CLASS 4
-  ROAD CLASS 5

AMHERST ISLAND WIND PROJECT


EXISTING ROAD CLASSIFICATION




FRONT RD




STELLA 40 FT RD



FRONT RD



LOWER 40FT ROAD



DUMP ROAD

ROAD USE AGREEMENT



Road Use Agreement which would mandate the following with further details to be negotiated with Loyalist Township:

- Island infrastructure must be maintained in the same or better condition after the Amherst Island Wind Project has been constructed.
- The project will provide payment for Loyalist Township to hire an independent engineering consultant to conduct the following:
 - Advise the Township on the infrastructure engineering as it pertains to the project affecting roads, drainage, etc.
 - Review and approve proposed project plans and drawings.
 - Conduct inspections during construction and advise Township.
 - Participate in pre and post construction audits.

Algonquin is working with Township on this agreement. A draft agreement was provided to Township last March (2012) in order to commence to discussions.




Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Loyalist Township Town Hall Meeting



Project Status Report



Project Status Report

REA Status

- Draft technical reports submitted to the Township on December 3 and generally to the public on December 27
- Final open houses scheduled for March 5th (Bath) and March 6th (Stella)

REA Documents

- www.amherstislandwindproject.com
- Hard copies available:
 - Loyalist Township office in Odessa
 - Lennox & Addington office in Napanee



Windelectric Inc.




Algonquin

Project Status Report

Anticipated Project Timeline

- Apr 2013 – REA Submission to MOE
- Nov 2013 – Anticipated REA Approval from MOE
- Q3 2014 – Dock Construction Starts
- Q4 2014 – Road Upgrades and Foundations
- Q2 2015 – Turbine Delivery
- Q3 2015 – Construction Complete



Windelectric Inc.



Algonquin

Construction Activities

Collection System

To be installed underground either under or beside the road



Windelectric Inc.



Algonquin

Construction Activities

Road Construction

Road upgrades completed by laying and compacting gravel



Construction Activities Road Construction

Culverts installed at access road entrances



Construction Activities

Road Construction

Intersection corners
expanded for large
equipment




Construction Activities

Material Transport



Transport of raw materials, concrete and other products by standard trucks



Construction Activities

Turbine Transport

Large turbine components will be delivered on specialized trucks

Blades and towers are the longest components



Construction Activities

Turbine Transport

Large turbine components will be delivered on specialized trucks

The heaviest loads are spread over many axles



Windelectric Inc.



Algonquin

Construction Activities

Crane Movements

Erection crane can be broken down and moved by flatbed



Expected to be one road crossing walk



Construction Traffic Planning

Concerns

- Will the ferry will be tied up by construction equipment and workers?
- Will road closures will prevent access to parts of the island and delay travel?
- Will construction traffic block the road and delay travel to the ferry or generally around the island?



Windelectric Inc.



Algonquin

Construction Traffic Planning

Ferry Use

- Township ferry will not be used for major construction
- Township ferry *might* be used for initial dock construction
- Purpose built private dock and barges

Road Closures

- Any temporary road closures will be communicated
- Road upgrades designed to minimize road closures
- Weekly roads updates: mailboxes, public postings, website
- Portable road signs along affected routes
- No part of the island will be completely inaccessible



Windelectric Inc.



Algonquin

Construction Traffic Planning

- ## Construction Traffic Road Blockages
- Staging area to park components before delivery to each wind turbine
 - Deliveries will go straight from the staging area to the turbine location
 - Concrete trucks will not be parked on public roads
 - Erection cranes will not walk along public roads, will be disassembled and taken by truck.



Impacts to the Roads

Concerns

- Permanent damage to the road system
- Poor condition of roads during construction
- Mud and stone on the roads during construction
- Negative impact to ditches and drainage



Windelectric Inc.



Algonquin

Impacts to the Roads

Road Use Agreement

- Agreement to protect the roads
- Independent engineer for the Township
- Township review of plans/designs
- Detailed audits before and after

Interim Maintenance

- Safe driving conditions will be maintained throughout construction
- Minimize mud and stone with prompt cleaning

Communication

- Construction Manager will be available for reporting issues



Health and Safety

Concerns

- Will emergency services be blocked or delayed?
- Excessive noise from construction
- Significant dust from construction
- Considerable traffic passing the school



Windlectric Inc.



Algonquin

Health and Safety

Emergency Response

- Ensure emergency response services have access between all properties, the fire hall and the ferry dock
- Emergency response mock runs will be completed during early stages of construction

Health and Safety

- Prudent industry practices will be followed to minimize effects arising from the construction activities, e.g. noise & dust
- No movement of components or materials during regular school bus activity
- Strict adherence to speed limits



Windelectric Inc.



Algonquin

Preservation of Important Heritage Areas

Concerns

- Damage to the stone fences
- Leveling of important hills
- Damage to historic buildings



Preservation of Important Heritage Areas

Stone Fences

- Avoidance where possible
- Pre/post monitoring, regular inspections

Heritage Buildings

- Vibration monitoring
- Reduced speed as mitigation

St. Paul's Presbyterian

- No plan to “cut” the hill



Preservation of the Natural Environment

Concerns

- Impact to mature trees
- Major trimming of limbs
- Destruction of environmentally sensitive areas



Windelectric Inc.



Algonquin

Preservation of the Natural Environment

Tree Trimming/Cutting

- To be done in accordance with the Bylaw under the supervision of a professional arborist

Environmental Approvals

- Construction will be done within the requirements of the REA



Windelectric Inc.



Algonquin



Amherst Island Wind Energy Project

Loyalist Township Town Hall Meeting





QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

① With the increase of traffic, will there be an increase of police officers visiting the island?

② Will affected roads be completely ~~re-~~ re-constructed after turbine construction? (Affects to vehicle tire cutting being considered)

③ What third-party inspectors will be involved during construction? After?

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

Why is Algonquin building a road beside
the Old Marshall Run? Is it instead of upgrading
the existing road which can be used of upgrading
thereof, at no cost to the Township
except for maintenance.

Name [redacted] Address [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) [redacted]

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

How are you going to get around
Hitchen's corner & stone walls at corner of
Emerald 40-foot & 2nd Concession? What
will happen to that historic stone wall?

Name [redacted] Address [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) _____

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

WILL TREES RELATED FOR REMOVAL BE TAGGED
BEFOREHAND SO THAT ISLANDERS WILL BE WARNED
OF THEIR REMOVAL. HOW WILL ALGONQUIN ARRANGE
TO REPLACE EACH TREE REMOVED. ANSWER WILL

Name [REDACTED]

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone or email address (optional) [REDACTED]

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

① Has this plan taken into consideration children walk to the school from the village?

② In the summer time, the restaurant is open and on many days & nights there are vehicles parked on the street. How are these vehicles & pedestrians going to be affected by the extra traffic?

Name _____ Address _____

Telephone or email address (optional) _____

Please check here _____ if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN TRAY WAGONS BEHIND
A TRACTOR MEET A TURBINE BLADE

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

How are you planning to ensure that commuter / residents are able to ride the ferry at certain times throughout the day, ensuring the ability to get to work on time etc.

Name [Redacted] Address [Redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) _____

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

Is there a plan ~~to~~ for ferry service during commuting hours - to ensure that we are able to get to our work on time on the correct ferry?



Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THE CABLE
WILL BE PUT ALONG THE ROAD
(ie FRONT RD E.) WILL THE ROAD BE CLOSED
TO LOCAL TRAFFIC TO ACCOMODATE THIS
(ie AMBULANCES)

Name [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED]

Telephone or email address (optional) [REDACTED]

Please check here ___ if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

WILL THE ELECTRICAL TRENCH BE IN
THE TRAVELLED PORTION OF THE ROAD
OR IN THE UNTRAVELLED PORTION?

Name

[Redacted Name]

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

[Redacted Telephone or Email Address]

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

WHEN THE APPROXIMATE 12 HYDRO POLES

ARE BEING RELOCATED WILL OUR HYDRO

BE OFF AND HOW LONG AND WILL WE

BE NOTIFIED WELL AHEAD?

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

Because of the expected increase of heavy road traffic during construction what does the proponent propose to do to alleviate the health issues that some people are already suffering (i.e. - depression, anxiety, panic attacks) because of the wind turbine issue coming to their community?

Name

S

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

WHAT EFFECTIVE DUST CONTROL IS ALGONQUIN GOING TO PROVIDE FOR RESIDENTS DURING CONSTRUCTION

WHEN THE EXTREMELY LARGE NUMBER OF BIG TRUCKLOADS

(i.e. HOLE? ON FRONT RIDE) ARE PASSING & ALSO WHEN THE CABLE IS BEING LAID? DUST CONTROL NEEDS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE AGREEMENT AT COST TO

ALGONQUIN

Name [redacted] Address [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) [redacted]

Please check here ___ if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

During the proposed 20 year (plus) life of the turbines, there is the real possibility that new large turbine components will be required to replace older or malfunctioning components. Will the same processes of widening, strengthening and altering roads and vegetation be repeated each time this happens?

Name: [redacted] Address: [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional): [redacted]

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

would be a parking blades, large
sections of ditches by helicopter
less all's there for is travelers;
Algonquin?

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

Is there an independent roads construction
overseer to assure compliance with the
roads-use agreement? Who will pay for the
overseer? Who hires the overseer?

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.

Question for Town Hall Meeting

January 29, 2013

The Marshal 40 ft Road is an existing road. It is an integral part of the Loyalist Township road system. The preliminary layout for the wind farm, circulated in December 2011, recorded Algonquin's preference to use the Marshall 40 ft Road. It appears today that Algonquin is no longer utilizing the open Marshall 40 ft Road.

There is a missed opportunity here, for Loyalist Township and road users. The public will benefit if this private corporation improves this public road. They could develop, build and maintain this necessary road. Why was this changed? How did we miss this? How can we engineer a process for the benefit of the public and Loyalist Township?

[REDACTED]



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

We commend the Township administration
for the protection of habitat. Is it part
of the Roads Policy now?

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

IN THE ROAD USE AGREEMENT WHAT WOULD

BE A REASONABLE DEPOSIT FROM WIND ELECTRIC

FOR POTENTIAL DAMAGE TO ROADS?

Name [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] Address [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here ___ if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

How are you planning on protecting
our children from the school from
the pollution & contamination
caused by the close proximity
of the concrete plant?

Name: [Redacted] Address: [Redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

How does council ~~ensure~~ plan to ensure the safety of our children who use the front rd to walk or ride bikes to school? Is there a plan for new sidewalks? Has Council + Limestone DSB liaised about delivery of curriculum with noise pollution during school hours?

Name [redacted] Address [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here ___ if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

Number 40' is or is not an
unmanned (unmaintained) road
not to be labelled for Turbines?

Name [redacted] Address [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) [redacted]

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

HOW FAR FROM CENTRE OF ROAD WILL
CONSTRUCTION AND TREE REMOVAL TAKE PLACE
ON FRONT ROAD AT BLOCK?
MY DRIVE SHED IS 5' FROM THE EDGE OF THE
PAYMENT.

Name [redacted] Address [redacted]
Telephone or email address (optional) [redacted] ROAD

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

Loyalist township staff have identified that Amherst Island roads are unable to handle the volume of industrial traffic proposed by the project; therefore, is council considering a prohibition of industrial heavy traffic, of the magnitude proposed by this project on Amherst Island.

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

The road use agreement refers to moving stone fences (in a similar way to moving sidewalk furniture and road signs) One particular stone fence in close proximity to Front Rd. was built over 150 years ago by founding fathers of this community. How will Loyalist Township protect the heritage and history of this community, specifically of the stone fences, during proposed wind turbine construction?

Name [redacted] Address [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) _____

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

We understand that you intend to take care of "important areas" of the island what about the areas that are close to areas with people's ~~own~~ homes where someone with Spasile health or health concerns that may be affected by turbinas

Name [redacted] Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

A SEPARATE BUBBLE SYSTEM WILL BE REQUIRED TO KEEP
A PATHWAY OPEN FOR THE BARGE. THIS WILL HAVE TO BE
IN PLACE FOR THE LIFE OF THE PROJECT. HOW WILL
THE FERRY BUBBLE SYSTEM BE AFFECTED AT THE
CROSSOVER.

Name  Address _____

Telephone or email address (optional) _____

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

The HATCH report identifies property lines
are to be confirmed by survey and that
further studies are required (see intersection
improvements General Arrangements) when will
this information be available for public
review? Why is this information so incomplete?

Name [redacted] Address [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) _____

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

GIVEN ~~THE~~ THAT MOST PEOPLE FROM AWAY
MOVED TO THE ISLAND FOR THE PEACE + BEAUTY, AFTER
YOU HAVE CUT DOWN THE TREES + PAVED THE QUIET DIRT
ROADS IS THE SECOND CONCESSION, ARE YOU GOING TO
RETURN THESE ROADS TO WHAT THEY WERE, OR LEAVE US
LIVING IN AN ^{ASPHALT} INDUSTRIAL MALL LIKE THE CITIES WE
LEFT?

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.

Question for meeting January 29, 2013

"The Owl Wood Management Strategy Report" of 2011, clearly lays out options for the Owl Wood, all of which entail good road access.

Why was the report and the Catarqui Regional Conservation Authority(CRCA) not consulted when the issue of the Marshall Forty Foot Road first came up?

In the interest of saving tax money is there any way to get the approval needed for Algonquin to improve the Forty Foot using the Owl Wood report as a guideline?

Untitled

with regard to damage to culverts and drainage ditches:

1) who is responsible for repair and restoration?

2) what kind of compensation could we expect if our properties should incur damage that may result from flooding?



I live in a heritage house in the historic village of Stella. It is over 130 years old and situated a mere 6 feet from the road. What measures are in place to protect the wooden siding, the foundation, and the original glass window panes from damages incurred by thousands of oversized trucks as they drive past my door?

Adjacent to my home is an organic vegetable garden. It is also within 6 ft. of the road. Are you prepared to put up barriers along the border between my garden and the road to protect it from contamination? If not, what can I expect in compensation - this produce provides me with food for a good portion of the year?



Loyalist Township staff have identified that Amherst Island roads are unable to handle the volume of industrial traffic proposed by the project; therefore, is council considering a prohibition of industrial heavy traffic, of the magnitude proposed by this project, on Amherst Island roads? And if so, what will this look like? If not, why?



| | |

Amherst Island was owned by an Irish land baron, who subsequently surveyed the island into lots and concessions. Then leasing and selling until all the island properties were sold into multi-landowners.

Roads were provided through the properties by forced road or right-of-ways, which were not surveyed. Only years after did Township government acquire roads in return for buildings fence in return for landowners forfeiting ownership of a road which they may or may not have surveyed.

More recent history, the township asked for and received up to 66 ft of roadway in compensation for park development through severances. There leaves many landowners which fell into neither of the above situations and whose road right of ways were laid out at 26 feet.

Therefore, it would seem that it is up to Algonquin Power to negotiate with those landowners access through these Right of Ways.

What is Council's position on road right of ways in the context of this information?



The proposed routing of heavy industrial traffic of the size, type and frequency envisioned within the Hatch Report past the Amherst Island Public School includes trucking to turbine sites as well as potentially trucking of all that is needed to build a dock west of the school.

How does the Township propose to mitigate the significant risks (for instance pollution caused by intense industrial road use, noise, dust, lack of safe areas of passage for children going to and from school) posed to Island children within the Village, and specifically in the area of Amherst Island Public School?



Questions posed by Kevin and Christine Archibald

Will the speed limit on the island roads be decreased in view of the high number of heavy equipment trucks travelling the island roads at high speeds? If not, why not?

Will the half load limit be enforced during the construction period and if not why not.

How will the Township ensure that private property is not encroached upon by construction vehicles travelling township roads? Who will assume liability in the case of damage to private properties in such cases? Will it be the Township or Algonquin Power?

As construction vehicles using Township roads will often take up the full width of the road, how will situations be handled when an oncoming vehicle confronts such vehicles?

Will Algonquin Power be denied use of the island roads 15 minutes before the ferry leaves and for 15 minutes after the ferry arrives? And if not, why not?

[REDACTED]

How will the Township guarantee that there will be no delay in emergency vehicles reacting to emergency calls in a timely and uninterrupted manner taking into consideration the fact that construction trucks will be regularly using the island roads and in many cases blocking other vehicles from passing?

Because island roads have no sidewalks, Township roads are used by walkers who are quite often accompanied by dogs and children. Already vehicles delivering construction materials and other heavy duty vehicles drive at high speeds on island roads many with no consideration for the safety of walkers. How will the Township ensure the safety of pedestrians, walkers, cyclists, children and animals who will have to share the roads with a huge number of heavy duty vehicles during the construction period?

If Algonquin Power and their sub-contractors do not adhere to the Road Use Agreement, what does the Township intend to do to ensure they do: eg: hire an independent overseer; enact fines for non-adherence; list a hot line number to call for complaints, etc.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

How are you planning on ensuring the safety of the children walking to and from school? Are you planning on installing sidewalks in the Village to protect them from traffic?

Name [Redacted] Address [Redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) _____

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

No attached

Name [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Telephone or email address (optional) [REDACTED]

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.

authorized the installation of safety guiderails along most of the South Shore Road, although it was acknowledged that the guiderails were a safety barrier for vehicles, not a method of stabilization against erosion.

Question:

Hatch Engineering's Public Road Allowance plans show that major portions of the South Shore Road are to be used for Turbine Component Delivery Flow.

The weight of many individual turbine and tractor trailer loads is listed as in excess of 100 metric tons, and some (33) as much as 155 metric tons.

To put this in perspective, a Canadian Leopard 2 Main Battle Tank weighs 56 metric tons, and is not allowed on many public roads.

The roadbed of the South Shore Road, which has already eroded to the point where it is considered a safety hazard and an environmental hazard, ~~must be prohibited against use by such vehicles, which will hasten erosion and destroy the fragile shoreline.~~

What is the developer plan to prevent erosion and destruction of the fragile shore line?



PLEASE PRINT
QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

If a present road or right of way is too narrow for Algonquin's trucks & construction equipment: What is your plan?

Name: [Redacted] Address: [Redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) [Redacted]

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.

Road allowances across the Island vary. Certain roads are much narrower than others and some are, in fact, owned by the landowners with a right-of-way agreement in place. Explain the steps you have taken to ensure that the roadways you are using can accommodate the size of the equipment without trespassing on adjacent properties.





PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

When there are delays to ^{stand} vehicles,
what is the maximum time limit allowed
to delay traffic by Algonquin Wind Electric
vehicles?

Who takes responsibility if this time limit is
exceeded?

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

Who has the right of way during daily construction, Algonquin/Windlectric vehicles or island residents' vehicles?

Name [Redacted] Address [Redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) [Redacted]

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

Could you explain what will happen in the event that an emergency vehicle requires access to the same road, at the same time that a large turbine component is being transported? Will the emergency vehicle be required to use an alternate, longer detour to access the emergency

Name [redacted] Address [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) [redacted]

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

With proposed use of roads affect people travelling to
the boat to make connections for their employment,
Will there be specific times that roads will be perhaps
blocked and will residents be given some forewarning
of such

Name [REDACTED] Address _____

Telephone or email address (optional) _____

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

How does council plan to ensure delivery of ~~some~~ 911 services - in a safe + timely fashion - when flatbeds + large vehicles could potentially block access to addresses, or at least reduce drastically the ~~area~~ time it takes to reach an address? It could be a matter of life and death. This is HUGE

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

1) HOW WILL ACCESS TO THE FERRY
BE IMPAIRED?

2) ANY SPECIAL PROTOCOLS FOR EMERGENCIES
LIKE 911 CALLS?

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

There should be no disruption to the ferry

- Ambulance service and the ferry saved my life after a stroke and they got me to K.S.H in time for a life saving injection which has to be done ASAP.

Name [redacted] Address [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.

Questions Regarding Disruption of Traffic during the Construction Phase of the
Algonguin/Wind Electric's Amherst Island Wind Project.

My wife and I operate a full-time farm business employing three people during the summer season.

Making hay(1700 large round bales) and hauling it home involves 200 round trips of 6-24kms with slow moving, heavy and wide loads.

Currently for reasons of safety and courtesy we try to minimize trips on the weekends and in the summer holidays focusing on hauling the hay home after labour day weekend.

We are also conscious of ferry times and try to pullover at strategic points to allow neighbours to get to the ferry.

What steps will you take to ensure that essential farm traffic will be able to move around the Island during the construction phase of this project, remembering that there are NO alternate routes?

[REDACTED]





PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

CONSIDERING THE SMALL WIDTH OF PAI & PROXIMITY TO LAKE ONTARIO &
 CONSIDERING THAT DRAINAGE DITCHES EMPTY INTO CULVERTS AND INTO
 LAKE ONTARIO, WHAT PROVISION IS THERE THAT TAILING & DITCHING
 WATER DOES NOT POLLUTE LAKE ONTARIO & EXISTING SHORE NEEDS
 AUXILIARY QUESTIONS: WHAT PROVISION TO SUSTAIN EXISTING
 UNDER ROAD & WATER & POWER LINES TO NEEDS. (GRANDFATHERED FROM
PAI. TOWNSHIP)

Name [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED]

Telephone or email address (optional) [REDACTED]

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

How will the Algonquin/Windlectric transportation vehicles and road use affect the construction of the new end-loading ferry dock if they occur at the same time?

Name [redacted] Address [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) [redacted]

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

Roads use Document
Top of Page 8 states "Amherst Island... by an end-loading ferry has not been exposed to heavy commercial traffic...")

When did we get an "end loading" ferry?

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

If a Road-use agreement is made between Loyalist Township and Algonquin/Windlectric, what will happen to this agreement if Algonquin Windlectric sells to a new company?

Name

Address

613 389 5481
~~430 7788~~

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

Will there be a separate Roads-Use agreement for the use of mainland Roads?

Will there be a separate meeting for Bath and Amherstview residents?

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

The demonstration photos show pastoral settings and clean sites.

Reality at Wolfe Island was (and remains) quite different, - torn up trees, flooding, gravel and rock piles, mud. Will Algonquin (if approved)

avoid the deception of the photos here and build a clean site

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

*Why are your pictures so positive and clear
and why are there no homes or people.*

Name

[Redacted Name]

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



PLEASE PRINT

QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

Who chooses the 2-bur-ist and Stone Fence
Experts to evaluate damage

Name

Address

Telephone or email address (optional)

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



QUESTION re: Algonquin's Road Use Proposal

January 29, 2013

PLEASE PRINT

Who chooses the "evaluator" ?
(referred to in display boards)

Name [redacted] Address [redacted]

Telephone or email address (optional) _____

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.



PLEASE PRINT

There are references to "qualified individual" to insure dry stone fences are protected -

What qualifications does this person have & will they work for the Township - so they are independent - NOT hired directly by Algonquin?

Will they document & study vibration potential BEFORE trucks pass?

Name [REDACTED] Address [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Telephone or email address (optional) _____

Please check here if you do not want your name or address to be shown on the public record related to this meeting or issue.

Questions Re: Road-Use Agreement

Submitted by:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

January 29, 2013

Thank-you Mayor Lowry and Council Members for agreeing to hold a public meeting on the draft road use agreement. This is further to my letter of November 30, 2012 to Council "Questions and Concerns Re: Proposed Road Use Agreement.

QUESTION #1 - Ongoing Consultation Process

The road use plans are in an early stage of development and there are many gaps in the information. Given this situation, how will the Township consult with Islanders and Township residents as the plans evolve and prior to a decision on the roads use agreement being taken?

QUESTION #2 - Use of Road Allowances

How will the Township clarify the status of the road allowances and ensure that the developer does not have access to closed road allowances on Amherst Island?

QUESTION #3 - Health & Safety

Access to emergency transportation for Islanders is a major concern if this project moves forward. Will the township take steps to ensure that the road use agreement is not signed off before the Developer's Emergency Plan is finalized and is clearly understood by Islanders?

QUESTION #4 - Tree Planting

Would Township agree that for every tree the Developer removes that they must plant two mature trees in its place?

QUESTION #5 - Heritage Preservation

St. Paul's Presbyterian Church and the hill it occupies constitute an important cultural heritage landscape. We have learned that there will be "branch trimming" and the addition of gravel on the roadway to permit the passage of the oversize vehicles. What steps will the Township take to ensure that this historic landscape is preserved?

Pentland Cemetery - it is believed that there are burials very close to the Road's edge on the north side. How will the Township and the developer ensure that these burials are not disturbed?

Using the roads in Stella and the dock as a primary transportation route should be avoided at all cost. The potential impact on village and Island residents and in particular the school children is not reasonable. The impacts on the heritage properties could be irreversible. Will the Township request that the developer find an alternative route for transporting components.

Questions posed by [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

1. Do the turbine blades come by water or by road?

If by road, which Loyalist Township roads will be used?

2. Do the other components come by water or by road?

If by road, which Loyalist Township roads will be used?

3. Where will the gravel and cement come from?

Which Loyalist Township roads will be used?

If this development is allowed to proceed you must answer the following questions in a manner to satisfy me and other residents of Amherst Island

You are going to widen most roads on Amherst Island.

1. What will you do to protect trees on private property from damage? Are you allowed to take my property to widen roads?
2. How will you properly ditch roads to prevent water runoff and flooding of personal property?

You state that use of the MTO ferry for transportation of workers and materials is also possible and these options will be discussed in detail the MTO and Loyalist Township.

3. How many workers and how much material? How will you insure that access during the regular ferry schedule is not disrupted by your use of the roads? Do you have the right to block roads thus preventing island residents from timely access to the ferry? Are we assured that no workers will use the MTO ferry?
4. Why not discuss details with citizens of Amherst Island as the great majority of islanders are well represented by APAI.

You state that a certain amount of aggregate is reserved for the topping of the island roads being driven on.

5. Are island roads as currently constructed suitable for the heavy loads proposed for transport of materials? Will most of the roads including the Stella 40 ft and South Shore Road be built to standards sufficient to support these loads?

You propose that during operation and maintenance the MTO ferry will be used to transport workers and waste greases and oils.

6. How will you handle these waste materials that will contain toxic hydrocarbons?

Communication and notification procedures shall be developed for the construction phases of the work through consultation with Loyalist Township and the County of Lennox and Addington and will be part of a formal Traffic Management Plan.

7. Why don't you consult with island residents that will be most affected by your traffic management plans? The great majority of island residents are currently well represented by APAI.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] 25

The road use agreement refers to moving stone fences (in a similar way to moving sidewalk furniture and road signs). One particular stone fence in very close proximity to Front Road was built over 150 years ago by founding fathers of this community. How will Loyalist Township protect the heritage and history of this community, specifically of the stone fences, during proposed wind turbine construction?



The documents presented in the Hatch report equate the moving of street signs to moving of stone fences.

Surely, Loyalist Township, which prides itself on Heritage preservation, would not allow the demolition of 170 year old stone fences, built by the founding fathers of this community.

What steps will the Township take to ensure that stone fences are Untouched?



Questions Regarding Disruption of Traffic during the Construction Phase of the
Algonquin/Wind Electric's Amherst Island Wind Project.

My wife and I operate a full-time farm business employing three people during the summer season.

Making hay(1700 large round bales) and hauling it home involves 200 round trips of 6-24kms with slow moving, heavy and wide loads.

Currently for reasons of safety and courtesy we try to minimize trips on the weekends and in the summer holidays focusing on hauling the hay home after labour day weekend.

We are also conscious of ferry times and try to pullover at strategic points to allow neighbours to get to the ferry.

What steps will you take to ensure that essential farm traffic will be able to move around the Island during the construction phase of this project, remembering that there are NO alternate routes?

[REDACTED]



Appendix E7

Public Comment/Response Summary

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
February 24, 2011	July 27, 2011	15	Correspondent sent a response to wind energy propaganda presented to the senate committee on energy, the environment, and natural resources, Nov. 23rd 2010. The contents of this 15 page document include discussion of the negative health effects of turbines, the reliability of wind energy, and costs associated with wind energy.	Summarized concerns and indicated that public concerns are considered very seriously. Stated that all work being performed for this project will be documented as part of the REA process. Stated that public stakeholders are being engaged with the support of Stantec Consulting Ltd. to ensure that all comments are taken into consideration and are responded to meaningfully. Provided project website and contact information and indicated that a list of Frequently asked Questions would be made available.
May 27, 2011	July 27, 2011	15	Correspondent wrote to explain why, in their opinion, a project on Amherst Island is a very bad idea. The six page letter elaborates on the following concepts: 1. project on Amherst Island would be marginal with a capacity factor (efficiency) of about 20%; the area available is too small to support a viable project 2. considerable resistance from a large number of islanders 3. it is quite irresponsible to develop a project in an important bird area,	Summarized concerns and indicated that public concerns are considered very seriously. Stated that all work being performed for this project will be documented as part of the REA process. Stated that public stakeholders are being engaged with the support of Stantec Consulting Ltd. to ensure that all comments are taken into consideration and are responded to meaningfully. Provided project website and contact information and indicated that a list of Frequently asked Questions would be made available.
July 11, 2011	July 25, 2011	49	Correspondent wrote in questioning Algonquin Power's Mission Statement in light of his assertion that the "vast majority people who live on Amherst Island are opposed to this project" and "Amherst Island is an internationally designated Important Bird Area"	Stated that public concerns are considered very seriously. Stated that all work being performed for this project will be documented as part of the REA process. Stated that public stakeholders are being engaged with the support of Stantec Consulting Ltd. to ensure that all comments are taken into consideration and are responded to meaningfully. Provided project website and contact information and indicated that a list of Frequently asked Questions would be made available.
July 24, 2011	July 27, 2011	72	Invitation to Amherst Island. Questions about infrastructure requirements to bring in materials to build wind farm. Question about dismantling and decommissioning wind farms.	Summarized concerns and indicated that public concerns are considered very seriously. Stated that all work being performed for this project will be documented as part of the REA process. Stated that public stakeholders are being engaged with the support of Stantec Consulting Ltd. to ensure that all comments are taken into consideration and are responded to meaningfully. Provided project website and contact information and indicated that a list of Frequently asked Questions would be made available.
August 3, 2011	October 5, 2011	181	Correspondent forwarded an excerpt from an article in the Globe and Mail where conservation group Nature Canada is asking for Transalta to shut down components of its Wolfe Island IWT installation during peak bird migration times to reduce wildlife fatalities. Correspondent expressed that migratory volumes are more concentrated over Amherst Island than Wolfe Island and this will result in bad press for the Amherst project. correspondent identifies himself as an AQN unit holder and questions why AQN has involved themselves in the Amherst wind development.	Summarized concerns and indicated that public concerns are considered very seriously. Stated that all work being performed for this project will be documented as part of the REA process. Stated that public stakeholders are being engaged with the support of Stantec Consulting Ltd. to ensure that all comments are taken into consideration and are responded to meaningfully. Provided project website and contact information and indicated that a list of Frequently asked Questions would be made available.
August 4, 2011	No response required	15	The Association to Protect Amherst Island distributed a study conducted by the group to analysts for Algonquin Power Co. The report is intended to assess the viability of the proposed 75 MW wind energy generating system. The report considers the probable energy generation potential, the probable return on investment and the risk factors associated with the project.	No response required. Information only.
August 5, 2011	November 3, 2011	72	Thanked Sean Fairfield for his response letters. Sent two articles about local wildlife. Concern about damage to hedgerows by the movement of construction equipment and subsequent destruction of bird and wildlife habitat. Concerned about mortality of bats and birds.	Indicated that all comments and concerns of community members are considered seriously by the project team. Stated that the project is following the REA process. Encouraged the correspondent to attend an upcoming public meeting in December, and provided the dates and location for these meetings. Provided project information such as project website and mailing and contact information. Indicated that all comments received during the REA process will be included in the project Consultation Report.
August 10, 2011	September 13, 2011	55	Correspondent had three questions: 1. Will you be considering the October 2008 Open House on Amherst Island to be the first of the two required Public Consultation Meetings? 2. Is this to be a Class 3 or Class 4 project? 3. What is the height of the proposed turbines?	Provided the following answers to correspondents questions: 1. We do not consider the 2008 public open house as one of the project open houses. 2. The project is considered a Class 4 project. 3. We are assessing turbines ranging from approximately 80m-100m in hub height. Provided correspondent with phone number for any further questions
August 21, 2011	November 3, 2011	72	Concern about damage to underground water supply due to construction	Indicated that all comments and concerns of community members are considered seriously by the project team.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			and operation of wind turbines.	Stated that the project is following the REA process. Encouraged the correspondent to attend an upcoming public meeting in December, and provided the dates and location for these meetings. Provided project information such as project website and mailing and contact information. Indicated that all comments received during the REA process will be included in the project Consultation Report.
August 22, 2011	No response required	149	"Please, no wind turbines on Amherst Island. Thank you,	No response required. Information only.
August 24, 2011	No response required	15	Correspondent has circulated a petition requesting that there be a moratorium on the development of industrial scale wind farms on the island.	No response required. Information only.
September 8, 2011	November 3, 2011	72	Correspondent indicated that she enjoys the lack of mechanically generated noise on the island, and that the installation of turbines would remove this from the island. Concerned about the effect of noise on human health. She is concerned about what type of noise mitigating measures may be necessary for her to install in her home to reduce the noise impacts of the turbines.	Indicated that all comments and concerns of community members are considered seriously by the project team. Stated that the project is following the REA process. Encouraged the correspondent to attend an upcoming public meeting in December, and provided the dates and location for these meetings. Provided project information such as project website and mailing and contact information. Indicated that all comments received during the REA process will be included in the project Consultation Report.
September 14, 2011	September 23, 2011	55	1. Where on the island are the proposed turbines to be sited? 2. Does the model of turbine being considered have the radar set-up that does away with the flashing red lights? 3. When is the first official public "open house" scheduled and where is the venue? 4. Has a web site been set up for this project? If not, when do you anticipate one will be made available?	Stated that Algonquin Power considers the concerns of stakeholders very seriously. Briefly described the REA process and the documents to be compiled for the final REA application. Stated that Stantec will be providing services to complete the public stakeholder engagement component of the REA process and provided contact information so that she could provide comments and feedback relating to the project. Provided an up to date list of Frequently asked Questions related to the project.
September 15, 2011	October 5, 2011	181	Why is such a unique environment being put at long term risk by an industrial scale wind farm?	Stated that public concerns are considered very seriously. Stated that all work being performed for this project will be documented as part of the REA process. Stated that public stakeholders are being engaged with the support of Stantec Consulting Ltd. to ensure that all comments are taken into consideration and are responded to meaningfully. Provided project website and contact information. Provided a list of Frequently asked Questions for the project.
September 15, 2011	October 5, 2011	49	Where will the turbines be located and where will the underwater line be located?	Stated that the final project layout has not yet been created and that the location of the submarine cable would likely be finalized and presented at the public open houses.
September 16, 2011	September 16, 2011	211	Lives on County Rd. 4 north of Taylor Kidd Blvd. Wanted to know if hydro lines would be crossing her property.	Noted that transmission lines would likely not cross her property. given the current needs for the terminus of the cable south of Taylor Kidd Blvd.
September 19, 2011	September 23, 2011	55	Correspondent quoted REA requirements relating to the project map showing proposed turbine locations. Indicated that the current project map provided does not include the appropriate level of detail as required by REA requirements.	Stated that Algonquin Power considers the concerns of stakeholders very seriously. Briefly described the REA process and the documents to be compiled for the final REA application. Stated that Stantec will be providing services to complete the public stakeholder engagement component of the REA process and provided contact information so that she could provide comments and feedback relating to the project. Provided an up to date list of Frequently asked Questions related to the project.
September 20, 2011	September 20, 2011	120	Offered to rent a single bedroom apartment to the project group. The apartment is located at 5605 Bath rd. in Bath Ont	Thanked correspondent for the offer but indicated that accommodation for the project had already been secured.
September 21, 2011	September 23, 2011	60	Indicated that the project website was not functioning properly and could not access the draft project description report online.	Indicated that the project website issue had been resolved and requested that the correspondent contact him if any further difficulties accessing or viewing the information were experienced.
September 21, 2011	Response Drafted September 30, 2011	170	Indicated that he would like his change of address to be noted for future communications. Also expressed that he feels the REA regulation on which the approval process is based is the "stupidest piece of public policy in existence". Referenced the bird and bat kills study for Wolfe	Stated that Algonquin Power considers the concerns of stakeholders very seriously. Briefly described the REA process and the documents to be compiled for the final REA application. Stated that Stantec will be providing services to complete the public stakeholder engagement component of the REA process and provided contact information so that she could provide comments and feedback relating to the project. Provided an up to date list

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			Island as an example.	of Frequently asked Questions related to the project.
September 22, 2011	September 26, 2011	162	Telephone call from a stakeholder who had received a Notice to Engage at her property which was addressed for a property that she did not own (3600 3rd Concession). There was concern that the property owner of 3600 3rd concession would not have received a copy of the notice to engage.	Stantec checked their records and determined that the same name had mistakenly been recorded for both addresses, another notice was sent to 3600 3rd concession.
September 23, 2011	October 5, 2011	60	Would like to know: 1. Where will the transmission line come ashore on Amherst Island? 2. Will the transmission line be underground or overhead when on the island? 3. Will each turbine have a red light to warn aircraft? Is there technology that allows the light only to turn on when an aircraft is in proximity?	Stated that public concerns are considered very seriously. Stated that all work being performed for this project will be documented as part of the REA process. Stated that public stakeholders are being engaged with the support of Stantec Consulting Ltd. to ensure that all comments are taken into consideration and are responded to meaningfully. Provided project website and contact information and indicated that a list of Frequently asked Questions would be made available. The FAQ list sent with the letter was updated to include a response to the questions about the transmission line
September 23, 2011	October 4, 2011	55	Correspondent feels that in order to follow a "good neighbours" policy, Windlectric must disclose the names and locations of all landowners who have agreed to the placement of one or more wind turbines on their land to the general public.	Stated that the list of landowners who have signed agreements is confidential and will not be released. However, once agreements are complete, the final layout will be made available at the public open house
September 24, 2011	October 5, 2011	134	Could you please confirm what the minimum setbacks are for historic properties on Amherst Island... and specifically properties where people do not live, such as a museum, a church (e.g. St. Paul's Presbyterian Church) or a graveyard?	Stated that public concerns are considered very seriously. Stated that all work being performed for this project will be documented as part of the REA process. Stated that public stakeholders are being engaged with the support of Stantec Consulting Ltd. to ensure that all comments are taken into consideration and are responded to meaningfully. Provided project website and contact information and indicated that a list of Frequently asked Questions would be made available. The FAQ list sent with the letter was updated to include a response to the question about heritage buildings
September 25, 2011	October 4, 2011	90	Would like to know how many roadside trees would need to be removed in order to allow the IWTs to be installed. Also interested in knowing what allowances would be made for air traffic from Kingston Airport.	Stated that public concerns are considered very seriously. Stated that all work being performed for this project will be documented as part of the REA process. Stated that public stakeholders are being engaged with the support of Stantec Consulting Ltd. to ensure that all comments are taken into consideration and are responded to meaningfully. Provided project website and contact information and indicated that a list of Frequently asked Questions would be made available. The FAQ list sent with the letter was updated to include a response to the question about tree removal
September 25, 2011	November 3, 2011	72	Sent a picture of a "view from the rise of Marhsall 40" on Amherst island. Referred to the first page of the Stantec report describing construction elements, and questioned what the landscape would look like following and during installations. Stated that she does not think such an installation would occur in Mr. Robertson's neighbourhood. Again invited Mr. Robertson to visit Amherst Island.	Stated that all comments and concerns of community members are considered seriously by the project team. Stated that the project is following the REA process. Encouraged the correspondent to attend an upcoming public meeting in December, and provided the dates and location for these meetings. Provided project information such as project website and mailing and contact information. Indicated that all comments received during the REA process will be included in the project Consultation Report.
October 5, 2011	October 19, 2011	134	Thanked Myriam for sending the response to her previous question. Asked if the 550 m. setback holds for a property that is from the early 1800s (e.g. a former UEL home), not designated and the resident is a participating landowner?	Stated that according to O.Reg 359/09 setbacks do not apply to noise receptors located on a participating landowner's property. Provided a link to the guide.
October 12, 2011	November 21, 2011	98	The association sent a letter outlining the following reasons for opposition to the Amherst wind project: 1. The area is not windy enough to support the project while maintaining a setback of 1.5 km from homes. 2. Landowners who have signed options for turbines are a minority and do not represent the interests of the population of the island. 3. The island is a federally designated Important Bird Area and there is concern about the impact of the turbines on raptor population and migratory bird populations. 4. Concern about impact on property values.	Stated that all concerns are taken very seriously and will attempt to be addressed by the project. Welcomed Janet to the two upcoming open houses and stated that project representatives would be happy to discuss her concerns at that time. Provided information regarding the date, time and location of upcoming open houses. Provided information about Windlectric's commitment to the REA process, and the involvement of Stantec in the stakeholder consultation process. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			5. The Act and Regulation have removed the ability of the municipality to determine its own land use The group states its dissatisfaction with the open house process conducted by Algonquin Power as they feel that not enough information is presented. The group states that AP and the project will be met with resistance from until the project is cancelled.	
October 18, 2011	October 18, 2011	45	Thanked Rob for filling him in on the progress of the Amherst Island Wind Project, asked to be added to the contact list so that he could receive project updates	Followed up on October 18, 2011 to obtain a physical mailing address and indicate that Daniel had been added to the project mailing list.
October 26, 2011	November 21, 2011	72	Talked about how they went from a liberal riding to a conservative one, believes this is due to the anti-wind sentiments of many residents. Indicated that the VP of Kingston Field Naturalists attended their meeting to show his support. Quoted a report by the Kingston Field Naturalists entitled "The abundance and distribution of wintering raptors on Amherst and Wolfe Island in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. Provided a newsletter from Nature Canada with an article urging that wind turbines not be erected in important bird areas.	Acknowledged receipt of the Nature Canada Newsletter for Fall 2011. Stated that comments have been reviewed by the project team and will be considered as part of the REA process. Stated that the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project Liaison Committee was created to serve a role in providing two-way communications between the local community and Windlectric. Indicated the composition of the Liaison Committee and the number of meetings it has had to date. Indicated that the Liaison Committee is not intended to replace other ideas and concerns from stakeholders. Provided information for upcoming open houses.
October 31, 2011	November 7, 2011	55	Feels that since individuals who hold contracts with Windlectric/AP have been given information regarding potential locations of turbines on their property, this information should also be disclosed to the public.	Stated that the project layout will be made available during the upcoming open houses. Provided the dates on which these open houses are to be conducted. The response also stated that the project materials presented at the open houses would be made available on the project website following the meetings.
November 1, 2011	November 7, 2011	98	Would like for the information on potential turbine locations that was recently disclosed to landowners to be disclosed to the public. Requested that a copy of the document providing this information be sent to her as soon as possible.	Stated that the layout of turbine locations would be available for public review and comment at the two public meetings in December, and that materials from the open houses would be posted to the project website following their conclusion. Indicated Windlectric's commitment to the REA process, and the role that Stantec's playing in the stakeholder consultation process. Provided contact information for Windlectric for all future comments. Indicated that comments received for the project will be considered and included in the REA Consultation Report.
November 2, 2011	November 15, 2011	188	It has come to her attention that participating landowners have received maps of proposed turbine locations on their property. As a resident of the island, has requested that a map of all proposed IWTs on the island be provided to her.	Stated that the Liaison Committee was intended to create two way communications between the community and the project team. The committee representatives were selected based on their ability and willingness to bring a variety of perspectives from/to the local community. Stated that the community was formed in June 2011 and that it met in July and October. The content from these meetings will be made available on the project website. The committee is not intended to replace the other methods by which stakeholders can express their observations and ideas. With respect to her question about the availability of a map: the preliminary layout of turbine locations will be available for review and comment at two separate public open houses. Provided the date and location of the open houses.
November 2, 2011	November 7, 2011	193	Would like to know how setbacks are determined. Would like to know how setback distances from homes and wetlands are sufficient to protect inhabitants and the environment. Would like to know if there will be any road construction or disturbances within 120 meters of wetland areas.	Stated that setback requirements for the project are defined by O.Reg 359/09, and provided a summary table showing the complete set of setback distances that will be used during the project. Indicated Windlectric's commitment to the REA process, and the role that Statics playing in the stakeholder consultation process. Provided contact information for Windlectric for all future comments. Indicated that comments received for the project will be considered and included in the REA Consultation Report.
November 3, 2011	November 15, 2011	188	Would like to know how the Liaison Committee was selected, concerned that they do not reflect the opinions and feelings of residents. Worried that Liaison Committee members do not have unbiased opinions because two are option holders for turbines. Concerned that information from Liaison Committee meetings is not being distributed effectively, does not feel that they should have to wait until the public meetings to be informed about the project. Feels that the project is being conducted too secretly.	Stated that the Liaison Committee was intended to create two way communication between the community and the project team. The committee representatives were selected based on their ability and willingness to bring a variety of perspectives from/to the local community. Stated that the community was formed in June 2011 and that it met in July and October. The content from these meetings will be made available on the project website. The committee is not intended to replace the other methods by which stakeholders can express their observations and ideas. With respect to her question about the availability of a map: the preliminary layout of turbine locations will be available for review and comment at two separate public open houses. Provided the date and location of the open houses.
November 4, 2011	November 7, 2011	181	Would like to know the proposed locations for the turbines in advance of the December 6th and 7th public meetings. Does not feel that a drop in	Stated that the layout of turbine locations would be available for public review and comment at the two public meetings in December. Provided the date and location of the two public meetings, and indicated that they would

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			format is an effective method for the meetings. Would prefer to see a panel including representatives of: project representatives, GEA, Hydro One, Ministry of Energy, Ministry of Health, conservation experts & Loyalist Township representation. Would like to know when the future meetings are planned to be held.	be drop in style with the members of the project team in attendance. There are currently no plans for a panel style meeting. Also indicated that the next public meeting would be held in the summer of 2012.
November 4, 2011	November 21, 2011	55	Would like Algonquin Power to provide map of proposed turbine locations on the project website within the next week.	The response was written to address questions surrounding the dimensions and materials to be used in turbine footings, and indicated that no definite information could be provided relating to the footing dimensions or type prior to the completion of a geotechnical assessment. Indicated that the equipment which is likely to be used for excavation would be a "hoe ram". Stated that details surrounding engineering of the turbines would be made available in the Design and Operations Report. Provided information for upcoming open houses.
November 5, 2011	November 7, 2011	98	Stated that she has requested a map of proposed turbine locations twice, and would like one in advance of the public meetings as this is critical for them to communicate effectively. Would like an immediate response with either the requested document or a reason why it cannot be provided.	Stated that the layout of turbine locations would be available for public review and comment at the two public meetings in December, and that materials from the open houses would be posted to the project website following their conclusion. Indicated Windlectric's commitment to the REA process, and the role that Stantec's playing in the stakeholder consultation process. Provided contact information for Windlectric for all future comments. Indicated that comments received for the project will be considered and included in the REA Consultation Report.
November 7, 2011	November 21, 2011	72	Would like clarification as to the purpose of the Liaison Group, and stated that she was disappointed that it was not formed more transparently. She also expressed that she would like to have access to information and maps relating to turbine siting and construction plans prior to the December open houses so that she will have enough information to ask informed questions and get the most out of the open house process. Ms. Harrison stated that she would like for experienced professionals to attend the meeting, rather than "juniors" and would like for Mr. Robertson to attend.	Acknowledged receipt of the Nature Canada Newsletter for Fall 2011. Stated that comments have been reviewed by the project team and will be considered as part of the REA process. Stated that the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project Liaison Committee was created to serve a role in providing two-way communications between the local community and Windlectric. Indicated the composition of the Liaison Committee and the number of meetings it has had to date. Indicated that the Liaison Committee is not intended to replace other ideas and concerns from stakeholders. Provided information for upcoming open houses.
November 7, 2011	November 30, 2011	15	A number of reasons why they feel that Algonquin Power should abandon the project: 1) Risk to human health 2) Risk to birds and the environment 3) Economic observations	Stated that the project team looked forward to discussing the concerns in person at an upcoming public meeting. Provided the dates and locations for two public meetings to be held in December.
November 8, 2011	November 21, 2011	9	Runs an internet based business from her home and would like to know how the firm will insure that internet service will not be affected by the industrial wind turbine installation.	Noted that it is known that turbines have the potential to impact TV signals but it is unlikely that there will be an impact on internet signals. Stated that any disruptions will be handled on a case by case basis. Also stated that Windlectric will undertake a study including consultation with the Radio Advisory Board of Canada to determine effects that wind turbines will have on local telecommunications.
November 8, 2011	November 21, 2011	23	Would like to know the height of the proposed turbines from base to tip of blade. Would like to know the weight of one turbine. Would like to know the amount of concrete needed for each pad and the proposed dimensions of turbine pads. Would like to know where temporary docking site will be installed, and where equipment will be housed. Would like to know the methods to be used to remove rock layers where necessary. Would like to know how many access roads will be created, and how these will be maintained. Would like to know how many construction jobs and full time jobs will be created as a result of the project. What is the life expectancy of each turbine? How much oil is required to operate a turbine, how often is the oil changed, and who is responsible for clean up if the oil spills? Who is liable in the event of an accident? When do you anticipate the first blade will turn on Amherst Island?	Stated that the open house would be drop in style with storyboards. Provided the information for the two upcoming open houses. Stated that the 11 questions would not be answered in this letter as many of the questions are addressed in reports being produced as part of the REA process. Indicated that the FAQ document which is attached has been modified to include some of the questions posed. Stated Windlectric's commitment to the REA process and the participation of Stantec in the stakeholder consultation component of the process. Provided contact information for future questions.
November 9, 2011	November 10, 2011	134	Would like the names of all individuals who will be conducting on-site investigations for the project. Would like to know if a registered archeologist is part of the project team. Requested that items of	Stated that the stage 2 archaeology survey will be conducted by an archaeologist licensed with the Ministry of Tourism and Culture and who holds a professional archaeologist consulting license. Stated that the archaeologist is an employee of Stantec Consulting. Stated that the destination of all recovered artifacts is up to the discretion

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			archeological significance that are found during the project be donated to the local museums collection of artifacts. Would like to know if sites will be registered on the provincial archeological database if artifacts are found.	of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture. Indicated that the museum should contact the archaeologist so that they can work with the Ministry to determine if artifacts can be displayed at the museum. Indicated that the archaeologist has been provided with the correspondents contact information and is aware of the request.
November 10, 2011	November 21, 2011	55	Requested information about the footing for proposed wind turbines. She is interested in the depth and circumference of proposed footings and the methods to be used in excavation.	The response was written to address questions surrounding the dimensions and materials to be used in turbine footings, and indicated that no definite information could be provided relating to the footing dimensions or type prior to the completion of a geotechnical assessment. Indicated that the equipment which is likely to be used for excavation would be a "hoe ram". Stated that details surrounding engineering of the turbines would be made available in the Design and Operations Report. Provided information for upcoming open houses.
November 10, 2011	February 24, 2012	9	5 questions provided via email and requested that they be presented to Sean Fairfield at an upcoming meeting of the Liaison Committee. The questions were: 1. Would like to know when wind test towers will be removed, as they were responsible for an owl death last winter 2. Would like to know what measures will be taken to protect raptors from being killed by turbines 3. Would like to know if there will be hunting restrictions in the vicinity of turbines 4. Would like disclosure of locations and numbers of turbines 5. Would like to know if AP has experience installing the Siemens SWT-2.3-113 model turbine. Would like to know where the closest proximity installation of this model is located.	In response to the question about meteorological towers stated that the impact on natural heritage species was a concern of the project and that the minimum possible number of meteorological towers would be sited on the island. Indicated that a Natural Heritage Assessment would be performed as part of the project to determine the significance of the island to bird populations and to minimize damage to and avoid sensitive plant and animal habitats. In regards to the question about hunting, stated that a public safety plan would be developed by the construction contractor for the protection of public safety during construction and decommissioning, and that the operation/maintenance contractor would create a public safety plan for the operation phase of the project. With respect to the turbine type proposed for the project, stated that prototypes of these turbines are operational in Denmark and the Netherlands and are undergoing testing. Stated that there is a commercial order for 213 units in Sweden and 37 units will be installed in the summer of 2013. Windlectric states their commitment to the REA process and the involvement of Stantec in the public consultation process of the project.
November 11, 2011	November 21, 2011	95	Stated that he lives on property adjacent to a participating landowner. Provided a link to a video that he would like us to watch. Would like to know how the noise issue will be responded to. Stated that larger turbines will be louder. Stated that to say the project is within the guidelines is unacceptable.	Stated that the primary factor for determining setbacks is that the cumulative noise level from turbines not exceed 40dBA at a receptor. This information creates the basis for the setback distance of 550 meters. Provided information for two upcoming open houses. Indicated Windlectric's commitment to the REA process and the involvement of Stantec Consulting Ltd. in the stakeholder consultation process. Provided contact information for the project.
November 11, 2011	November 30, 2011	206	Requested details on proposed layout.	Stated that the layout of proposed turbine locations would be made available at two public meetings in December and that review and public comment could be made at that time. Provided the details of the meetings including date and location. Indicated that all material that is displayed at the open houses will be posted to the project website following the meetings. Indicated Windlectric's commitment to the REA process and the involvement of Stantec in the stakeholder consultation process. Indicated that all public comments would be considered and included in the REA report.
November 12, 2011	November 21, 2011	72	Would like an explanation of the reasoning behind waiting until December 6th to disclose turbine locations to the public. She also stated that roads and stone fences are considered part of the heritage of the island and that construction impact that heritage. Questioned the siting of turbines on island, and referred to the Ontario Wind Atlas to support her opinion that wind speeds on the island will not be high enough to make an IWT installation profitable. She indicated that some residents of the island have health problems and the stress related to the project process and potential for property value loss could aggravate these health problems.	Acknowledged receipt of the Nature Canada Newsletter for Fall 2011. Stated that comments have been reviewed by the project team and will be considered as part of the REA process. Stated that the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project Liaison Committee was created to serve a role in providing two-way communications between the local community and Windlectric. Indicated the composition of the Liaison Committee and the number of meetings it has had to date. Indicated that the Liaison Committee is not intended to replace other ideas and concerns from stakeholders. Provided information for upcoming open houses.
November 15, 2011	November 15, 2011	78A	Address change.	Returned call to confirm address change.
November 15, 2011	November 21, 2011	23	Stated her dissatisfaction that her questions sent on November 8th 2011 have not yet been addressed. Also stated her dissatisfaction with the information provided at the Loyalist Township Council meeting on November 14th. Would like to know if there will be an open panel format at the December 6th meeting. Stated that she would prefer an open panel	Provide information about the format of the upcoming public open houses. These meetings will be drop-in style with storyboards available with information about the Project. In addition, the preliminary layout of turbine locations will be available for review and comment. Members of the project team will be available to answer questions and listen to comments about the proposed Project in individual or small group settings.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			format to the drop in format.	
November 21, 2011	November 21, 2011	210	Discussed the Marshall Forty Foot Road, which is not considered part of the road network of Amherst by Loyalist Township and has not been maintained. Tom is happy to hear that upgrades to this road will be part of the project, and would like to alert the project that the Owl Woods Management Strategy proposes to put winter gates across the road. Tom stated that winter gates across an all season public road are not desirable.	Assured him that his note would be provided and this item could be discussed further upon their next meeting
November 21, 2011	December 5, 2011	26	Has been following this process and similar developments for five years. Sent some questions in advance of the open house in hopes that complete answers could be given at that time. Is concerned about the placement of turbines because many of his neighbours have signed agreements to have turbines on their land. Brian is concerned that the placement of turbines near his house will exasperate the medical issues he and his family currently experience. Brian is concerned that the construction process to erect turbines may negatively impact his well water, as his well is 16 feet deep. Concerned about the potential for negative impact of the turbines on wildlife and scenery effecting his ability to draw income from his part time profession of photography on the island. Concerned about the safety of his children and dogs while heavy equipment is being moved around the island during the construction phase of the project. Concerned about the potential for disruption to television and satellite internet signals. Concerned about potential for decreasing property values.	Stated that the preliminary project layout would be made available at two public meetings in December and provided the dates and location for these meetings. Stated that following the public meetings all materials that were displayed would be posted on the project website. Indicated that the areas observed being ploughed represent potential project construction sites where field staff are currently performing Stage 2 Archeological Assessments. Stated that there would be project team members at the open house who are subject matter experts in the effects of turbines on human health, these individuals would be happy to discuss concerns about human health at the open houses. In response to the question about well water, stated that a detailed geotechnical assessment will take place before construction and that care will be taken to not disrupt the water table. In response to concerns about wildlife, indicated that a Natural Heritage Assessment would be conducted as part of the project in order to understand the significance of the island for birds and other species of wildlife and to determine mitigation measures that could be used to limit impacts on wildlife. Stated that Public Safety Plans would be developed for the construction, operation and decommissioning stages of the project, and that a traffic management plan will also be implemented during the construction phase of the project. In response to concerns about internet signal and telecommunications, stated that potential interference would be reviewed on a case by case basis. Indicated that a telecommunications impact assessment will be performed through consultation with the Radio Advisory Board of Canada. Stated Windlectric's commitment to the REA process and the involvement of Stantec in the stakeholder consultation process. Provided project contact information for further questions and comments.
November 22, 2011	November 30, 2011	119	Would like to know where the wind turbines are to be sited. Is under the understanding that turbines will be located in the middle of the island but cannot find a map disclosing turbine locations.	Stated that the preliminary layout showing potential turbine locations would be made available at two upcoming public meetings. Provided details surrounding date and location of these public meetings. Stated Windlectrics commitment to the REA process and the involvement of Stantec in the stakeholder consultation component of this process. Provided contact information for further comments or questions relating to the project. Indicated that all comments received during the consultation process would be included in the final REA report package.
November 30, 2011		72	Indicated that some questions about the liaison committee were not answered to her satisfaction and stated that the creation of the Liaison Committee was not an open process. Stated that Algonquin Power has not acknowledged the stress it is causing to citizens of the island. Stated that the ploughing being conducted prior to the start of the project is causing widespread resentment and unease on the island.	No response required. Information only.
December 3, 2011	December 3, 2011	100	Could you please advise as to the names of the individuals that are conducting all on-site investigations ? Is a registered archaeologist doing each of these investigations? As a member and volunteer of our museum exhibits committee I would like to see any and all material become part of our local museum's archaeological collection. Please advise on the disposition of artifacts. In the event that artifacts are found are these sites registered on the provincial archaeological database?	Stated that responses had already been given to another correspondent relating to the questions relayed by Janet. These responses were given on November 10th, 2011. In a second email dated December 5 copies of responses sent to other correspondents were forwarded.
December 4, 2011	April 19, 2013	156	Resident diagnosed with a form of vertigo called 'Benign Paroxysmal Positional Vertigo or BBPV, characterized by recurring 'attacks' often brought on by 'external' stressors such as repetitive movement and flickering lights. Resident concerned about turbines proposed near property. Concerned about health effects and compensation if forced to	Provided the correspondent with the following information: As presented in the recent public open houses health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsik Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents The current project as proposed will meet the requirements of

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			move.	Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the Green Energy Act, which ensures a project must be sited at least 550 meters from non-participating receptors (residences) provided a cumulative sound level does not exceed 40 dB(A).
December 4, 2011	April 19, 2013	156	Resident concerned about the construction corresponding with the time when they would like to start renting out the property as a vacation spot. Requests that the turbines across from their property be relocated so as not to affect their business, or that they are compensated for the loss of income.	Provided the correspondent with the FAQ which discusses the following items:: 1. Project location; 2. Setbacks; 3. Shadow flicker; 4. Construction activities and impacts; 5. Noise; 6. Traffic; 7. Visual Effects; 7.8. Property values. 8.9. Landowner lease agreements; and, 9.10. Complaint response protocol.
December 6, 2011	February 15 2012	31	Concerned about the effect to the water. What are the plans to avoid potential effects?	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Questions about water issues are covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	March 12 2012	167	Residents provided questions regarding improvements to roads due to increased traffic, keeping the island school open, consideration of St. Paul's church and Glenwood cemetery, a referendum, providing free power to islanders, property value guarantees, gag orders, and electromagnetic levels and the safety of school children.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted during the openhouse. Summarized correspondence into 6 main points and provided a list of Frequently asked Questions to address these points. Indicated that there are no plans to use the unopened road allowance between Marshall 40 foot and Stella 40 foot. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	March 12 2012	203	Provided a list of questions concerning improvements to current roads due to increased traffic, ensurance that the Island school will stay open, consideration of St. Paul's church and Glenwood cemetery, a referendum, providing free power to Islanders, property value guarantees, discussion of contracts and gag orders, electromagnetic levels and safety and the safety of endangered protected species on the Island.	Thanked correspondent for comments and questions received during the openhouse. Stated that the proposed project is 75 MW and each turbine is a proposed 2.3 MW Siemens model. Stated that there are no plans to use the unopened road allowance between Stella 40 foot and Marshall 40 foot. Summarized main concerns into 9 areas and provided a list of Frequently asked Questions to address these concerns. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	131	Provided questions regarding improvements to current roads due to increased traffic, ensuring the island school stays open, consideration to St. Paul's church and Glenwood cemetery, conducting a referendum, providing free power to islanders, property value guarantees, discussion of contracts, gag orders, ensuring safety from electromagnetic levels near school children and protecting the habitat of birds/bats.	Provided an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. Windlelectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
December 6, 2011	March 5, 2012	40	Resident concerned regarding migratory and important birds on the Island. Asked why the Project is being considered when Mr. Whittaker, Vice President Policy, CANWEA, stated that wind projects cannot be put where there are potential risks for migratory birds. Requested information about the restrictions imposed on hunters continuing to hunt on their property, from fences and 'no trespassing' signs. Requests an answer to why it was felt necessary to impose a gag order on options holders. Would like a response regarding the opposition and why the project is	Thanked them for questions received at the first public open house as well as on January 30th. Summarized concerns into 14 main areas and indicated that these were addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Regarding project effects on hunters, access roads and turbines are not fenced off and so long as hunters have agreements with landowners they will be able to hunt in properties with turbines. Provided contact information for future inquiries regarding the project.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			<p>continuing. Are you on time with process scheduling, if not, why not? Concerned regarding methods of transportation of equipment to the island during construction. Would like information about how health concerns will be addressed in the future. Concerned about potential effects to the water table. How will property value issues be addressed in the future? How will Windlectric minimize the effects that construction will have on the roads? How will the ferry be affected by the construction, and will islanders receive priority ferry usage?</p>	
December 6, 2011	February 24, 2012	63	Resident asking question regarding financial compensation for those negatively affected from physical ailments, property or real estate devaluation, due to the turbines.	<p>Questions posed by the correspondent covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future inquiries. In summary, your correspondence raises the following points: 1.Compensation; 2.Property values; and, 7. Health effects.</p>
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	71	Requesting responses to concerns regarding the Canadian Senate's notion for a moratorium on turbines, including on Amherst Island, compensation for loss of property values, and increasing turbine setbacks for safety.	Resent response providing the correspondent with how to locate project information.
December 6, 2011	February 15 2012	69	Would like additional disclosure on tax calculation and who it will be paid to.	Thanked him for questions submitted during the public openhouse. Questions about taxes were clarified by attachment of recalculated estimates. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	March 12 2012	23	Concerned resident provided questions regarding plans for expansion of the Project, archaeological work for the Project, the current stage in the process and who is the approval authority, a non-disclosure clause in the landowner's clause, and issues of the community being divided.	Thanked them for comments and questions submitted at the public openhouse. Summarized into 9 main concerns and indicated that these were addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided details about the power collection and transmission network. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 29, 2012	117	Provided a list of questions concerning the distance of the closest turbine to the school, potential health issues in the future, compensation for loss of property value, road closures during construction, construction equipment dimensions and requirements, the movement of electricity and telephone wires, disruption of ferry service and ferry usage, hours of construction, strobe and red lights, noise from turbines and mortality of migrating birds.	Thanked her for questions received at the first public open house as well as the questionnaire received on December 12 2012. Stated that the modern turbines produce electricity 70-80% of the time but that on average over the course of a year they generate 30% of their maximum theoretical output. Summarized her concerns into 11 main topic areas and stated that these are covered by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 24 2012	18	Provided a list of questions concerning the distance of the closest turbine to the school, potential health issues in the future, compensation for loss of property value, road closures during construction, construction equipment dimensions and requirements, the movement of electricity and telephone wires, disruption of ferry service and ferry usage, hours of construction, the cost-effectiveness of the Project, responsibility for well-water damage and interference to cell phone reception.	<p>Thanked them for questions submitted during the first public open house. Summarized their main concerns into the following areas: 1. setbacks 2. health effects 3. complaint response protocol 4. property values 5. traffic management 6. construction activities 7. ground/well water impacts 8. economics 9. impacts to wireless/cellular service Indicated that these concerns are addressed by the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for further inquiries.</p>
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	68	Returned questionnaire identifying concerns regarding disposal of tailings	

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			from construction, potential effects on ground water during construction, regulations for the flicker effect, and turbine decommissioning.	Questions posed by the correspondent covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future inquiries. In summary, your correspondence raises the following points: 1. Impacts to groundwater; 2. Project construction and operation; 3. Natural environment; 4. Shadow/Flicker effect; 5. Impacts to wireless based communications; 6. Decommissioning; and, 7. Turbine lighting.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	132	Provided a list of questions regarding mitigation measures for bee colonies and bats, land use during and after construction, re-seeding of ploughed areas, interference with telecommunications, distance of shadows and flicker effect and differences throughout the year, and turbine operation during black-outs.	Questions posed by the correspondent covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future inquiries. In summary, your correspondence raises the following points: 1. Impacts to groundwater; 2. Project construction and operation; 3. Natural environment; 4. Shadow/Flicker effect; 5. Impacts to wireless based communications; 6. Decommissioning; and, 7. Turbine lighting.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	76	Thank you for responding to the letter on November 21, 2011, however disappointed with the "cut & paste" platitudes of the response. Provided a list of specific questions concerning disruption of water to their property, a list of the chemicals/minerals that will be introduced to the water, liability for ill health to residents resulting from turbines, advise on specific research on listed medical conditions, responsibility for health problems resulting during construction, and the possibility of putting a stop to the turbine installation until complete scientific and peer-reviewed research is done. Provided a list of questions regarding mitigation measures for bee colonies and bats, land use during and after construction, re-seeding of ploughed areas, interference with telecommunications, distance of shadows and flicker effect and differences throughout the year, and turbine operation during black-outs.	Questions posed by the correspondent covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future inquiries. 1. Impacts to groundwater; 2. Project construction and operation; and 3. Health effects Natural environment; 4. Shadow/Flicker effect; 5. Impacts to wireless based communications; 6. Decommissioning; and, 7.3. Turbine lighting. Please find enclosed a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on the topics listed above. Windlectric has created a list of common questions/concerns (similar to your questions) raised by stakeholders and has developed general responses to those inquiries. These responses will be made available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. With respect to your question on accessibility and land use following completion of the project; farmers will still be able to utilize their properties for all agricultural practices carried out prior to construction with exception of those lands on which the turbine is located as well as the service pad and access roads. Information on the dimensions of these areas are available in the design and operations report once the details have been finalized.
December 6, 2011	March 12 2012	203	Identified concerns regarding potential risks to migratory birds, efficiency and cost of wind turbines, electricity cost savings per month and the nameplate capacity and actual capacity of the wind turbines planned for Amherst Island.	Stated that the proposed project is 75 MW and each turbine is a proposed 2.3 MW Siemens model. Stated that there are no plans to use the unopened road allowance between Stella 40 foot and Marshall 40 foot. Summarized main concerns into 9 areas and provided a list of Frequently asked Questions to address these concerns. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	March 5 2012	20	Identified concerns regarding potential risks to migratory birds, efficiency and cost of wind turbines, electricity cost savings per month and the nameplate capacity and actual capacity of the wind turbines planned for Amherst Island.	Provided specifications regarding turbine and project power generation. Indicated that her main concerns were hydro costs, turbine specifications and impact to birds and endangered species. Stated that these areas are covered by the attached FAQ. Provided project contact information for future questions.
December 6, 2011	February 15 2012	58	Identified concerns regarding potential risks to migratory birds, efficiency	Stated that the contract received a 75 MW contract from the Ontario Power Authority and the turbines to be used

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			and cost of wind turbines, electricity cost savings per month and the nameplate capacity and actual capacity of the wind turbines planned for Amherst Island.	are Siemens 2.3 MW units. Questions about hydro costs, turbine specifications, impacts to birds bats endangered species and groundwater are found in the attached FAQ. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	March 12 2012	28	Requesting more information about the shadow and flicker effects, the power line collector system, stray voltage, existing infrastructure and transmission cables.	Summarized into 9 main concerns and indicated that these were addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided details about the power collection and transmission network. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	March 12 2012	190	Requesting more information about proposals with Loyalist Township to assist/benefit every citizen. Would like more openness and truth regarding the Project.	Summarized into 9 main concerns and indicated that these were addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided details about the power collection and transmission network. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	March 12 2012	101	Requesting a map of the proposed turbine locations. Identified questions regarding where the turbines will come onto the island, potential traffic during construction and maintenance, duration of the contracts with landowners, rehabilitation of the farmland, liability if adverse health effects are experienced, potential for children to experience health effects, liability if property damage occurs during construction, liability if there are affects to farm production, benefits to the community, draw-backs of the Project for the community, community projects, the amount of money provided to Loyalist Township and what it will be used for, affect on taxes and compensation of decreased property values.	Thanked her for questions submitted at the public openhouse, on February 3 and February 8. Stated that the preliminary layout and other materials shown at the openhouse can be found on the project website. Summarized her concerns into 14 main areas and indicated that these are addressed by an attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Stated that tax calculations had been recalculated based on information provided by Loyalist township. No damages are anticipated to private property relating to project construction, however a complaint response protocol will be developed. Stated that the methodology used for natural heritage assessment will be described in the report. Stated if the project is located within 120 meters of a significant environmental feature a study will be conducted to identify potential impacts and processes for mitigation. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 24 2012	9	Submitted a list of questions regarding the Project phase, potential future expansion, the maximum number of Siemens wind turbines that Amherst Island can accommodate (physically and economically), providing notice of open houses on the ferry docks, wind turbine noise assessment and monitoring, what flashing red light system is being proposed, possibility of a visitor interpretive center, will a shadow flicker assessment be conducted, and the impacts of shadow flicker on the surrounding community.	Thanked for comments submitted at the first public open house and on December 8, January 30th and February 12th. Stated that maps and all information from the public open house are available on the project website. Stated that the project received a 75 MW contract from the OPA and that proposed turbines are Siemens 2.3 MW units. Thanked for the recommendation to post notice at the two ferry docks and this will be taken into consideration for the second openhouse. Stated that transport Canada will provide input into considerations for lighting of turbines. Summarized concerns into 8 main topics and indicated that these were covered by the attached list of FAQ. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	97	Provided a list of questions concerning safety protocols for emergencies, road paving on Amherst Island, preventing damage to historical stone fences, water for construction, possibility of a cement plant on the Island, mitigating dust and noise during construction, mitigating the destruction of vegetation during construction, replacement of trees that are cut down, re-planting procedures, information to seasonal residents and health effects resulting from noise and light pollution.	Questions posed by the correspondent covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future inquiries. Correspondent raises the following points: 1. Project construction and operation; 2. Impacts to roads; 3. Cultural heritage features; 4. Emergency response; 5. Shadow/Flicker effect; 6. Natural environment and trees; 7. Health effects; and, 8. Noise.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	175	Provided a list of questions concerning a pre-construction inspection of homes and wells on Amherst Island, fund for damages to property, decommissioning fund, the removal of failed or obsolete turbines, restoration of the land after turbine removal, mitigation for changes in well or water drainage, possibility of a pre-construction well water report for island wells and whether Algonquin/Windlectric's insurance covers damage to homes.	Provided an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
December 6, 2011	February 21 2012	176	Provided a list of questions concerning a pre-construction inspection of homes and wells on Amherst Island, fund for damages to property, decommissioning fund, the removal of failed or obsolete turbines, restoration of the land after turbine removal, mitigation for changes in well or water drainage, possibility of a pre-construction well water report for island wells and whether Algonquin/Windlectric's insurance covers damage to homes.	Thanked correspondent for his questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. In addition, Windlectric indicated that it stands by the benefits outlined at the openhouse and indicated that a recalculation of municipal property tax payments had been made and clarification is available on the project website. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Stated that no pre construction inspection of homes will occur as it is not anticipated that damage will be caused to homes during construction. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
December 6, 2011	February 21 2012	176	Suggested that we take this panel down. Opposed to the Project. Does not see benefit to the Project, does not produce enough energy, costly, already too much energy, Wolfe Island left a mess for the Township to clean up. Feels that employment will be brought from offshore (Wolfe Island employs 3 people), only a few will benefit from supplemental income, no benefit to the majority of islanders. Would like answers about the benefits and a social study of impacts has not been completed. Noted that the age profile of the island is important and that there have been no comments about community health. Moved to the island because it was pastoral and quiet, and feels as though turbines may ruin that.	Thanked correspondent for his questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. In addition, Windlectric indicated that it stands by the benefits outlined at the openhouse and indicated that a recalculation of municipal property tax payments had been made and clarification is available on the project website. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Stated that no pre construction inspection of homes will occur as it is not anticipated that damage will be caused to homes during construction. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
December 6, 2011	February 29 2012	124	Suggested that we take this panel down. Opposed to the Project. Does not see benefit to the Project, does not produce enough energy, costly, already too much energy, Wolfe Island left a mess for the Township to clean up. Feels that employment will be brought from offshore (Wolfe Island employs 3 people), only a few will benefit from supplemental income, no benefit to the majority of islanders. Would like answers about the benefits and a social study of impacts has not been completed. Noted that the age profile of the island is important and that there have been no comments about community health. Moved to the island because it was pastoral and quiet, and feels as though turbines may ruin that.	Thanked them for their comment received at the public openhouse. Summarized concerns into three main topics: 1. community benefits 2. employment opportunities 3. health effects Indicated that these concerns are addressed by the FAQ list attached. Stated that Windlectric stands behind the community benefits outlined at the public openhouse. Stated that social impacts would be addressed by the Construction Plan Report and Design and Operations Report. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 17 2012	72	Requests responses to questions regarding compensations to homeowners for loss of enjoyment of property, gauging sound level emissions, accident and fire emergency plans, the possibility of a pre-construction inspection of homes and wells on the Island, fund for damages to property, decommissioning fund, the removal of failed or obsolete turbines, restoration of the land after turbine removal, and the transportation of blades and equipment along narrow roads without damaging property or heritage resources.	Thanked her for comments submitted during the Open House as well as on December 30th, January 30th and February 6th. Thanked her for forwarding the CRCA report. Summarized concerns into 11 main areas and indicated that they were addressed by the attached set of frequently asked questions. Responded to a question about uncertainty in noise modelling by stating that ISO 9613-2 is the methodology used for this calculation, as is approved by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment. Provided the definition for a waterbody as stated in O.Reg 359/09. Provided contact information for the project for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 24 2012	88	Provided questions regarding the life expectancy of the turbines, the oil requirements and disposal, the date for operation to start, compensation for loss of enjoyment of property, the noise emissions error rate for calculations, the accident and fire emergency plans, complaints protocol for health issues and flicker concerns during operation, compensation for loss of property value and legal responsibility for health issues of residents and loss of property value.	Thanked for questions submitted at the public open house and on January 30th via email. Summarized their concerns into 11 main topic areas and indicated that these are addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Stated that the noise model is based on ISO 9613-2 which is a procedure approved by the Ontario Ministry of Environment. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 24 2012	86	Would like to know who to address concerns about noise and flicker from the proposed wind turbine, and to whom would they seek legal redress from? Who would they contact to seek compensation for a drop in property value?	Thanked for questions submitted at the public open house and on January 30th via email. Summarized their concerns into 11 main topic areas and indicated that these are addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Stated that the noise model is based on ISO 9613-2 which is a procedure approved by the Ontario Ministry of Environment. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 17 2012	194	Provided a list of questions concerning safety protocols for emergencies, road paving on Amherst Island, preventing damage to historical stone	Thanked her for her questions submitted at the Open House as well as questions emailed on January 27th. Summarized questions into nine main subject categories and indicated that they were addressed by the attached

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			fences, water for construction, possibility of a cement plant on the Island, mitigating dust and noise during construction, mitigating the destruction of vegetation during construction, replacement of trees that are cut down, and re-planting procedures.	frequently asked questions. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	March 5, 2012	187	Provided a list of questions regarding the temporary dock for transportation of turbine components during construction, storage of maintenance equipment, new roads and maintenance of roads, employment from the Project and life expectancy of one turbine.	Thanked correspondent for their comments received during the first public open house. Summarized their concerns into 11 main topic areas and indicated that these were addressed by the attached Frequently asked Questions. Stated that the required permits and authorizations could be found in a table in the draft project description report. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 24, 2012	21	Provided a list of questions regarding the temporary dock for transportation of turbine components during construction, storage of maintenance equipment, new roads and maintenance of roads, employment from the Project and life expectancy of one turbine.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the open house as well as on December 12, 2011. Stated that her correspondence raise the following main points and concerns: 1. turbine specifications 2. construction and operations 3. roads 4. employment opportunities 5. health effects 6. water 7. natural environment 8. life of the project Stated that these concerns are addressed by the attached FAQ document. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	March 5, 2012	27	Identified the key issues that need to be addressed as impacts on human health, transportation, water supplies, wildlife, especially birds/bats, re aero generators. Noted that groundwater geology is a sensitive factor to consider in environmental studies. May have further questions after reviewing the information to date.	Thanked correspondents for their comments received during the first public open house. Summarized their concerns into 11 main topic areas and indicated that these were addressed by the attached Frequently asked Questions. Stated that the required permits and authorizations could be found in a table in the draft project description report. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	48	Identified the key issues that need to be addressed as health and property values and future impacts to Island roads. Requested more information regarding transportation during construction using the ferry, the future impact on ferry maintenance, the condition of island roads after construction and who will be responsible for maintenance of roads.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the open house as well as on December 12, 2011. Raise the following main points and concerns correspondence raises the following points: 1. Health; 2. Project construction and operation and effects on the ferry; 3. Property values; and, 4. Traffic and impacts to roads. Stated that these concerns are addressed by the attached FAQ document. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	December 13, 2011	123	Request for an emailed copy of the project map.	Emailed a soft copy of the preliminary draft layout.
December 6, 2011	February 15 2012	73	Provided a list of questions regarding preventing ice build-up on blades, painting the turbines, signage on the turbines, the number of construction trucks on the island, turbine installation, mitigation for stray voltage, and incorporating health effect findings into the project planning.	Thanked the correspondents for their questions submitted at the Open House and their email sent on January 31. Summarized their items of interests into thirteen categories and indicated that these items were covered by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Provided project contact information for future comments and inquiries.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	140	Provided a list of questions regarding preventing ice build-up on blades, painting the turbines, signage on the turbines, the number of construction trucks on the island, turbine installation, mitigation for stray voltage, and incorporating health effect findings into the project planning.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the open house as well as on December 12, 2011. Raise the following main points and concerns correspondence raises the following points: 1. Project construction and operation; 2. Impacts to roads; 3. Stray voltage; 4. Emergency response; and, 5. Health effects. Stated that these concerns are addressed by the attached FAQ document. Provided contact information for future inquiries.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
December 6, 2011	February 24 2012	19	Identified questions regarding the impacts of the Project on personal health, financial health of the community, CO2 emissions, physical environment/infrastructure, and the ecological environment.	Thanked her for her questions submitted during the first public open house. Stated that each turbine is projected to save over 4,000 tonnes of CO2 emissions annually. Stated that over the course of the year the turbines will generate approximately 30% of their maximum power output. Summarized her concerns into thirteen points and indicated that these were addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 15 2012	201	Requesting responses to questions regarding life expectancy of turbines, oil requirements and disposal, timelines, compensation for the loss of enjoyment of the property, the error rate for turbines, the accident emergency plan, and the fire emergency plan.	Thanked the correspondents for their questions submitted at the Open House and their email sent on January 31. Summarized their items of interests into thirteen categories and indicated that these items were covered by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Provided project contact information for future comments and inquiries.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	115	Requesting information regarding cost effectiveness of wind turbines, liability insurance for damage caused to the turbine by hunting, consequences to landowners speaking out about the turbines, liability exposure for landowners that allow the public close to turbines on their land, property value guarantee, and the purchase of homes from landowners experiencing health issues.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the open house as well as on December 12, 2011. Raise the following main points and concerns correspondence raises the following points:1. Project construction and operation; 1. Property values; 2. Project economics/viability of the project; 3. Hunting; and, 4. Noise. Stated that these concerns are addressed by the attached FAQ document. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 15 2012	98	Recommends that a community discussion occur to have appropriate communication. Would like property value guarantees. Concerned about the birds, as they will not move for the turbines. What are the mitigation measures for the destruction of the community. How will the stone fences (heritage features) be avoided? Do you have a permit to stake roads into turbine locations? How will our property values be compensated?	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the Open House, as well as on December 10th and January 27th. Summarized the main topic points that she wished to be addressed and indicated that these were covered by the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 15 2012	98	Would like answers to questions regarding power interruptions on the island during construction, mitigating negative effects to birds on the island, information about the archaeological dig, speeds at the tip of the blade, procedure for health complaints, speeds at which turbines are turned on and off, potential for sleep disturbance in children, preventing bat mortality, increasing the setback distance and complaints regarding noise, shadow/flicker and infrasound.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the Open House, as well as on December 10th and January 27th. Summarized the main topic points that she wished to be addressed and indicated that these were covered by the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	April 5, 2012	64	How far from this latitude and longitude will the flicker stretch from the turbines? How many hours were spent by qualified naturalists searching for endangered species on the island? How many were found? What will be done to protect these species?	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the open house as well as on December 12, 2011. Raise the following main points and concerns correspondence raises the following points: 1. Project construction and operation; 2. Property values; 3. Shadow/Flicker effect; 4. Impacts to wireless based communications; 5. Viability of the project; and, 6. Community benefits.
December 6, 2011	April 5, 2012	64	Would like responses to questions regarding turbine manipulation, electricity required to operate the turbines, power to the red blinking lights, cost effectiveness of turbines without government subsidies, who is responsible for trouble if ownership changes, gag orders, property value guarantees, telephone and cell phone reception interference, local job creation, and the sound of the turbines.	Stated that these concerns are addressed by the attached FAQ document. Provided contact information for future inquiries. Regarding the lights on the turbines, these are powered by the turbine output while it is operating, and by grid power while the turbine is not operating and will continue to operate when the turbine blades are not rotating.
December 6, 2011	April 5, 2012	188	Provided a list of questions regarding the sound emitted from individual and multiple turbines, transformers, coolant and chemicals required for the transformer's operating system, burying electrical transmission lines, the protocol for lights on turbines, and what happens to the turbine	Provided an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. Additionally, the Archaeological Assessment Report

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			decommissioning fund if the project changes ownership.	is available for review on the Project website.
December 6, 2011	April 5, 2012	113	Request for responses to questions regarding property value compensation, distance of the shadow flicker, turbines within the Important Birding Area, epidemiological study, and lack of trust.	<p>Provided information on the following items: Draft Shadow Flicker report – as presented in the recent public open houses the project health consultant (Intrinsic) stipulated that there is no scientific evidence suggesting that shadow flicker from wind turbines poses a health risk. A copy of the Shadow Flicker report was made available at the Public Open Houses. An electronic copy is available on the project website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Heritage Assessment and Protected Properties report – your recommendations have been noted and some of them have already been documented by the consultant in their report. Your additional items will be considered. • Location of mainland dock – the proposed location was presented at the Public Open Houses and is made available in the draft REA documents. The storyboards from the public meeting and the draft reports are available on the project website. • Lights - Transport Canada will provide recommendations as to lighting requirements for the turbine towers and Windlectric Inc. will examine all options in order to satisfy Transport Canada.
December 6, 2011	December 13, 2011	185	Requests a copy of the map book mailed to him. Concerned about the shadow to his home.	Sent copy of map book Dec 13, 2011
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	13	Would like responses to questions regarding the definition of 'mitigation', shadow flicker, complaints process, electricity requirements to operate turbines, electricity to the blinking red lights during times of no wind, and the possibility of expropriation for required easements or right-of-ways.	<p>Regarding the lights on the Wolfe Island turbines these are powered and operated independently of the power generated by the turbines and will continue to operate regardless of whether the turbine blades are rotating or not. The navigational lights on Amherst Island will be powered by the turbine output while it is operating, and by grid power while the turbine is not operating.</p> <p>Regarding your questions about noise,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The distance setbacks from noise are independent of wind turbine dimensions. Larger turbines are not necessarily louder than smaller turbines. This is the case for Amherst Island, because the turbines will be direct-drive (no gearbox) they will be quieter than their smaller counterparts on Wolfe Island. • The pitch system controls the rotational speed of the turbine. As the blades pitch, the turbulence generated by the blade increases, until the turbine reaches its maximum rotational speed. The sound levels used in the noise model reflect the maximum sound emissions from the wind turbine. • Ice reduces the aerodynamic performance of the blades. The manufacturer does not provide information about the effect of ice on sound emissions. <p>With respect to your question about mitigation measures, an assessment of potential effects and any required mitigation measures will be provided in the Construction Plan Report and Design and Operations Report as required under O. Reg. 359/09. These reports will be made available for public review for a minimum of 60 days prior to the final open house for the Project.</p> <p>With respect to your query on turbine power consumption, typical power consumption of a turbine while it is not yawing is 0.8kW. During the brief period that it is yawing, the power consumption increases to 20kW. No adverse effects to the local power grid are anticipated as a result of the Project.</p>
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	145	Would like responses to questions regarding the definition of 'mitigation', shadow flicker, complaints process, electricity requirements to operate turbines, electricity to the blinking red lights during times of no wind, and the possibility of expropriation for required easements or right-of-ways.	Provided a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on the topics listed above. Windlectric has created a list of common questions/concerns (similar to your questions) raised by stakeholders and has developed general responses to those inquiries. These responses will be made available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	13	Key issues that need to be addressed were identified as democracy stamped out by the Green Energy Act, bird migration route and the abundance of bats. Concerned about depression and anxiety experienced from thoughts of the Project.	<p>Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the open house. Raised the following main points and concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shadow flicker; 2. Heath effects; 3. Setbacks; 4. Property values; 5. Noise; 6. Complaint response protocol; 7. Construction activities;

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				<p>8. Turbine operation (including oil use and electricity requirements); 9. Monitoring; 10. Decommissioning; 11. Lighting; 12. Roads and traffic; 13. Project schedule; 14. Natural environment including birds, bats, and owl woods; 15. Groundwater/wells; and, 16. Stray voltage. Stated that these concerns are addressed by the attached FAQ document. Provided contact information for future inquiries.</p>
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	57	<p>Would like a response in writing regarding the credentials and strategies of the archaeology team. Would like them to conduct fieldwork in the spring.</p>	<p>Thanked the correspondent for questions submitted during the first open house. Summarized her questions into 7 main categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Archaeological studies; 2. Landowner lease agreements; 3. Concerns about the natural environment; and, 4. Health effects. <p>Stated that these questions are addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future questions.</p>
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	57	<p>Would like Algonquin/Windlectric to ask the government for a full, independent environmental health assessment for the Project. Would like additional research conducted regarding human health and wind turbines. Would also like to know about the shut-down policy. Will Algonquin/Windlectric shut down the turbines during the core migration periods?</p>	<p>Thanked the correspondent for questions submitted during the first open house. Summarized her questions into 7 main categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Archaeological studies; 2. Landowner lease agreements; 3. Concerns about the natural environment; and, 4. Health effects. <p>Stated that these questions are addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future questions.</p>
December 6, 2011	February 15, 2012	83	<p>Concerned about bird species in the area. Would like answers to questions regarding effects to hydro prices, addressing bird migration, the Project operation timeline, and procedures during storm winds.</p>	<p>Provided the following information: Additional information about the project, including a description of potential effects to traffic and roads, will be provided in the Construction Plan Report and Design and Operations Report. The reports will form part of the complete REA application package that will be available for public review at least 60 days before the final open house for the Project. With regards to your comment about high winds, Project components will be designed to withstand the effects from extreme weather events including high winds. Considering the design features of the turbine which act to reduce or eliminate the potential for damage from extreme events, no adverse net effects from extreme weather events are anticipated during operation of the Project. With regards to your questions about traffic, hydro prices, migratory birds, and project schedule, please find enclosed a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on these topics. Windlectric has created a list of common questions/concerns (similar to your questions) raised by stakeholders and has developed general responses to those inquiries. These responses will be made available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.</p>
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	41	<p>Provided a list of questions concerning the cost effectiveness of the Project, liability for damage to turbines from hunting, consequences to landowners that speak out, liability for letting the public close to the turbines, property value guarantees, and health issues. Requests that Algonquin/Windlectric install the radar alternatives to the red blinking lights.</p>	<p>Thanked the correspondent for questions submitted during the first open house. Summarized her questions into 7 main categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. natural environment 2. health 3. setbacks 4. viability of project 5. property values 6. visual impacts

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				7. construction operations Stated that these questions are addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future questions.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	180	Identified questions regarding impact to TV and internet reception, and the steps taken if there is a decline in service. Also questioned about the possibility of compensation for lost property value, if decline is a result of the Project. Would also like to know if there will be an impact to his geothermal pump and the height difference between turbines on Wolfe Island and those proposed for Amherst Island.	Thanked the correspondent for questions submitted during the first open house. Summarized her questions into 7 main categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hub height of proposed Amherst Island turbine (99.5 m) versus hub height of Wolfe Island wind project (80m) • Geothermal pump – the company does not anticipate any issues that would affect your pump as a result of the proposed construction activity. Stated that these questions are addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future questions.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	160	Provided a list of questions regarding the number of homes that can be powered by the turbines, what is considered a significant woodland, one word to describe rural life, the noise from turbines and how the pitch of the blade and ice on the blades effect it, mitigating shadow flicker at households and the longest distance of a shadow from a turbine.	Thanked the correspondent for questions submitted during the first open house. Summarized the questions into: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Natural environment; 2. Noise; 3. Shadow Flicker; and, 4. Turbine construction and operations. Stated that these questions are addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future questions.
December 6, 2011	February 24 2012	52	Provided a list of questions regarding the number of homes that can be powered by the turbines, what is considered a significant woodland, one word to describe rural life, the noise from turbines and how the pitch of the blade and ice on the blades effect it, mitigating shadow flicker at households, the longest distance of a shadow from a turbine, radar shadow, the cost of decommissioning, and a property value guarantee.	Thanked her for questions submitted at the first public open house. Stated that a modern wind turbine will generate enough electricity to power more than 1000 homes over the course of a year. Summarized concerns into the following areas: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. noise 2. decommissioning 3. property values 4. shadow flicker 5. natural environment Indicated that these concerns were covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	December 13, 2011	26	Requesting a copy of all public information including the reports, etc. Also requesting GPS coordinates of the turbines, and the closest turbine to his house (base of substation road).	Please note that all the information that was at the open house is now available on the Project website. The Project website was provided and a copy of the display boards were added. Contact information for the Project team to ask further questions was also provided.
December 6, 2011	March 5 2012	6	Requesting responses to questions regarding measures to protect the daytime and nighttime habitat of the at risk short eared owl, strategies to prevent bat mortality, strategies to protect bobolink and meadowlark habitat on Amherst Island, health effects of erecting the turbines near a public school, insurance for health effects suffered by residents of Amherst Island, steps to fight the proposed wind turbine moratorium, why propose the Project on Amherst Island, compensation for damage to property during construction/operation, compensation for loss of view due to turbines and dust, and possibility of signing a property value guarantee.	Thanked the correspondent for questions submitted during the first open house. Summarized her questions into 7 main categories: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. natural environment 2. health 3. setbacks 4. viability of project 5. property values 6. visual impacts 7. construction operations Stated that these questions are addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future questions.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	182	Requesting responses to a list of questions regarding noise assessment procedures and error associated with them, how tonal characteristics or cyclic variation in the noise caused by wind turbines is measured and taken into account, the possibility of using an unweighted dB scale to accurately measure noise, the actual unweighted noise profile for the	Thanked the correspondent for questions submitted during the first open house. Summarized her questions into the following categories:1. Noise;2. Health;3. Setbacks;4. Property values;5. Natural heritage including owls and birds; and,6. Potential impacts to water.With respect to your question about the noise model, we assume you mean "uncertainty" when you say "error rate". The sound modeling is carried out based on standard ISO 9613-2, which presents the methodology for evaluating the propagation and attenuation of sound from a source located

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			<p>Project for receptors outside and within 550m, required setbacks when an unweighted scale is used, the impact of noise on the enjoyment of residents - taking into consideration numerous turbines, taking into account annoyance that may cause adverse health effects, how will complaints be addressed, will the turbines be operated in a manner that will minimize adverse medical effects based on emerging medical knowledge, what is the level of annoyance and how many will suffer it, explaining the methodology used to determine the provincial setbacks, the number of tonnes of carbon will be saved by operation of the proposed turbines, the cost per tonne of carbon saved, the likelihood of the project without subsidies, compensation for the loss of property value, and the consideration of values of the residents on the Island.</p>	<p>outdoors. Uncertainty is not added to the predicted sound levels calculated at points of reception. This is consistent with the procedures approved by the Ontario Ministry of Environment. Likewise, noise emissions from the turbines are calculated using methods published in IEC (International Electro technical Commission) 61400-11. The equipment manufacturer declares its sound power emissions in statements that will be included in the Project's Noise Assessment Report. This will present any uncertainty that the equipment vendor believes is prudent based on the tests conducted. Additional uncertainty on top of the vendor data is not added. The substation transformer is another sound source modeled as part of the project. This is consistent with the practices approved by the Ontario Ministry of Environment. With respect to your other questions about noise, we provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sound power spectra of most wind turbines are not tonal (IEC-61400-11 definitions). • In addition to the required setbacks, noise cannot exceed 40.0 dBA at participating points of reception as prescribed in the legislation. The wind farm must have a layout that satisfies both criteria (setback and noise). • A dBA scale is used to measure noise instead of an unweighted dB scale because it reflects the response of the human ear to different frequencies. • The wind turbine manufacturer provides octave band data from 65 Hz to 8000 Hz. This is typical of industrial equipment: heavy machinery, transformers, fans, pumps, compressors, etc. In general, these devices do not provide sound emissions below 65 Hz (20 Hz is the lower frequency humans can hear). • Regarding what turbine setback would be required from a receptor to ensure that the noise level (measured on an unweighted scale) would not exceed the noise level (also on an unweighted scale) at the site prior to installation of turbines, we provide the following response: The performance limit is defined in dBA for an overall value. The answer to this question requires the performance limit to be defined per each frequency, in dB. • There is a cumulative effect, and that is assessed in the noise calculations as part of the legislated noise impacts at points of reception have to be obeyed considering all the sources around a receptor. Points of reception are defined as either the center of a dwelling (or school/daycare/place of worship/campsites, i.e.. anywhere where people may sleep), 4.5 m above the ground (e.g.. a 2nd story bedroom) or 1.5 m above the ground anywhere within 30 m of the center of a dwelling. The current project as proposed by Algonquin will meet the requirements of Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the Green Energy Act, which ensures a project must be sited at least 550 meters from non-participating receptors provided a cumulative sound level does not exceed 40 dB(A). Our health consultants have informed us that adhering to these conditions would not result in undue adverse health effects for the residents of Amherst Island. Scientists and medical experts around the world continue to publish research in this area. Through our health consultants, Windlectric is committed to keeping informed on the most recent findings. The scientific literature suggests that some people living near wind turbines may become annoyed. The Chief Medical Officer of Health in Ontario released a review of the literature regarding the potential health impact of wind turbines (2010) where it was reported that 4 to 10% of people may experience annoyance at sound levels between 35 dB and 45 dB but that the annoyance was strongly correlated with individual attitudes toward wind turbines. Overall, annoyance appears to be more strongly related to visual cues and attitude than to noise itself and that the self-reported health effects of people living near wind turbines are, therefore, more likely attributed to physical manifestation from an annoyed state than from the wind turbines themselves. With respect to your questions on the impact of the project on CO2 emissions wind power is a clean, renewable source of energy which produces no greenhouse gas emissions or waste products. Just one modern wind turbine will save over 4,000 tonnes of CO2 emissions annually. In terms of efficiency a modern wind turbine produces electricity 70-85% of the time, but it generates different outputs dependent on wind speed. Over the course of a year, it will generate about 30% of the theoretical maximum output. A modern wind turbine will generate enough to meet the electricity demands of more than a thousand homes over the course of a year (Source: http://www.canwea.ca). Windlectric Inc. received a contract from the Ontario Power Authority to supply renewable energy to the Province under the Feed-in-Tariff (FIT) program. The power purchase rate that the program provides is for 13.5 cents/kWh. Windlectric believes the economics of the Project make it viable.
December 6, 2011	march 5 2012	42	<p>Provided questions regarding the possible disruption of ferry service during construction, pre-construction well water report on all wells on the Island, the height of the original turbines in which the 550 m setback was based , and whether the setbacks or noise have changed with different turbine heights.</p>	<p>Thanked her for her questions submitted during the first open house. Summarized her questions into 4 main categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Turbine construction transportation and impacts on ferry service 2. effects on well and ground water 3. setbacks 4. noise <p>Stated that these questions are addressed by the attached FAQ list. Stated that the setbacks required by O. Reg 359/09 are independent of turbine height, and the project components will be sited in compliance with this regulation. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.</p>

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
December 6, 2011	February 15 2012	126	Noted that questions were not answered about shading by towers for the solar array. Loons fly over the property and resident is concerned about their survival. Would like to know the real purpose of the steel blade attachments. Island resident will be erecting a solar array on property and would like to know if compensation will be paid if towers cast shadows and reduce the power to the panels.	Acknowledged correspondence indicating intent to build. Indicated that questions about noise impact assessment methodology, waterfowl and turbine blades are covered by the attached frequently asked questions. Stated that a response to question about solar panels would be generated shortly. Provided project contact information for future questions.
December 6, 2011	February 15 2012	127	Identified key issues that need to be addressed as health and property values. Would like more information about declining property values.	Thanked correspondents for their questions received during the public open house. Stated that questions surrounding health, property values and birds were covered by the attached Frequently Asked Questions. Stated commitment to the REA process and provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 15 2012	58	Identified key issues that need to be addressed as the economic realities in the location, infrastructure limitations, destruction of the natural environment, and the relative remoteness from major power demands. Concerned about the possibility of construction affecting groundwater quality by infiltration of existing salt water veins into fresh water veins. Would like to know what studies will be done on groundwater on the island and the possible impact during construction.	Thanked her for questions submitted during the public openhouse. Stated that the contract received a 75 MW contract from the Ontario Power Authority and the turbines to be used are Siemens 2.3 MW units. Questions about hydro costs, turbine specifications, impacts to birds bats endangered species and groundwater are found in the attached FAQ. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	December 5, 2011	165	Noted that people will likely want to address future comments to the individual(s) they spoke with at the open house. Requests a list of the names of the Project Team members who attended the open houses be posted on the Project website.	Maps provided Dec 15, 2011
December 6, 2011	February 29, 2012	114	Provided questions regarding the possibility of the proposed underwater cable to emit electromagnetic waves, will the fish spawning in the Sand Bay area NE of the Island be disrupted, and will there be a guarantee that wells on the island will not be disrupted.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized concerns into the following topics: 1. Electrical interconnection 2. natural environment 3. health and safety 4. ground/well water Stated that responses to these concerns could be found in the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	99	Provided questions regarding work offers for islanders vs. non-islanders, remuneration for the Township from Windlectric/Algonquin, benefits to non-participating landowners, the height of the turbines in which the 550m setback was based, the difference in noise between different sized turbines, noise effects to mainland waterfront homeowners, mitigation for birds, possible effects to migrating birds, land space required for each turbine and project components, benefits in cost reductions of home electricity rates, the government's plans for excess energy, the cost effectiveness of turbines and the plan of action if health issues arise.	Thanked the correspondents for questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized concerns into the following topics: 1. Community benefits; 2. Setbacks; 3. Noise; 4. Health; 5. Project economics/viability of the project; 6. Natural environment and migratory birds; and, 7. Project construction and operations. Stated that responses to these concerns could be found in the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 15, 2012	110	Would like to know whether the water supply will be replaced to an equivalent level if digging and blasting destroys the water table around the turbine base? Who will be responsible for replacing the water supply? Would also like to know if the roads damaged during construction will be replaced to their original conditions?	Thanked for questions submitted during the public openhouse. Windlectric assumes responsibility and liability for the construction of the project and claims will be handled by them on a case by case basis. Questions regarding water and roads are covered by the attached FAQ. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	148	Provided a list of questions regarding the location where the turbine parts are manufactured, transportation of turbine components to the Island, the actual locations of the turbines, the total area required during construction	Thanked the correspondents for questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized concerns into the following topics:

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			and whether it will be permanently altered, results of environmental assessments of current installed turbines, and whether a follow-up environmental assessment will be conducted and the monitoring that will occur to identify and minimize impacts.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental assessment; 2. Need for additional docking facilities; and, 3. Turbine construction and operations. <p>Stated that responses to these concerns could be found in the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries. With respect to the query on a follow up environmental assessment, an environmental assessment is not required subsequent to the construction of the project. Windlectric will conduct operational monitoring as stipulated by the regulatory authorities and document the results of this monitoring. In the event that mitigation is warranted Windlectric will work with the regulators to determine appropriate actions.</p> <p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
December 6, 2011	March 12 2012	220	Resident opposed to the Project. Concerned that any number of turbines will destroy the hawks' and other birds habitat and the serenity of this beautiful island. Would like to know why Amherst Island was chosen as a site when it was not identified as a top 20 'best' location for an industrial wind turbine. Identified concerns regarding the whooshing noise, flicker effect, the visual 'eyesore' from turbines, the fragile water table, her house and the effect on island bats, birds, and short eared owls. Identified specific questions regarding possible damage to the water table, guarantee that the turbines will not have a negative effect on her house and property, ensuring an abundant supply of good, clean and healthy water, and ensuring that her house and property are maintained in working order.	<p>Thanked her for comments provided at the open house. Stated that the project is a 75 MW microfit program. Summarized her comments into the following main areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. natural heritage 2. project viability 3. noise 4. flicker effect 5. visual impacts 6. impacts to groundwater and geothermal systems <p>Indicated that these topics are addressed by an attached FAQ. Provided contact information for future inquiries.</p>
December 6, 2011	March 12 2012	212	Resident would like to know if there was a legal right in 2008 to include properties from landowners that did not sign options on the proposed project map to Loyalist Township, OPA, MOE and MNR. Was the map of the entire Island (except Stella and Bird Sanctuary) to enhance the chances of winning the Project? Would also like responses to questions concerning legal rights to include properties on the map from landowners that did not sign options, trespassing on properties of non-optioned landowners, destroying people's health and property values, and the number of employees living closer that 3, 280 feet (one km) from a wind turbine.	<p>Thanked him for comments submitted during the openhouse. Stated that the property maps used in the 2008 mapping were publically available and could be purchased by consultants. Stated that field staff will not entered unoptioned properties without consent from the landowner. Provided a list of FAQ to address the three main concerns raised. Provided contact information for future correspondence</p>
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	161	Identified key issues that need to be addressed as potential damage to health and property values for non-participating home owners. Noted that the lodge on Amherst Island can be used as a guest house. Would like to know what the substation will look like, and how it will be landscaped. Requests pictures of previous substations made by the company. How are you addressing the issue of "flicker"?	<p>Thanked her for comments provided at the open house. Stated that the project is a 75 MW microfit program. Summarized her comments into the following main areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Property values; 2. Project construction; 3. Health; and, 4. Shadow flicker. <p>Indicated that these topics are addressed by an attached FAQ. Provided contact information for future inquiries. With respect to the query on the substation the specific design, layout and landscaping has not yet been completed but will be provided in the Construction Plan report. However for your information we have provided a typical substation layout.</p>

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				<p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	61	<p>What plans will be in place to protect livestock and sheep dogs from accessing the Project location (i.e. access roads, substation, etc.)?</p>	<p>Provided the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Protection of livestock – Impacts to groundwater; the company is aware of the sheep farming businesses on the island and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is anticipated that within the next year further draft project details for planning work on participating private property and public road use which would involve discussions with the Township which will include transportation/traffic management planning plus communication and emergency response plans, will be completed. Project construction and operation; 3. Natural environment; 4. Shadow/Flicker effect; 5. Impacts to wireless based communications; 6. Decommissioning; and, 7. Turbine lighting. <p>Please find enclosed a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on the topics listed above. Windlectric has created a list of common questions/concerns (similar to your questions) raised by stakeholders and has developed general responses to those inquiries. These responses will be made available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.</p> <p>With respect to your question on accessibility and land use following completion of the project; farmers will still be able to utilize their properties for all agricultural practices carried out prior to construction with exception of those lands on which the turbine is located as well as the service pad and access roads. Information on the dimensions of these areas are available in the design and operations report once the details have been finalized.</p>
December 6, 2011	February 29, 2012	159	<p>Resident would like to know if anyone on the senior Algonquin or Stantec staffs live or own property in close proximity to one or more industrial wind turbines? How many and how close? Would also like to know if Algonquin or Stantec staff have slept several nights in a home in proximity to an industrial wind turbine? Provided questions regarding reporting of turbine noise or sleep loss, shadow flicker, shadow distances, and gag orders imposed on neighbors who sign for turbines.</p>	<p>Thanked them for their open house comments. Indicated that the comments had been summarized into 13 main topic areas which are covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided contact information for further inquiries.</p>
December 6, 2011	June 19, 2012	181	<p>Requests that the following issues be addressed in writing: provision of an independent and objective review of potential health impacts for nearby residents, impact on birds, bats and other wildlife, provisions of the appropriate reviews and approvals to build wind turbines on Amherst Island from the Canadian Wildlife Services/Environment Canada or other Federal bodies responsible for migratory birds, protection to the community after turbines are no longer needed or must be replaced, timeline for maintenance activities, dealing with problems of properties not selling and the use of radar activated lights.</p>	<p>Thanked him for correspondence received during the public open house as well as on January 30, February 2 and 16, May 8 and May 14. Summarized comments and questions into 9 main areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. property values 2. decommissioning 3. impacts to homes and properties 4. natural heritage 5. noise assessment 6. compensation 7. health 8. adequacy of size of land mass for project 9. turbine lighting <p>Provided a copy of the project frequently asked questions which addresses the 9 categories listed. Provided project contact information for future comments and questions.</p>

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	51	Provided health and economic questions. Concerned about health effects due to severe tinnitus exacerbated by low frequency vibration and noise. Would like to know the plan to recompense neighbouring landowners adjacent to turbines if homes become unsellable. Also concerned with potential effects to the bird environment.	<p>Thanked them for questions and comments submitted at the first public openhouse. Summarized concerns into the following main topic areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Natural heritage including birds, raptors, owls, species at risk, rare and threatened species; 2. Monitoring during operations; 3. Health; 4. Property values; 5. Lighting; 6. Noise; and, 7. Visual impacts. <p>Indicated that these topics are converged by the attached Frequently asked Questions list. Provided project contact information for future inquiries. Post-construction monitoring for bird, bat, and raptor mortality will occur at the Amherst Island Wind facility in accordance with standard protocols established by Ministry of Natural Resources. More information will be provided about monitoring in the draft Design and Operations Report. The report will form part of the complete REA application package that will be available for public review at least 60 days before the final open house for the Project</p> <p>The current project as proposed by Algonquin will meet the requirements of Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the Green Energy Act, which ensures a project must be sited at least 550 meters from non-participating receptors provided a cumulative sound level does not exceed 40 dB(A). Our health consultants have informed us that adhering to these conditions would not result in undue adverse health effects for the residents of Amherst Island.</p>
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	184	Identified concerns regarding the ability of residents to sell their homes, mortality of migrating birds, noise, and red flashing lights causing light pollution. Would like to know the plans for financial support to people whose homes are unsellable because of the Project.	<p>Thanked them for questions and comments submitted at the first public openhouse. Summarized concerns into the following main topic areas:1. Natural heritage including birds, raptors, owls, species at risk, rare and threatened species;2. Monitoring during operations;3. Health;4. Property values;5. Lighting;6. Noise; and,7. Visual impacts.Indicated that these topics are converged by the attached Frequently asked Questions list. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.</p> <p>Post-construction monitoring for bird, bat, and raptor mortality will occur at the Amherst Island Wind facility in accordance with standard protocols established by Ministry of Natural Resources. More information will be provided about monitoring in the draft Design and Operations Report. The report will form part of the complete REA application package that will be available for public review at least 60 days before the final open house for the Project The current project as proposed by Algonquin will meet the requirements of Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the Green Energy Act, which ensures a project must be sited at least 550 meters from non-participating receptors provided a cumulative sound level does not exceed 40 dB(A). Our health consultants have informed us that adhering to these conditions would not result in undue adverse health effects for the residents of Amherst Island.</p>
December 6, 2011	March 5, 2012	195	Provided questions regarding the total height of a turbine (to the tip of the blade), the weight of one turbine, the amount of concrete required for each turbine, the dimensions of the concrete pad, excavation methods that will be used, the disposal of excavated material, the location and removal of the temporary dock and the components of the environmental impact assessment.	<p>Thanked them for questions and comments submitted at the first public openhouse. Summarized concerns into the following main topic areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. turbine specifications 2. construction requirements and activities 3. roads 4. project location <p>Indicated that these topics are covered by the attached FAQ list. Stated that socioeconomic impacts would be covered by the REA Construction Plan Report and Design and Operations Report. Stated that a table of the required authorizations and permits could be found as part of the draft project description report. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.</p>
December 6, 2011	March 5, 2012	197	Identified key impacts that need to be considered as the community impact. Noted that the small land mass is insufficient to support such an industrial installation. Concerned for island roads being incapable of supporting proposed loads, turning areas, etc.	<p>Thanked them for questions and comments submitted at the first public openhouse. Summarized concerns into the following main topic areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. turbine specifications 2. construction requirements and activities 3. roads 4. project location <p>Indicated that these topics are covered by the attached FAQ list. Stated that socioeconomic impacts would be</p>

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				covered by the REA Construction Plan Report and Design and Operations Report. Stated that a table of the required authorizations and permits could be found as part of the draft project description report. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	April 5, 2013	55	Would like more timely notification of Liaison Committee meetings and posting notes on the website. Would like to know about meetings in advance of the meetings. Asked how the Liaison Committee is chosen, and stated that they do not represent her or the APAI. Interested in knowing what financial protection is available if the company goes bankrupt. Inquired as to why the most recent health information available is dated from 2010.	Provided the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial security – the project power purchase agreement with the Ontario Power Authority does not require any financial security be posted. • Project Liaison Committee - the Liaison Committee includes four local community representatives and a Lead Facilitator (owner's management representative). Members of the Liaison Committee were solicited by direct invitation to community stakeholders and were appointed by the project proponent. Local community representatives were selected based on their ability and willingness to bring a variety of perspectives from/to the local community. Note that membership on the Liaison Committee does not constitute support, endorsement, or opposition of the Amherst Island Wind Energy Project.
December 6, 2011	February 29 2012	174	Asked questions regarding emergency services access during construction and truck delivery blocking roads. Concerned about effects to Owl Woods. Asked about the magnitude of the decommissioning security, how it is determined and how do we know it is sufficient if the company goes away?	Thanked her for her questions submitted at the first public open house. Summarized concerns into the following: 1. traffic 2. emergency response plan 3. natural environment including birds and the owl woods 4. visual effects 5. property values 6. landowner lease agreements 7. setbacks 8. ploughing for the stage 2 archaeological assessment 9. Decommissioning; 10. Turbine construction and operations. Stated that responses to the concerns could be found in the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 24 2012	52	Very concerned regarding property values. Would like a guarantee that she will not lose the value.	Thanked her for questions submitted at the first public open house. Stated that a modern wind turbine will generate enough electricity to power more than 1000 homes over the course of a year. Summarized concerns into the following areas: 1. noise 2. decommissioning 3. property values 4. shadow flicker 5. natural environment Indicated that these concerns were covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	30	Would like to know the exponential effects of a wind turbine on the health of an already compromised individual. Would like cumulative effects considered.	Provided an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
December 6, 2011	February 15, 2012	Unkn own	Seeking GPS coordinates of the turbines.	Thanked correspondent for their interest in the project, stated that the UTM coordinates for the proposed turbine sites were available on the project website.
December 6, 2011	February 17, 2013	134	Concerned about the substation and stray voltage affect on humans and	Thanked correspondent for her questions submitted at the Open House as well as questions emailed on

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			animals.	December 13th and January 2nd. Summarized her main concerns into the topics of stray voltage, public consultation and roads. Indicated that these concerns were addressed in the attached frequently asked questions. Stated that the minimum period of advance notice for the final Public Open house is 60 days and that this Open House will likely occur in August 2012, stated that the locations of REA application materials will be made available when the notification for the final public meeting is given. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 15, 2012	217	Looking for detailed vegetation maps of the Island to assist with developing walking trails/biking paths on the island.	Thanked correspondent for their questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Noted that detailed vegetation mapping would be available in the draft NHA to be provided prior to the final open house.
December 6, 2011	February 24, 2012	63	After studying the numbers and locations of the proposed turbines, we suggest that "Amherst Island" be renamed "Turbine Island". Shame. Also submitted a number of questions collectively.	Thanked correspondent for their questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Questions about compensation, property values and health effects are covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 15 2012	31	After studying the numbers and locations of the proposed turbines, we suggest that "Amherst Island" be renamed "Turbine Island". Shame. Also submitted a number of questions collectively.	Thanked correspondent for their questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Questions about water issues are covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 24, 2012	17	After studying the numbers and locations of the proposed turbines, we suggest that "Amherst Island" be renamed "Turbine Island". Shame. Also submitted a number of questions collectively.	Thanked the correspondent for their questions submitted at the Open House and their email sent on January 31. Summarized their items of interests into nine categories and indicated that these items were covered by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Provided project contact information for future comments and inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 17, 2013	201	After studying the numbers and locations of the proposed turbines, we suggest that "Amherst Island" be renamed "Turbine Island". Shame. Also submitted a number of questions collectively.	Thanked the correspondent for their questions submitted at the Open House and their email sent on January 31. Summarized their items of interests into thirteen categories and indicated that these items were covered by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Provided project contact information for future comments and inquiries.
December 6, 2011	April 19, 2013	75	Noted that more importance should be given to wildlife issues (bird kills). Communicated information to Stantec regarding winter raptors and breeding birds.	Thanked them for questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized them into the following categories: 1. Natural environment and migratory birds. Indicated that these topics are covered by the attached Frequently asked Questions. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	March 5 2012	199	Identified key issues to be addressed as getting it out to the public - Canadian and U.S.	Thanked them for questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized them into the following categories: 1. Property values; 2. Noise; 3. Shadow flicker; 4. Setbacks; 5. Property values; 6. Visual effects; and, 7. Natural environment including birds and Owl woods. Indicated that these topics are covered by the attached Frequently asked Questions. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 15, 2012	169	No comments. Attended open house for information on the placement of turbines.	Thanked Paul for his interest in the project. Provided him with the website location where project maps and information could be found. Indicated that he had been added to the project mailing list and that his comment would be considered during the REA process
December 6, 2011	March 5 2012	177	Identified key issues that need to be addressed as the effects of wind turbines on the community, socio-economic impacts. Concerned with the	Thanked them for questions and comments submitted at the first public openhouse. Summarized concerns into the following main topic areas:

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			effects to relationships in the community.	1. turbine specifications 2. construction requirements and activities 3. roads 4. project location Indicated that these topics are covered by the attached FAQ list. Stated that socioeconomic impacts would be covered by the REA Construction Plan Report and Design and Operations Report. Stated that a table of the required authorizations and permits could be found as part of the draft project description report. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 6, 2011	February 12, 2012	165	Concerned about the noise from the nacelle upon start up	Discuss at February 2012 Liasion committee meeting
December 6, 2011	February 12, 2012	210	Concerned about the foundation of a log shanty that was occupied during the 1830s. The foundation is within a road allowance and part of the foundation is touching the road. This building is east of turbine location S02	Discuss at February 2012 Liasion committee meeting
December 6, 2011	February 12, 2012	222	"depth from foundation?"	Discuss at February 2012 Liasion committee meeting
December 7, 2011	March 5 2012	128	Identified the key issues that need to be addressed as impact to Owl population in Owl woods. Requested more information regarding the impact this project will have on the native bird populations	Thanked them for questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized them into six main categories: 1. natural environment 2. health effects 3. property values 4. noise 5. shadow flicker 6. setbacks Indicated that these topics are covered by the attached Frequently asked Questions. Requested that the name and contact information of the construction company that they stated they knew be passed along to the project for consideration. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 7, 2011	April 19, 2013	94	Resident felt the open house was unbalanced an pro-wind. Identified key issues that need to be addressed as residents concerns and fears over the impact of the project, the impact to the local Owl population and recreational boating in the bays.	Thanked the correspondent for questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized them into the following categories: 1. Natural environment and Owl woods; and, 2. Project construction and operations. Indicated that these topics are covered by the attached Frequently asked Questions. Provided contact information for future inquiries. With respect your concern over anchoring in the lake the location of the submarine cable between the island and the mainland will be clearly identified where it leaves and enters the water from the shore.
December 7, 2011	March 12 2012	146	Concerned about the decommissioning of the turbines at the end of their life cycle and the impact to human health. Would like to know who would be held accountable for remediation of the environment upon decommissioning and long term monitoring of the site.	Thanked them for comments and questions submitted at the public openhouse. Summarized into 9 main concerns and indicated that these were addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided details about the power collection and transmission network. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 7, 2011	February 29 2012	199	Identified key issues that need to be addressed as impact to property value, aesthetic impact to the community, and impact of noise and flicker effects in the vicinity of schools. Would like to know who will provide financial compensation due to negative impacts.	Thanked them for their questions submitted at the openhouse. Summarized their concerns into the follow topic areas: 1. property values 2. noise 3. shadow flicker 4. setbacks 5. property values 6. visual effects 7. natural environment Indicated that these concerns are addressed by the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				inquiries.
December 7, 2011	March 12 2012	101	Concerned about the decommissioning of the turbines, would like to review the decommissioning plan. Provided a list of questions requesting information on who is financially responsible for: negative impacts to township infrastructure, social, health and economic impacts, reduction in property value, remediation of the site if company goes under.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the public openhouse, on February 3 and February 8. Stated that the preliminary layout and other materials shown at the openhouse can be found on the project website. Summarized her concerns into 14 main areas and indicated that these are addressed by an attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Stated that tax calculations had been recalculated based on information provided by Loyalist township. No damages are anticipated to private property relating to project construction, however a complaint response protocol will be developed. Stated that the methodology used for natural heritage assessment will be described in the report. Stated if the project is located within 120 meters of a significant environmental feature a study will be conducted to identify potential impacts and processes for mitigation. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 7, 2011	March 12 2012	101	Identified questions during the open house: Do residents have the ability to construct new developments on their property? What is the crystallization process and when does it take place? How do you delineate the boundary of the natural heritage features? When would an EIS be required? In the Project Description Report you document in Appendix C-3, Section 2.6 there may be potential impacts to "other wildlife and wildlife habitat", why isn't an EIS required for these natural resources?	Thanked her for questions submitted at the public openhouse, on February 3 and February 8. Stated that the preliminary layout and other materials shown at the openhouse can be found on the project website. Summarized her concerns into 14 main areas and indicated that these are addressed by an attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Stated that tax calculations had been recalculated based on information provided by Loyalist township. No damages are anticipated to private property relating to project construction, however a complaint response protocol will be developed. Stated that the methodology used for natural heritage assessment will be described in the report. Stated if the project is located within 120 meters of a significant environmental feature a study will be conducted to identify potential impacts and processes for mitigation. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 7, 2011	March 12 2012	163	Provided a list of questions requesting information on the location of the turbines, visual impact of the turbines, the distance at which the noise will be audible under all conditions, specifically the decibel level. Concerned about the negative impact to native wildlife populations	Thanked correspondent for their comments and questions submitted during the open house. Stated that the project will operate under a FIT program contract and there is reason to believe that it will be economically viable. Summarized their questions and concerns into main topic areas and indicated that these are addressed by an attached Frequently asked Questions. Stated that potential impacts to recreation would be addressed by the Construction Report and Design and Operations Report. Provided project contact information for future communication
December 7, 2011	March 12 2013	163	Resident opposed to the Project. Felt the open house was biased, pro-wind. Would like to know how information will be provided to the public in the future. Requesting additional information on impact to wildlife and habitat.	Thanked correspondent for their comments and questions submitted during the open house. Stated that the project will operate under a FIT program contract and there is reason to believe that it will be economically viable. Summarized their questions and concerns into main topic areas and indicated that these are addressed by an attached Frequently asked Questions. Stated that potential impacts to recreation would be addressed by the Construction Report and Design and Operations Report. Provided project contact information for future communication
December 7, 2011	March 12 2012	168	Concerned that the project will divide the community. Requested additional information on generation efficiencies of the turbines in relation to their location, and the validation for siting turbines on the North shore.	Stated that the project will operate under a FIT program contract and there is reason to believe that it will be economically viable. Summarized their questions and concerns into main topic areas and indicated that these are addressed by the attached FAQ. Stated that potential impacts to recreation would be addressed by the Construction Report and Design and Operations Report. Provided project contact information for future communication
December 7, 2011	February 29 2012	174	Resident opposed to the Project. Identified key issues that need to be addressed as impact to human health, wildlife and property values. Specific concerns regarding the Owl population and bird migration.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the first public open house. Summarized concerns into the following: 1. traffic 2. emergency response plan 3. natural environment including birds and the owl woods 4. visual effects 5. property values 6. landowner lease agreements 7. setbacks 8. ploughing for the stage 2 archaeological assessment Stated that responses to the concerns could be found in the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 7, 2011	April 19, 2013	66	Provided a list of question requesting information on: democratic public	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the first public open house. Summarized concerns into the

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			input process into the project, impacts to aesthetic impacts on community, the impact of the flashing lights on top of the turbines, comparison of lighting impacts between the project and Wolfe Island turbines, impacts of noise, impacts to property values. Are there any additional location under consideration for this project.	<p>following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Property values and compensation; 2. Noise; 3. Turbine lights; 4. Visual impacts; and, 5. Regulatory/environmental process. <p>Stated that responses to the concerns could be found in the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries. With respect to your question on the project within the context of democratic process, Windlectric is committed to following the Renewable Energy Approval process as mandated by the Ministry of Environment and the Province of Ontario. This process includes extensive public consultation and communication.</p> <p>Regarding turbine lighting, Windlectric has not yet selected a specific type of lighting for the turbines but will endeavor to select the best option that will minimize disturbance to the island population while providing the appropriate level of operability, durability and compliance with Transport Canada regulations.</p> <p>In terms of additional/alternative projects planned for the area Windlectric is only involved in the currently contracted Amherst Island project and is not considering other projects in other locations under the current contract.</p>
December 7, 2011	February 15 2012	98	Requesting Land Option Contract	Thanked her for questions submitted at the Open House, as well as on December 10th and January 27th. Summarized the main topic points that she wished to be addressed and indicated that these were covered by the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 7, 2011	April 19, 2013	188	Concerned about the health impacts of the project between S01 and S29	Provided an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. Additionally, the Archaeological Assessment Report is available for review on the Project website.
December 7, 2011	April 19, 2013	188	Would like to know the methodology required for the Stage 2 Arch Assessment and what artifacts they are looking for. What licenses are required by the archaeologists and do they have them with them in the field? What is the procedure if artifacts or remains are found during construction? Is it possible to see a template for a landowner lease agreement?	Provided an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. Additionally, the Archaeological Assessment Report is available for review on the Project website.
December 7, 2011	April 19, 2013	186	Concerned about Light Flicker on their residents, specifically the impact from turbines S30, S26, S18, S13 and S07. Would like reassurance that the Shadow Flicker Report will be unbiased.	<p>Provided an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.</p> <p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
December 7, 2011	April 19, 2013	41	Requesting additional information on the use of radar systems instead of indicator lights on the tops of the turbines, and impacts of shadows when they are at their longest	Provided an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				<p>the Project.</p> <p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
December 7, 2011	February 21, 20102	176	Requesting additional information on the financial compensation to be provided to non-participating residents, and justification of the Project vs. the division of the community.	<p>Thanked correspondent for questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. Concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. In addition, Windlectric indicated that it stands by the benefits outlined at the openhouse and indicated that a recalculation of municipal property tax payments had been made and clarification is available on the project website. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Stated that no pre construction inspection of homes will occur as it is not anticipated that damage will be caused to homes during construction. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.</p>
December 7, 2011	April 19, 2013	129	Requesting additional information on the impacts to bird migration, aesthetic impact to residents along South Shore Rd, impact of lighting on residents, justification for wind vs. solar, impact on waterways due to increased boat travel	<p>Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the first public open house. Summarized concerns into the following:1. Natural environment specifically migratory birds;2. Turbine lighting;3. Visual impacts; and,4. Project construction and operations and increases in trafficStated that responses to the concerns could be found in the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries.</p> <p>Regarding turbine lighting, Windlectric has not yet selected a specific type of lighting for the turbines but will endeavor to select the best option that will minimize disturbance to the island population while providing the appropriate level of operability, durability and comply with Transport Canada regulations. Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
December 7, 2011	March 12, 2012	2	Provided a list of questions requesting information on: the maintenance costs of the turbines, health impacts of vibrations, longevity of the technology i.e. will it become obsolete in 10-20 years, financial compensation for decreased property value, justification of the efficiency vs. the aesthetic and wildlife impacts, possible placement of turbines in Provincial Parks and is this project a "done deal"	<p>Thanked her for her questions submitted at the openhouse. Stated that the project will be funded by a FIT contract and that it is believed it will be financially viable. Provided information regarding the estimated efficiency of the turbines. Sited studies indicating that noise and vibrations do not cause a health hazard. Provided contact information for future questions.</p>
December 7, 2011	February 17 2012	192	Identified key issues that need to be addressed as birds, land/property values and health concerns. Opposed to the Project and requesting a written response to questions regarding steps to identify the environmental impact, steps to ensure the bird population and migration routes are not affected and if they are the mitigation methods that will be used, the government approvals required before the Project is approved, a local contact office or phone number, the benefit to local employment, the location of the power lines crossing the waterway, and possible reimbursement for loss of property values.	<p>Thanked them for their comments and questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized their concerns into nine main topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. environmental effects 2. birds 3. government approvals 4. project contact information 5. construction costs 6. community benefits 7. location of project components 8. property values 9. health concerns <p>Indicated that these topics were covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Stated that the draft project description report includes a list of required government approvals, permits and authorizations. Provided contact information for future inquiries.</p>

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
December 7, 2011	April 19, 2013	122	Identified concerns regarding owl colony, property values.	Thanked them for their comments and questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized their concerns into the following opics: 1. Natural environment and Owl Woods; 2. Property values; and, 3. Visual impacts. Indicated that these topics were covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Stated that the draft project description report includes a list of required government approvals, permits and authorizations. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 7, 2011	February 24 2012	216	Identified key issues that need to be addressed as noise levels, setbacks, and the protection of birds. Would like to know where these turbines are in operation now and the setbacks in those communities? Would like to know about possible compensation to the community.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Stated that two prototypes of the turbines to be used are being operated in the Netherlands and Denmark, and are undergoing standard testing and monitoring. Stated that the first commercial models of this turbine will be installed in Sweden in 2013 and setbacks for this installation are not yet known. Summarized concerns into: 1. operations 2. noise 3. birds and owls 4. natural heritage features 5. community benefits Stated that these concerns are covered by the attached Frequently asked Questions. Provided contact information for additional inquiries.
December 7, 2011	February 29, 2012	44	Identified key issues to be addressed as economic benefits for non-participating landowners. Concerned about birds and bats, flashing red lights and property values. Would like the facts about effects to birds and bats. Would like to know the amount of money each turbine collects per year.	Thanked him for comments received during the first public open house. Summarized concerns into the following six areas: 1. project economics 2. natural environment 3. lighting 4. property values 5. visual effects 6. landowner lease agreement Stated that these concerns are addressed in the FAQ attached. Thanked him for information provided regarding Upper Canada Office Systems and indicated that this would be taken under consideration in the project. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 7, 2011	February 29, 2012	159	Provided questions regarding CANWEA's statement about turbines and birds, the Island as an Important Bird Area, bird kills on Wolfe Island, effects of noise, flicker, bird kill and stress on roads and trees, restoration plans, benefits to non-participating Islanders, and the possibility of permanent fire-protection facilities.	Thanked them for their open house comments. Indicated that the comments had been summarized into 13 main topic areas which are covered by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Provided contact information for further inquiries.
December 7, 2011	April 19, 2013	37	If we install a ground mount solar panel system on our property, will the turbines (specifically T13 and T18) cast a shadow and therefore effect where we should place the solar panels?	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the first public open house. Summarized concerns into the following: • Impacts to solar project – in discussion with the project engineering subject matter experts on this subject it is believed that there would be minimal (if any) effects on any future solar project on your property. Stated that these concerns are addressed in the FAQ attached. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 7, 2011	February 15, 2012	26	Why was I not informed of the location of the substation, as I am the closest resident to the proposed location?What noise, electricity and subsonic vibration impacts/effects will be heard/felt by residents near the substation?What is the emergency response plan for the Island during construction and operation?Have you considered the potential effect to the helicopter pad and the ability for Islanders to use it?	• The UTM coordinates for the turbines have been provided in the Draft Site Plan report which is posted on the project website: www.amherstislandwindproject.com. • The maps which were available for viewing at the Public Open Houses and all the information presented at the Public Open House, have been made available on the Project website. • With regards to your question about the location of the substation, the proposed location is preferred because of the central location for this project component. The substation is located in accordance with O. Reg. 359/09. As Section 35(2) of O. Reg. 359/09 stipulates, if a noise assessment is completed following the MOEs Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms (October 2008) then the setbacks described in Section 35(1) of O. Reg. 359/09 do not apply. The Noise Guideline for Wind Farms (October 2008) requires that noise does not exceed 40 dBA at the location of non-participating receptors. • The wind industry does not anticipate any potential effects

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				from vibration or stray electricity from substations during operation. • For your remaining questions about noise, emergency response, the island's helicopter pad, the land owner lease agreements, community benefits and roads, please find enclosed a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on these topics. Windlectric has created a list of common questions/concerns (similar to your questions) raised by stakeholders and has developed general responses to those inquiries. These responses will be made available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
December 7, 2011	February 15, 2012	90	Sent an article supporting his opinion that industrial wind turbines have a negative impact on property values and requested response.	Stated that the turbines are designed to handle extreme winds and that there is no foreseeable damage from extreme weather events. Stated that all other questions are covered by the attached Frequently asked Questions
December 7, 2011	February 15, 2012	90	Sent Sean an article from the CBC "Ontario wind power bringing down property values" and stated "I need your input on these allegations"	Stated that the turbines are designed to handle extreme winds and that there is no foreseeable damage from extreme weather events. Stated that all other questions are covered by the attached Frequently asked Questions
December 7, 2011	December 8, 2011	33	Cannot find the project layout map that was shown at the public meeting on the project website. Requested that the correct URL or a PDF be provided to her.	Apologized for not having the project layout map posted to the website yet. Provided her with a pdf attachment of the map.
December 7, 2011	April 19, 2013	55	Denise would like a project map similar to those developed for the NHA and water body assessment that shows the proposed turbine locations. Denise is concerned that the current format does not adequately identify where proposed turbine locations will be.	Provided comprehensive responses to all queries in April 19, 2013 letter. Draft Environmental Impact Study (EIS): • The project EIS is available on the project web site and has been provided to the Kingston Field Naturalists (KFN). In a separate matter the Species at Risk (SAR) report is a separate topic from the Natural Heritage Assessment (Environmental Impact Study) and is provided only to the Ministry of Natural Resources and is not a public document. Nevertheless, our consultants have been speaking with KFN representative(s) and there has been a discussion about the SAR with them. We will be to continue to consult with the KFN in the future.
December 8, 2011	February 24, 2012	9	Andrea would like to know where the information from public meetings that was to be posted to the project website can be found. She would like to know when the information, including project maps, would be posted to the website.	Thanked correspondent for comments submitted at the first public open house and on December 8, January 30th and February 12th. Stated that maps and all information from the public open house are available on the project website. Stated that the project received a 75 MW contract from the OPA and that proposed turbines are Siemens 2.3 MW units. Thanked for the recommendation to post notice at the two ferry docks and this will be taken into consideration for the second open house. Stated that transport Canada will provide input into considerations for lighting of turbines. Summarized concerns into 8 main topics and indicated that these were covered by the attached list of FAQ. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 8, 2011		33	Thanked Stantec for their consideration and for providing the project layout map.	No response necessary. Information only.
December 9, 2011	February 15, 2012	90	Forwarded an email with a picture showing a turbine that was reportedly toppled due to high winds. Hugh stated that high winds occur on Amherst Island as well.	Stated that the turbines are designed to handle extreme winds and that there is no foreseeable damage from extreme weather events. Stated that all other questions are covered by the attached Frequently asked Questions
December 9, 2011	February 15, 2012	90	James forwarded an email indicating that he had signed a petition with the Nature Conservancy to promote regulations that support renewable energy while avoiding harm to wildlife.	Stated that the turbines are designed to handle extreme winds and that there is no foreseeable damage from extreme weather events. Stated that all other questions are covered by the attached Frequently asked Questions
December 10, 2011	February 21, 2012	176	Forwarded an email indicating that he had signed a petition with the Nature Conservancy to promote regulations that support renewable energy while avoiding harm to wildlife.	Thanked correspondent for questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. In addition, Windlectric indicated that it stands by the benefits outlined at the open house and indicated that a recalculation of municipal property tax payments had been made and clarification is available on the project website. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Stated that no pre construction inspection of homes will occur as it is not anticipated that damage will be caused to homes during construction. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
December 10, 2011	February 17, 2012	98	Forwarded an email indicating signing a petition with the Nature Conservancy to promote regulations that support renewable energy while avoiding harm to wildlife.	Summarized the main topic points that she wished to be addressed and indicated that these were covered by the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 10, 2011		95	James forwarded an email from Mr. Harrison which included an article about wind energy from Rex Murphy in The National Post. James stated that he would continue to send all types of information like this that he could find available for the next two years unless S13 and S18 were removed from the proposed project plan.	No response required. Information only.
December 11, 2011	April 18, 2012	23	Forgot to provide contact information with comment form submitted during open house. Followed up with contact information as well as the questions asked. 1. Are additional turbines planned to be added to the project at a later time?2. Would like details about the archaeological studies, how they were conducted and the qualifications of the team that performed them3. What step of the process is the project currently at?4. What is the purpose of the non disclosure cause of the contracts signed with landowners?	Stated that materials from the open house were available on the project website and information about the REA process could be found on slide 12 of 26. Summarized her questions into five main points: 1. archaeological assessment2. Shadow flicker3. extreme weather events including lightning4. project schedule 5. land owner lease agreementStated that these topics are addressed in the attached frequently asked questions document. Provide contact information for the project.
December 11, 2011	April 19, 2013	13	Asked what "decommissioning" means with respect to the project	Provided comprehensive responses to all queries in April 19, 2013 letter. Provided a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your previous comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
December 11, 2011		95	Provided an article discussing accidents experienced by the wind industry in the United Kingdom over a five year period. Would like to know why these types of statistics were not disclosed or discussed at the open houses conducted in December.	No response required. Information only.
December 12, 2011	February 15, 2012	90	Identified key issues that need to be addressed as profitability from intermittent energy and the only people making money are the land owners and the construction company. Would like to know the decommissioning date for the turbines. Will there be a bond posted to pay for the decommissioning? How much will it cost to decommission and is there a face value for the bond? Questions if the company will buy properties that have suffering owners. What study is being used to prove property values do not decline when in close proximity to IWTs (i.e. within 550m)?	The correspondent was provided with the following: Project components will be designed to withstand the effects from extreme weather events including high winds. Considering the design features of the turbine which act to reduce or eliminate the potential for damage from extreme events, no adverse net effects from extreme weather events are anticipated during operation of the Project. With regards to your request for information about project schedule, decommissioning and property values please find enclosed a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on these topics. Windlectric has created a list of common questions/concerns (similar to your questions) raised by stakeholders and has developed general responses to those inquiries. These responses will be made available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
December 12, 2011	February 29, 2012	103	Identified key issues that need to be addressed as where to locate this project so that it does not destroy the environment, as was done for Kingston/Wolfe Island. Would like to know where the project can be relocated so that it will not destroy the wonderful environment of Amherst Island as well as the Mainland opposite it. Will you provide guaranteed property valuation agreements for us an compensation in the event that values go down?	Thanked her for questions received at the first public open house as well as the questionnaire received on December 12 2012. Stated that the modern turbines produce electricity 70-80% of the time but that on average over the course of a year they generate 30% of their maximum theoretical output. Summarized her concerns into 11 main topic areas and stated that these are covered by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 12, 2011	February 29, 2012	117	Identified key issues that need to be addressed as: does the project justify destroying our local environment; do you really believe there will be no impact on property value; and what gives you the right to introduce major viewing pollution to our environment? Requests that the full economics of this project be presented to her. Concerned about loss of	Thanked her for questions received at the first public open house as well as the questionnaire received on December 12 2012. Stated that the modern turbines produce electricity 70-80% of the time but that on average over the course of a year they generate 30% of their maximum theoretical output. Summarized her concerns into 11 main topic areas and stated that these are covered by the attached list of frequently asked questions.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			property value, and negative effects to the environment, view, birds, people, noise, etc.	Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 12, 2011	February 15 2012	201	Identified key issues to be addressed as the cost. Noted information about the local environment, including that there are 26 species of birds that are at risk and that the water table will be affected by the blasting. Would like to know if when property values go down, will our taxes go down as well? Will we be reimbursed for our loss of property value? What can be done if residents are affected by the noise and flicker? If residents become seriously ill, where do they go? What happens when the turbines break down with only a temporary dock? Who is responsible when accidents happen?	Thanked the Friesens for their questions submitted at the Open House and their email sent on January 31. Summarized their items of interests into thirteen categories and indicated that these items were covered by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Provided project contact information for future comments and inquiries.
December 12, 2011	February 24 2012	86	Requests that a formal sit-down meeting be held so that the residents can ask intelligent, probing questions and hear the responses. Identified key issues that need to be addressed as setbacks of the turbines, and the form of the information session. Would like the consultation to be able to result in the relocation of turbines. Not satisfied with the responses provided during the Open House.	Thanked for questions submitted at the public open house and on January 30th via email. Summarized their concerns into 11 main topic areas and indicated that these are addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Stated that the noise model is based on ISO 9613-2 which is a procedure approved by the Ontario Ministry of Environment. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 12, 2011	March 12 2012	198	Identified key issues to be addressed as needing more open "discussion" with those involved and present at the meeting re impact on the community (both pro and con), and that the Project Team should not be quoting statistics if the resources are not available to present to the public. Noted that it is a very small but sensitive eco-system and that many species of birds and their natural habitats will be impacted. Would like to know about the economic cost of building the project, leasing land costs and the return on electricity provided. How many years will it take to see a profit and will hydro bills decrease? Stated that the short-term construction jobs created are not the best solution for a community.	Thanked her for questions received from the first open house. Stated that layout material and all information posted at the public openhouse are available on the project website. Indicated that the project is intended to be a 75 MW capacity and be part of the FIT program. Summarized major concerns into: 1. natural heritage 2. hydro costs 3. community benefits Indicated that these concerns are addressed by the attached FAQ. Provided contact information for future communication
December 12, 2011	February 21, 2012	35	Requests that all the information at the Open House be put online. Identified that the undermining of community health needs to be addressed and that the approval process needs to abide by federal migratory bird regulation. Notes that qualified biologists need to be consulted to protect the birds. Would like to know if there is a guarantee that the turbines project will not adversely affect water volume/quality in any existing island wells. Who is liable if there is damage to property from the turbines? Would like to know if you can guarantee that the Project will not adversely affect the bird and bat populations. Concerned about the owls in Owl Woods and what will be done to protect and preserve this environment.	Thanked for providing comments at public openhouse #1 as well as via letter on December 19, 2011. Stated that all open house material was posted to the project website. The proposed project is a 75 MW contract from the OPA and turbines will be 2.3 MW Siemens model. Responses to questions about hydro costs, turbine specs and impacts to birds bats and groundwater can be found in the attached FAQ. Stated that communication between construction personnel and livestock owners would ensure a minimum level of impact to livestock during construction. Temporary fencing and gates may be necessary around work sites. Stated that following construction all land will be restored to preconstruction conditions. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 12, 2011	February 24, 2012	21	Would like to know why there is no concern about increased bird and bat kills. Noted that there was no real info about bad health effects. Identified key issues that need to be addressed as health, water supply, destruction of beauty and bird migration routes.	Thanked her for her questions submitted at the open house as well as on December 12, 2011. Stated that her correspondence raise the following main points and concerns:1. turbine specifications2. construction and operations3. roads4. employment opportunities5. health effects6. water7. natural environment8. life of the projectStated that these concerns are addressed by the attached FAQ document. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 14, 2011	April 19, 2013	77	Identified key issues that need to be addressed as noise and health impacts, property values and impact to migratory birds. Would like additional information on cost of total project, individual turbine, average rent paid to land owner, impact to property value on Wolfe Island, length of contract with Ontario Hydro, price paid by Ontario Hydro per kWh	Thanked the correspondent for the questions submitted at the open house. Stated that her correspondence raise the following main points and concerns: 1. Natural environment and migratory birds; 2. Project cost and economics; 3. Landowner lease agreements; 4. Property values; and,

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				5. Health. Stated that these concerns are addressed by the attached FAQ document. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 15, 2011	February 21, 2012	35	Identified key issues that need to be addressed as impact to bird population, and all reg and leg requirements are met. Concerned about the tension this project has created within the community. Doesn't feel the REA process is transparent, would like to know who makes the decisions regarding the approval of this project. Would also like to know the efficiency levels of the turbines, if there will be an impact to their hydro bills, what is the actual capacity of the turbines.	Thanked for providing comments at public openhouse #1 as well as via letter on December 19, 2011. Stated that all open house material was posted to the project website. The proposed project is a 75 MW contract from the OPA and turbines will be 2.3 MW Siemens model. Responses to questions about hydro costs, turbine specs and impacts to birds bats and groundwater can be found in the attached FAQ. Stated that communication between construction personnel and livestock owners would ensure a minimum level of impact to livestock during construction. Temporary fencing and gates may be necessary around work sites. Stated that following construction all land will be restored to preconstruction conditions. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 16, 2011	March 5 2012	12	Identified key issue that needs to be addressed as the impact to the bird populations, especially owls. Would like a guarantee that there will be no impacts to health, property values, or bird and wildlife populations. Concerned about the negative effect the project has had on the community.	Thanked them for questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized them into six main categories: 1. natural environment 2. health effects 3. property values 4. noise 5. shadow flicker 6. setbacks Indicated that these topics are covered by the attached Frequently asked Questions. Requested that the name and contact information of the construction company that they stated they knew be passed along to the project for consideration. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 16, 2011	April 19, 2013	147	Not in support of the project. Identified key issues that need to be addressed as impact to Owl population, property values, aesthetics, placement of turbines in relations to homes and schools. Concerned about impacts from vibrations, noise and flicker, impact to property values, and aesthetics of the turbines	Thanked the correspondent or questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized them into the following categories: 1. Property values; 2. Noise; 3. Shadow flicker; 4. Setbacks; 5. Property values; 6. Visual effects; and, 7. Natural environment including birds and Owl woods. Indicated that these topics are covered by the attached Frequently asked Questions. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 16, 2011	February 29 2012	174	Not in support of the project. Identified key issues that need to be addressed as impact to Owl population, bird migration paths and property values. Feels the island is too small for turbines. Would like to know if Client will purchase their property at current market value as concerned about the impact to property value.	Thanked her for her questions submitted at the first public open house. Summarized concerns into the following: 1. traffic 2. emergency response plan 3. natural environment including birds and the owl woods 4. visual effects 5. property values 6. landowner lease agreements 7. setbacks 8. ploughing for the stage 2 archaeological assessment Stated that responses to the concerns could be found in the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 16, 2011	February 29, 2012	114	Identified issues that need to be addressed as impacts to health and the environment. Concerned about the impacts to bird populations and migratory paths. Concerned about the proximity of turbines S30, S26, S18 & S13 to the Owl Woods.	Thanked them for questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized concerns into the following topics: 1. Electrical interconnection 2. natural environment

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				3. health and safety 4. ground/well water Stated that responses to these concerns could be found in the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 19, 2011	March 12, 2012	183	Would like regular communication and updates on the project	Thanked them for comments submitted during the openhouse and provided a list of Frequently asked Questions and project contact information
December 19, 2011	March 12 2012	153	Not in support of the project. Concerned about the aesthetic impact of the turbines on the community and the proximity of the turbines to the community and residents. Upset about the impact of the project to the community dynamic.	Thanked her for questions and comments submitted during the public openhouse. Summarized main themes of correspondence into natural heritage and setbacks. Indicated that these themes are addressed by attached frequently asked questions. Provided contact information for future correspondence.
December 23, 2011	April 19, 2013	16	Resident of Amherst Island noted that the public meeting did not meet his information needs, as it had no info on effects on flora or fauna nor on shadow effect. Identified that the key issues that need to be addressed are setbacks and spacing. Noted that Amherst Island is an Important Bird Area, and there are only four in Ontario. Requests that a sun and moon study be conducted with specific parameters that he outlined. Asked questions about the power consumption of one turbine as well as the power requirements for the complete Project installation on Amherst Island. He would also like to know about how the turbines will be serviced once cranes and the barge are gone and which four turbines are planned to be deleted from the Project.	Thanked the correspondent for the questions submitted during the first public openhouse. Summarized concerns into the following topics: 1. Natural environment, migratory birds, IBA; 2. Construction and operations; 3. Power consumption 4. Setbacks; and, 5. Shadow flicker. Stated that responses to these concerns could be found in the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries. With respect to your query on turbine power consumption, typical power consumption of a turbine while it is not yawing is 0.8kW. During the brief period that it is yawing, the power consumption increases to 20kW.
January 3, 2012	April 19, 2013	175	She noted that not all questions were answered satisfactorily. Identified the key issues to be addressed as distance from residents, health concerns/issues, efficiency, and cost effectiveness. Provided information about the Important Bird Area on the Island and the ability to find 8 different species of owl in one day. Identified questions on reducing bird and bat mortality, reducing noise from turbines, involvement with the turbines in 5, 10 and 15 years, the projected profit from turbines in Ontario, and whether any of the Project Team live near a turbine.	Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project
January 3, 2012	April 19, 2013	150	Concerned about the visual obstruction of the turbines and the impact on sight-seeing and wildlife photography on the Island. Concerned that the Project will jeopardize his enjoyment of the area.	All of the material that was on display at the public open houses, including maps, display boards and literature, is available on the project website: www.amherstislandwindproject.com
January 3, 2012	April 19, 2013	82	He is not pleased about hearing the plans late in the process. Identified key issues to be addressed as birds and bats, etc., aesthetics, noise, economic impacts, government subsidies, social implications, agricultural and other concerns. Provided information on the local environment: major migration flyway, habitat for endangered species, groundwater concerns, property values in real terms. Concerned about property values and wind turbines putting habitat in jeopardy.	Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
February 2, 2012	April 19, 2013	32	Noted that she does not want to look out of her window and see turbines, not does she want to hear them and feel them. Concerned that all the experts that have been quoted have been hired/approached by Windlectric, as they have hired them, their findings will reflect what the company wants them to say/find. Key issues that need to be addressed were identified as setbacks (schools, shorelines at least 1000 m), and health (ADHD, autism & epilepsy) conditions intensifying. Provided information about the local environment, including shore wells, wells,	Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			septic systems, Parrots Bay, heated cables from wells to property. Had questions regarding where temporary docks would be located, traffic studies, property values, compensation, vibrations and noise from the turbines, expert reports from the township, and safety during construction for people on the Island.	
February 2, 2012	April 19, 2013	78	He stated that he was unable to attend the meeting as he was at work. He heard that the public open house was sales people selling a product with no drawbacks discussed. Key issues to be addressed were noted as the placement of turbines in view of residences. Concerned about noise and vibration from turbines. Also concerned regarding disruption of traffic and how property values will be affected.	Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
December 13, 2011	February 15, 2012	26	Requested GPS coordinates of all proposed turbine locations, as well as copies of all photos including those available at the centre table during the open house. Indicated that he would prefer digital copies of this information.	Stated that UTM coordinates for turbine sites could be found on the project website, as well as maps for public viewing and all information from the open houses. Stated that the substation is located in accordance with O.Reg 359/09. There is no anticipated stray voltage or vibration issues associated with the transformer substation. Stated that the remainder of his questions are covered by the attached FAQ
December 13, 2011	February 17, 2012	134	Would like to know how far in advance of Public Meeting #2 notification must be given. Would also like clarification about how far in advance of Public Meeting #2 revised documents must be available and how stakeholders will be notified of the availability of this material. Would like confirmation that the earliest the second stakeholder meeting could be held is May 2012, Would like to know how many kilometers of roads would be built on the island as a result of the project, according to the current plan.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the Open House as well as questions emailed on December 13th and January 2nd. Summarized her main concerns into the topics of stray voltage, public consultation and roads. Indicated that these concerns were addressed in the attached frequently asked questions. Stated that the minimum period of advance notice for the final Public Open house is 60 days and that this Open House will likely occur in August 2012, stated that the locations of REA application materials will be made available when the notification for the final public meeting is given. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
December 13, 2011	April 19, 2013	95	James requested records of the noise tests for the type of IWT that are planned for Amherst Island.	Provided the correspondent with an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. You can also find the complete Noise Assessment Report on the Project website within the Draft Design and Operations Report.
December 15, 2011	December 16 2011	70	Stantec contacted the correspondent to request permission to conduct a winter raptor survey on her property on December 20th or 21st. Stantec apologized for the short notice and stated that they understood that the correspondent preferred to have a KFN representative in attendance.	Replied to Stantec and stated that the apology for short notice was inadequate. She also stated that the presence of a KFN representative was not a preference it is a requirement. Requested that AP representatives ask for permission each time they would like to enter her property. Stated that she must consult with KFN before allowing project representatives on her property, and stated that until her consent is given if a project representative is found on the property she will press criminal charges. Stated that she is disgusted with plans to site turbines close to Owl Woods.
December 15, 2011	February 21, 2012	176	Emailed to discuss property values in relation to the information presented on storyboards at the December Open Houses. Stated that the information presented asserted that there would be no impact on value of properties within the view shed of the project or between properties a variety of distances from turbine locations. Contrasted this information with information presented by the CBC on October 1, 2011. This information stated that real estate associations have found a reduction in the number of interested buyers for properties in the view shed of turbines and that this has reduced the price of these homes. It also discussed families who were forced to abandon their homes because there were no interested buyers. Also referred to documents showing property value	Thanked correspondent for his questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. In addition, Windlectric indicated that it stands by the benefits outlined at the open house and indicated that a recalculation of municipal property tax payments had been made and clarification is available on the project website. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Stated that no pre construction inspection of homes will occur as it is not anticipated that damage will be caused to homes during construction. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			loss of properties near wind projects which were purchased and resold by hydro companies. Peter discussed the statement by MP Scott Reid that the property values of homes situated near wind developments will decrease. Requested that the Company sign agreements with landowners guaranteeing the value of their homes.	
December 17, 2011	February 21, 2012	176	Emailed to seek clarification regarding a story board from the open house entitled "benefits of the project". Does not believe that energy created by the project is insignificant in contributing to the forecasted energy demands of the province both due to the size of the project and the level of efficiency of wind turbines. Feels that the project does not support being good neighbours because he feels there is too much secrecy imposed on participating landowners. Feels that the project does not present an opportunity for local employment and states that the Wolfe island project employs three people. States that the majority of taxes collected from the project will go to the county and the value is lower than what has been estimated. Would like to know what roadway improvements are being proposed and if these are to be considered benefits. Concluded by stating that he feels the benefits attributed to the project are trivial, insubstantial, misleading and wrong. Would like to know when AP will be issuing a revised statement about the benefits to the public.	Thanked correspondent for his questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. In addition, Windlectric indicated that it stands by the benefits outlined at the open house and indicated that a recalculation of municipal property tax payments had been made and clarification is available on the project website. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Stated that no pre construction inspection of homes will occur as it is not anticipated that damage will be caused to homes during construction. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
December 17, 2011		95	James forwarded a video about a landowner who participated in an industrial wind project and became opposed to the project after it was in operation, the title of the video is "The truth about wind turbines noise and flicker"	No response required. Information only.
December 18, 2011	February 21, 2012	176	Wrote to question the information provided in an Open House storyboard entitled "Site Selection". He quoted statements by CANWEA President Sean Whittaker that turbines cannot be sited near endangered species or migratory bird areas. Questions why the project has selected Amherst, as he says it is home to many endangered species and is a migratory bird area. Questions the statement by Algonquin Power that the island has a good wind regime, citing information from the Ontario Wind Map. Questions the statement that there is landowner interest, stating that most island residents do not want the wind farm on the island. He feels the island does not offer a compatible land use for turbines, and that the road infrastructure will not support the project.	Thanked correspondent for questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
December 18, 2011		95	James forwarded an article titled "The Bruce McPherson infrasound and low frequency noise study" which study the noise and health effects from a Vestas V82 turbine.	No response required. Information only.
December 18, 2011	April 19, 2013	209	Would like for someone at Algonquin Power to provide measurements of the distance to each of the six turbines located near their house.	Provided an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. Scaled maps showing the location of turbines relative to surrounding features can be found in the Project Description Report..
December 19, 2011	February 15, 2012	26	Requested that GPS coordinates of all turbines and areas of special interest as well as JPEG images of the images in open house photo books for specific proposed turbine sites be sent to him as per his previous request. Indicated that plans show a transformer substation to be placed within 300 meters of his house, and has concluded that this will	Stated that UTM coordinates for turbine sites could be found on the project website, as well as maps for public viewing and all information from the open houses. Stated that the substation is located in accordance with O.Reg 359/09. There is no anticipated stray voltage or vibration issues associated with the transformer substation. Stated that the remainder of his questions are covered by the attached FAQ

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			be sited based on noise restrictions rather than distance restrictions. States that the noise testing methods used by the project are flawed and would like to know if the project will relocate the substation to a greater distance if it is built and exceeds acceptable noise levels. Stated that he would be commissioning an independent noise assessment once the substation has been built.	
December 19, 2011	February 21, 2012	36	Sheep farmers with a flock of 1500 currently, projected to grow to 3500 within a year. Concerned about the grazing of their animals on approximately 500 acres of land with which the landowners have signed turbine lease agreements. Concerned about disruption during the construction phase, and the need for them to construct additional fences. Concerned about the need for biosecurity protocols to prevent diseases from entering their flock from off island sources. Requested a protocol to prevent weeds and seeds from being transferred between construction properties, as some plant species on the island are poisonous to sheep. Concerned with the potential that the project could negatively effect the size of their flock, which is their only source of income.	Thanked correspondent for providing comments at public open house #1 as well as via letter on December 19, 2011. Stated that all open house material was posted to the project website. The proposed project is a 75 MW contract from the OPA and turbines will be 2.3 MW Siemens model. Responses to questions about hydro costs, turbine specs and impacts to birds bats and groundwater can be found in the attached FAQ. Stated that communication between construction personnel and livestock owners would ensure a minimum level of impact to livestock during construction. Temporary fencing and gates may be necessary around work sites. Stated that following construction all land will be restored to preconstruction conditions. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
December 19, 2011	April 19, 2013	39	Sent a number of follow up questions relating to her attendance of the December 7th Open house. The letter was sent due to her concern for the people, wildlife and birds in the project area and a general concern for the future of Amherst Island. Christie believes that no turbines should be located east of Marshall 40 feet road in order to protect the Owl Wood. Christie believes that bird and bat kill ratios are not acceptable by any standard.	Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. You can also find the complete Natural Heritage Assessment Report on the Project website which should address your concerns in significant detail.
December 19, 2011		95	James forwarded an article from the Kingston Whig in which John Harrison is quoted extensively refuting the findings of an Ontario government report which states there are no direct health effects to humans from turbines. The article is called "Wind farm report hot air"	No response required. Information only.
December 20, 2011	-	221	Algonquin Power distributed emails and mailed letters thanking attendees of two public open houses in December for participating in the REA process. Both forms of communication stated that all information presented at the open house would be available on the project website and that individual comments and questions which had been submitted would be considered and addressed in a timely manner. Project contact information was provided for any further comments or questions about the project.	No response required. Information only.
December 21, 2011	December 21, 2011	158	Mati responded to an email that was distributed to all attendees of the December open houses. Mati asked to be directed to a map of all proposed turbine sites.	Stantec responded to provide a hyperlink to the location of a map illustrating proposed turbine sites.
December 22, 2011	April 19, 2013	156	Stated that they appreciated the prompt reply to their question posed at the open house (the reply to which they are referring was the acknowledgement of attendance sent December 20th by Algonquin Power). Stated that the response did not sufficiently address their questions. Would like to know if the proposed turbine locations near their property are permanent or may be moved elsewhere as this will impact their decision to continue renovating their property for use as summer vacation rental property.	<p>Provided comprehensive responses to all queries in April 19, 2013 letter. Appreciated comments and concern about the effect wind turbines may have on health condition. As presented in the recent public open houses health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsik Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents</p> <p>The current project as proposed will meet the requirements of Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the Green Energy Act, which ensures a project must be sited at least 550 meters from non-participating receptors (residences) provided a cumulative sound level does not exceed 40 dB(A).</p>

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				<p>Other correspondence listed the following items of interest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project location; 2. Setbacks; 3. Shadow flicker; 4. Construction activities and impacts; 5. Noise; 6. Traffic; 7. Visual Effects; 8. Landowner lease agreements; and, 9. Complaint response protocol. <p>Enclosed a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on the topics listed above. Windlectric has created a list of common questions/concerns (similar to your questions) raised by stakeholders and has developed general responses to those inquiries. These responses will be made available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate.</p>
December 30, 2011	February 17, 2012	72	<p>Concerned about the truck traffic related to the transport cement for the project construction. Would like to know if provisions have been made so that residents can travel to the ferry unencumbered by this traffic. Concern about the need for trucks to cross Front Road.</p>	<p>Thanked correspondent for comments submitted during the Open House as well as on December 30th, January 30th and February 6th. Thanked her for forwarding the CRCA report. Summarized concerns into 11 main areas and indicated that they were addressed by the attached set of frequently asked questions. Responded to a question about uncertainty in noise modelling by stating that ISO 9613-2 is the methodology used for this calculation, as is approved by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment. Provided the definition for a water body as stated in O.Reg 359/09. Provided contact information for the project for future inquiries.</p>
January 2, 2012	February 21, 2012	176	<p>Had several questions related to the story board shown at the open house titled "Project Components". The questions were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the plan for providing concrete for turbine foundations? Where will the water for the concrete come from? What volume of truck traffic, especially cement trucks, will be expected on the island during construction? 2. What is the plan for disposal of surplus excavated material? 3. What is the plan for dust control during construction? If water is to be used to control dust what is the planned water source? 4. Would like for the project to provide a written guarantee to Loyalist Township that culturally significant Irish stone walls will remain in situ and not be disturbed by project construction. <p>Suggests that Algonquin Power take into consideration that many landowners do not want this project, and withdraw from the proposed area.</p>	<p>Thanked correspondent for questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.</p>
January 2, 2012	February 17, 2012	134	<p>Forwarded an invitation to a presentation about the adverse health effects of industrial wind to be held on the island on January 8th, 2012. Invited Algonquin Power and Intrinsic representatives to attend and indicated that the event was sponsored by the Association to Protect Amherst Island.</p>	<p>Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the Open House as well as questions emailed on December 13th and January 2nd. Summarized her main concerns into the topics of stray voltage, public consultation and roads. Indicated that these concerns were addressed in the attached frequently asked questions. Stated that the minimum period of advance notice for the final Public Open house is 60 days and that this Open House will likely occur in August 2012, stated that the locations of REA application materials will be made available when the notification for the final public meeting is given. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.</p>
January 2, 2012		106	<p>Provided a summary of the question and answer resulting from his attendance at the open houses. He also provided a report on noise for the project. Indicated that he does not believe that the project will be approved on the basis of non-compliance with noise requirements.</p>	<p>No response required. Information only.</p>
January 3, 2012	January 5, 2012	150	<p>Was unable to attend open house and sent comment form to the project mailing address. Believes that the presence of turbines on Amherst Island will be an injustice, visual and otherwise. Does not want the project to jeopardize enjoyment of wildlife on the island and sightseeing opportunities.</p>	<p>Sent response letter thanking for his open house comments and indicating that information displayed at the open houses is available on the project website.</p>

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
January 4, 2012		100	Provided an excel document detailing the results of a Christmas bird survey conducted on the island.	No response required. Information only.
January 5, 2012	February 21, 2012	176	Referenced a letter he had sent to the project dated December 18, 2011. He inquired about why Amherst Island has been determined a good site for this project. Quoted testimony from Sean Whittaker stating that turbines can not be sited near bird migration areas. Stated that Amherst Island has been designated an Important Bird Area. Would like know what Algonquin Power considers to be a significant enough protected area as described by Mr. Whittaker's statement.	Thanked correspondent for questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. In addition, Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
January 6, 2012	February 21, 2012	176	Forwarded a hyperlink to an article regarding wind turbines in Britain that have been destroyed or caught fire during storms with high winds. Peter stated that he would be sending questions to Algonquin shortly regarding their plans for responding to turbine fire emergencies.	Thanked correspondent for questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
January 6, 2012	June 19, 2012	37	Stated that they have plans to construct a house near the back of their lot on South Shore Concession of Amherst Island (Lot 12, 78 acres). Also plan to construct solar panels and potentially a small wind turbine on the property. Indicated that they will be pursuing these ideas with the municipality. Requested comments from the project team and would be happy to discuss the plan with Algonquin Power	Thanked them for correspondence received on January 9, 20, February 14 and June 11. Indicated that at the time of creation of the draft site plan no permits had been filed or approved for the construction planned by the Papertzians at Lot 12 South Shore Concession. Stated that proposed turbine location S13 will remain static, in accordance with O. Reg 359/09. Summarized additional items of interest:1. ground vibrations during operations2. shadow flicker3. setbacks4. owls and important bird areas5. turbine sound levelProvided project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided project contact information for future inquiries.
January 7, 2012	February 21, 2012	176	Notice that Algonquin Power will shortly be receiving a letter with a question about what protection from fire Algonquin will be building into the industrial wind-turbine complex proposed for Amherst Island	Thanked correspondent for questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
January 7, 2012	February 21, 2012	176	Concerned about the proximity of proposed turbine locations to homes on the island, and the possibility of nacelle fires in turbines. He is concerned that there may be potential for turbine fires to damage property and endanger residents. Peter would like to know if fire extinguishing systems will be built into the nacelle of each turbine. Peter is also concerned that local fire fighting crews and equipment would be inadequate to address potential turbine fires, he would like to know what plans are being made to address turbine fire emergencies from the ground. Peter would like to know what measures will be taken to ensure that old tree growth is not damaged during project construction. Will an arborist be provided by Algonquin to assess the extent to which trees on the island must remain untouched by the project? In the event that trees must be removed, will Algonquin replace these trees with mature indigenous trees immediately following construction?	Thanked correspondent for questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
January 9, 2012	June 19, 2012	37	Concerned about ground vibrations due to operation of wind turbines in thinly bedded limestone. Would also like to know why the setback distance that was quoted for their property at the recent Open House was to a receptor close to the shore road. Stated that this setback (according to their reading of O.Reg.359/09) should have been to the centre of our 78 acre lot.	Thanked them for correspondence received on January 9, 20, February 14 and June 11. Summarized additional items of interest: 1. ground vibrations during operations 2. shadow flicker 3. setbacks 4. owls and important bird areas 5. turbine sound level Provided project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided project contact information for future inquiries.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
January 10, 2012	April 19, 2013	144	Advising the project of intentions to build three homes on building lots they own on Amherst Island. Indicated that the homes directly north of Gary Osborne's lot would be sited as close as is permitted to Front Road due to the grade of the lots. Requested assurance that siting of turbines will not affect their intent to build these homes.	Thanked the correspondent for questions and information submitted at the initial public open house and provided a copy of an updated Frequently asked Questions pertaining to his comments.
January 17, 2012	January 31, 2012	74	Representing the Association to Protect Amherst Island, Eric provided information regarding potential health effects relating to Industrial Wind Turbines. Quoted evidence and expert testimony from the 2011 Ontario Environmental Tribunal Review as well as the World Health Organization, supporting the position that indirect health and psychological effects can be caused by wind turbines located close to residents. Stated that Algonquin could be viewed as negligent if this information is not disclosed to stakeholders through the REA process.	Acknowledged receipt of the letter and stated that the information provided would be taken into consideration during the REA process.
January 17, 2012	February 15, 2012	83	Would like more public information to be available on the project website, specifically items such as access and transportation plans.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at public open house and on January 17 2012. Indicated that potential effects on traffic and roads will be covered by the Construction Plan Report and Design and Operations Report. Stated that considerations in the design of turbines account for high wind events and no adverse effects of high winds are expected. Questions about traffic, hydro prices, migratory birds and project schedule are covered by the project FAQ attached. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
January 17, 2012	February 21, 2012	176	Expressed dissatisfaction with the meetings of December 6th and 7th. Indicated that subsequent to the meetings, several letters have been written to Algonquin Power with no response. This email is intended to summarize the deficiencies identified. With respect to meeting style, would have preferred a group format so that everyone could ask questions and hear the same response. In regards to consultation, feels that consultants conducted themselves in a way that gave the impression that all project decisions had already been made. Indicated that they feel that Algonquin Power has not sufficiently or accurately addressed the issue of human health at the meeting. Felt that information regarding property values was also false and misleading. Felt that when speaking with representatives from Hatch there was a lack of previous knowledge about the status of well water on the island. Also provided a list of questions to which responses have not been provided in past correspondence from Algonquin Power.	Thanked correspondent for questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. Concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
January 19, 2012	June 19, 2012	116	Stated that she attended the open house and is concerned that the project will destroy the serene rural nature of the island and disrupt bird migration. Asked a number of questions including: 1. Will turbines be shut down twice annually during bird migrations? 2. What guarantees are being provided to residents living within the vicinity of turbines that there will be no health effects 3. What is the distance from turbines to the school? 4. What guarantees are being provided that property values will not be impacted by the project? 5. What proof is there that turbines do not have an impact on human health? 6. What is the net carbon reduction that will result from this project? 7. How many jobs will be created for construction? What will be the total number of paid man hours for construction? What is the average rate of pay? 8. How many permanent jobs will be created? At what hourly rate? 9. What are the plans for dismantling and disposal of turbines once they have reached their end of life?	Thanked correspondent for letters submitted on December 6th and May 11. Summarized comments and concerns into 10 main areas: 1. health and safety 2. setbacks 3. property values and compensation 4. noise 5. natural environment 6. decommissioning 7. community benefits 8. project economics 9. traffic management 10. turbine to close to school Provided project frequently asked questions to address these areas, and indicated the project commitment to the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
January 19, 2012	June 19, 2012	55	Stated that this question had been sent to Algonquin previously with no response. Quoted statements made by Mr. Whittaker relating to siting of turbines near endangered species. Would like to know what Algonquin defines as a significant enough protected area as CANWEA's V.P. Policy has described? Would like to know why Amherst has been selected for this project, taking into consideration the above information.	Thanked correspondent for comments submitted on January 19th. Indicated that she was interested in comments made by Mr. Whittaker and considerations of the natural environment and the IBA. Provided the project frequently asked questions to address her comments. Indicated the project commitment to the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries
January 20, 2012	June 19, 2012	37	Requested response to previous questions. Additional question regarding setback distances. Quoted REA statement that turbines with a noise level of 105 dBA are required a setback of 850 meters, would like to know why project setbacks are 550 meters. Also inquired as to why the hunting grounds beside owl woods are not considered when calculating the setback distance from the woods.	Thanked them for correspondence received on January 9, 20, February 14 and June 11. Summarized additional items of interest: 1. ground vibrations during operations 2. shadow flicker 3. setbacks 4. owls and important bird areas 5. turbine sound level Provided project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided project contact information for future inquiries.
January 21, 2012	April 19, 2013	137	Inquired as to whether the project was still accepting open house comments. Would like to know whether horizontal axis or vertical axis turbines are being considered for the project. Stated that vertical axis turbines are preferable because they cause fewer bird deaths.	Provided a updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. Additionally, the Turbine Specification Report, available on the project website provides a detailed description of the wind turbines proposed for the Project.
January 22, 2012		107	Offered to rent their house at 6550 3rd Concession to the project for use during construction. The price per day for the rental was quoted at \$300.	No response required. Information only.
January 25, 2012	April 19, 2013	81	Concerned about their solar panels in the field west of S15 and S24. Indicated that they have plans to build in that field in the future. Requested a meeting be scheduled in the near future to discuss these issues.	Provided the correspondence with the following information: Impacts to solar project – in discussion with the project engineering subject matter experts it is believed that there would be minimal (if any) effects on your solar panels. Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
January 27, 2012	February 17, 2012	98	Requested that four turbines near owl woods and the turbine located near the school be taken into consideration. Indicated that these turbines will be detrimental to community and to the species that live in the owl woods.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the Open House, as well as on December 10th and January 27th. Summarized the main topic points to be addressed and indicated that these were covered by the attached FAQ list. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
January 27, 2012	February 17, 2012	194	Feels that the project will ruin the beauty and threaten birds and bats. Stated that the health effects of the turbines are unknown and that they are too noisy and cause flicker.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the Open House as well as questions emailed on January 27th. Summarized questions into nine main subject categories and indicated that they were addressed by the attached frequently asked questions. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
January 27, 2012	February 21, 2012	176	Referenced letter from solicitor Mr. Gillespie, and used the turbine sited nearest the school as an example. Requested that the turbines sited within 2 kilometers of the school be removed from the project.	Thanked correspondent for his questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
January 27, 2012	August 24, 2012	81	As a follow up to discussions with Sean Fairfield regarding his intent to build on his property, Provided more detailed descriptions of his plans to build on his property. This email included a satellite image of their property and the probable build locations. Requested that these plans be	Stated that there was a delay in responding due to the need for environmental assessment field work to determine if the turbines could be moved further from the proposed building site, and discussion with the Ministry of the Environment for the planned movement of the two turbines. Indicated that the turbines have been moved to comply with the minimum setback requirements. Provided project contact information for future concerns or

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			considered in turbine siting. Stated that turbine shadows will block existing solar panels on their property, and cause them to lose income from their micro FIT contract.	questions.
January 28, 2012		49	Indicated that there are five specific turbine locations which significantly increase community dissatisfaction with the project. These are: the location closest to the school (S06), and the locations north and south of the owl woods (S26, S30, S13, S18). Stated that these turbine locations will be detrimental to the bird species living in the owl woods. Requested that these sites be removed from the project.	No response required. Information only.
January 28, 2012		171	Stated that health concerns have not been adequately addressed and that siting turbines on the island will have negative effects on the bird population. Strongly objects to the locations of turbines S06, S26, S30, S1 and S18.	No response required. Information only.
January 29, 2012	April 19, 2013	13	Would like to know: 1. How much oil is in each turbine? 2. How often must oil be changed? 3. What is done with the used oil? 4. If oil is spilled, who cleans it up and how? 5. If an oil spill damages people's land will Algonquin Power provide compensation?	Provided a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
January 29, 2012	April 19, 2013	13	Would like to know:1. What amount of concrete is in each turbine base?2. What are the dimensions of the concrete pad?3. What method will be used to excavate the rock for the concrete pads?4. What will be done with the rock and earth that has been excavated?	Provided a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
January 29, 2012	April 19, 2013	13	Would like to know: 1. What is the life expectancy of one turbine for the project? 2. How was this life expectancy determined? 3. Who is responsible for taking turbines down at the end of their useful life?	Provided a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
January 29, 2012	April 19, 2013	13	Stated that information about existing road infrastructure on the island is false. Would like to know what Algonquin Power intends to do about clarifying this information for the public. Would like to know what type of changes are planned for roadways in order to allow transportation of turbine components.	Provided a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
January 29, 2012	April 19, 2013	13	Requested that information be provided about how Algonquin Power plans to ensure there are no detrimental effects from construction on the island groundwater and wells.	Provided a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
January 29, 2012	April 19, 2013	13	1. What would be the volume of truck traffic, especially cement mixers, on the island during the project? 2. What are Algonquin's planned mitigation measures for dust and noise during construction and where will Algonquin obtain water for those measures? 3. How many construction related trucks will be on the island at one time? 4. Is Algonquin planning to have turbines installed at one time or in groups?	Provided a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your previous comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			5. What will be the hours of construction activity? 6. Will islanders be notified of plans for blasting? 7. How many months will construction take?	
January 29, 2012	April 19, 2013	13	1. What method will be used to gauge the amount of sound emitted from single and multiple turbines? 2. Will monitoring of sound levels in all homes be constant? 3. What measures will be taken by the project if the sound exceeds 40 dB? 4. If sleep is disturbed due to the turbines, will AP turn off the turbines that are causing a disturbance? 5. How tall were the turbines upon which the original setbacks were based? Will these setbacks be longer since the turbines are taller? Is noise emitted from larger turbines louder than that from smaller ones? Does their noise travel further? 6. How does the pitch of the turbine blade effect the noise emitted? 7. Does ice on the blades effect the noise they make? 8. Can AP guarantee that stray voltage is not an issue or concern? 9. If you are in a house can you hear noise from a turbine 550 meters away? 10. What measures will be taken to help residents effected by light flicker? 11. What is the longest distance these turbines will cast their shadow? 12. What is the project definition of mitigation?	Provided comprehensive responses to all queries in April 19, 2013 letter. Provided a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
January 29, 2012	February 15, 2012	126	Indicated that they have plans to build a home at North Shore Rd. of Amherst Island at civic number 2570, reference pin 451360141 with a ten meter setback from North Shore Concession Road. Request that Algonquin Power provide confirmation of receipt.	Acknowledged correspondence indicating intent to build. Indicated that questions about noise impact assessment methodology, waterfowl and turbine blades are covered by the attached frequently asked questions. Stated that a response to question about solar panels would be generated shortly. Provided project contact information for future questions.
January 29, 2012		106	Indicated that a list of questions has been formulated, to which he has requested a response be provided for each question.	No response required. Information only.
January 29, 2012	April 19, 2013	172	Indicated that a list of questions has been formulated, to which he has requested a response be provided for each question.	Provided a updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
January 29, 2012		172	Stated that health concerns have not been adequately addressed and that siting turbines on the island will have negative effects on the bird population. Strongly objects to the locations of turbines S06, S26, S30, S1 and S18.	No response required. Information only.
January 30, 2012	February 24, 2012	88	Objection to location of Industrial Wind Turbines near Owl Woods (S26, S30,S13 &S18) & Amherst Island Public School (S06) Requested contact information for additional parties that should be contacted with this message.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the public open house and on January 30th via email. Summarized their concerns into 11 main topic areas and indicated that these are addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Stated that the noise model is based on ISO 9613-2 which is a procedure approved by the Ontario Ministry of Environment. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
January 30, 2012	February 24, 2012	9	Come to the conclusion that Algonquin Power cannot be considered a "Good Corporate Citizen" based upon review of the project. Concerned about the proximity of turbine sites to the public school and community centre.	Thanked correspondent for comments submitted at the first public open house and on December 8, January 30th and February 12th. Stated that maps and all information from the public open house are available on the project website. Stated that the project received a 75 MW contract from the OPA and that proposed turbines are Siemens 2.3 MW units. Thanked for the recommendation to post notice at the two ferry docks and this will be taken into consideration for the second open house. Stated that transport Canada will provide input into considerations for lighting of turbines. Summarized concerns into 8 main topics and indicated that these were

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			<p>Would like the four turbines sited nearest to the Owl Woods to be removed from the project because of concern that these will cause high bird mortality. Indicated that a request to have the test tower removed due to its cause of an owl death had been ignored.</p> <p>Stated that they do not feel it is acceptable to have six turbines within 1.5 km of their house. Concerned that this will cause cumulative noise effects and that it will result in lower efficiency of the turbines sited closely together.</p> <p>Would like to know why some landowners are receiving payments from the project yet do not have turbines sited for their property. Concerned that this is a retainer and that a second phase of the project is planned.</p>	<p>covered by the attached list of FAQ. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.</p>
January 30, 2012	February 17, 2012	72	<p>A list of questions:1. Will the hydro poles along 2nd concession have to be moved during construction? Will this cause power disruptions? For what duration?2. Will trees at the edge of the road on 2nd Concession have to be removed?3. If 2nd Concession must be widened, how wide will it be made?4. What will happen to the stone fences at the edge of Emerald 40 and Concession 2?5. What measures will be taken to mitigate dust on 2nd Concession during construction?6. Will drilling and digging during the nesting season for ground nesting birds be avoided?7. Have underground vibrations beneath turbines been investigated? Will any underground vibrations cause disturbance to voles upon which owls and raptors depend? Is there scientific, peer reviewed data to substantiate this claim?</p>	<p>Thanked correspondent for comments submitted during the Open House as well as on December 30th, January 30th and February 6th and forwarding the CRCA report. Summarized concerns into 11 main areas and indicated that they were addressed by the attached set of frequently asked questions. Responded to a question about uncertainty in noise modelling by stating that ISO 9613-2 is the methodology used for this calculation, as is approved by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment. Provided the definition for a water body as stated in O.Reg 359/09. Provided contact information for the project for future inquiries.</p>
January 30, 2012	February 17, 2012	72	<p>Forwarded a copy of the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority Report relating to the project.</p>	<p>Thanked her for comments submitted during the Open House as well as on December 30th, January 30th and February 6th. Thanked her for forwarding the CRCA report. Summarized concerns into 11 main areas and indicated that they were addressed by the attached set of frequently asked questions. Responded to a question about uncertainty in noise modelling by stating that ISO 9613-2 is the methodology used for this calculation, as is approved by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment. Provided the definition for a waterbody as stated in O.Reg 359/09. Provided contact information for the project for future inquiries.</p>
January 30, 2012	June 19, 2012	181	<p>The sound/ 40 dB zones do not appear to have been set with defensible scientific rigour, what model of turbine was used for these studies? How will the sound be independently monitored when the IWTs become operational? What recourse will residents have if the noise requirements are not met? What process must be undertaken for reimbursement of damages by Algonquin Power? Does not believe that the island has sufficient wind to support the project, indicated that the letter from Eric Gillespie be read before the project proceeds.</p>	<p>Thanked him for correspondence received during the public open house as well as on January 30, February 2 and 16, May 8 and May 14. Summarized comments and questions into 9 main areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. property values 2. decommissioning 3. impacts to homes and properties 4. natural heritage 5. noise assessment 6. compensation 7. health 8. adequacy of size of land mass for project 9. turbine lighting <p>Provided a copy of the project frequently asked questions which addresses the 9 categories listed. Provided project contact information for future comments and questions.</p>
January 30, 2012	February 24, 2012	9	<p>Come to the conclusion that Algonquin Power cannot be considered a "Good Corporate Citizen" based upon review of the project.</p> <p>Concerned about the proximity of turbine sites to the public school and community centre.</p> <p>Would like the four turbines sited nearest to the Owl Woods to be removed from the project because of concern that these will cause high</p>	<p>Thanked correspondent for comments submitted at the first public open house and on December 8, January 30th and February 12th. Stated that maps and all information from the public open house are available on the project website. Stated that the project received a 75 MW contract from the OPA and that proposed turbines are Siemens 2.3 MW units. Thanked for the recommendation to post notice at the two ferry docks and this will be taken into consideration for the second open house. Stated that transport Canada will provide input into considerations for lighting of turbines. Summarized concerns into 8 main topics and indicated that these were covered by the attached list of FAQ. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.</p>

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			<p>bird mortality. Indicated that a request to have the test tower removed due to its cause of an owl death had been ignored.</p> <p>Stated that they do not feel it is acceptable to have six turbines within 1.5 km of their house. Concerned that this will cause cumulative noise effects and that it will result in lower efficiency of the turbines sited closely together.</p> <p>Would like to know why some landowners are receiving payments from the project yet do not have turbines sited for their property. Concerned that this is a retainer and that a second phase of the project is planned.</p>	
January 31, 2012	February 8, 2012	11	Concerned about the project and provided questions grouped under the topics of setbacks, health and safety, and homeowners.	Responded to thank Ann for her correspondence to date and to indicate that her contact information for Sean Fairfield is correct.
January 31, 2012	April 19, 2013	34	Would like Algonquin Power to consider removing several turbines from the site plan including: S06, S26, S30, S13 and S18. Since these turbines are taller than the ones originally proposed, will the noise emitted from these be louder than from the smaller ones? If so, will the noise travel farther, in which case should this not have been taken into account when determining the setback distance?	Provided a updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
January 31, 2012	August 24, 2012	81	Provided clarification that the 'guest house' that was referred to in a previous email is actually intended to be a 3-4 person dwelling with washroom facilities that will be used year round during the construction of their farm house. Requested that the closest turbine be moved back to the appropriate setback distance.	Stated that there was a delay in responding due to the need for environmental assessment field work to determine if the turbines could be moved further from the proposed building site, and discussion with the Ministry of the Environment for the planned movement of the two turbines. Indicated that the turbines have been moved to comply with the minimum setback requirements. Provided project contact information for future concerns or questions.
January 31, 2012	June 19, 2012	121	Request that consideration be given to removing turbine S06, which is planned to be located behind the public school. Requested that the turbine be removed from the plan completely, or moved to a setback distance of 2 kilometers. Concerned about potential accidents with ice throw and turbine collapse. Worried about effects on children within the autism spectrum.	<p>Thanked correspondent for emails submitted on January 31 and February 1. Summarized her comments into 5 main areas of interest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distance of turbines from school 2. Draft site plan 3. Emergency response plan 4. ice throws 5. health and safety <p>Provided the project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future inquiries.</p>
January 31, 2012	February 17, 2012	201	Concerned about turbine locations in the vicinity of the owl woods and the school. Concerned that turbines in these locations will kill birds and harm children.	Thanked correspondents for their questions submitted at the Open House and their email sent on January 31. Summarized their items of interests into thirteen categories and indicated that these items were covered by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Provided project contact information for future comments and inquiries.
January 31, 2012	March 5, 2012	130	Identified specific turbine sites of concern in the draft plan. These included: S06 - the turbine nearby the school, S13 S18 S26 and S30 - turbines located adjacent to the Owl Woods. Additionally, object to S04 on lot 21 as it is the minimum distance from their house. Feel that their property should be treated as a Significant Wildlife Habitat because it is naturalized and provides good hunting habitat for raptors, as such have requested a setback of 120 meters from their property line.	Thanked correspondent for questions received at the first public open house as well as on January 30th. Summarized concerns into 14 main areas and indicated that these were addressed by the attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Regarding project effects on hunters, access roads and turbines are not fenced off and so long as hunters have agreements with landowners they will be able to hunt in properties with turbines. Provided contact information for future inquiries regarding the project.
January 31, 2012	April 19, 2013	47	Concerned about the survival of threatened species of birds. Would like to know if the project is prepared to abandon project sites that threaten bird species. Would like to know how many bird kills are considered within acceptable limits. How have the number of at risk species been assessed?	<p>Provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of S06 - Comments about removing turbine S06 from the project layout will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval consultation report. • Health Effects - Health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsic Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents. • Property Values - Windlectric acknowledges public comments and concerns related to potential property value impacts. Based upon the published reports reviewed to date based on data from other areas with established wind plants, there is little evidence of a material negative effect on property value as a result of the presence of a wind project. A recent decision in 2012 by the Ontario Assessment Review Board ruled that there is no evidence that the presence of a wind farm affected the value of a waterfront property on Wolfe Island located in the Township of Frontenac Islands on Lake Ontario. As a result of their review and subsequent findings, the Board concluded that there was nothing to indicate that the value of the property had been negatively affected by the creation or operation of the wind farm and confirmed the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation's (MPAC) assessment of the property. To date, MPAC's analysis of sales has not indicated that the presence of wind turbines that are either abutting or in proximity to a property has either a positive or negative impact on its value. Enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate.
January 31, 2012	April 19, 2013	156	Stated that they are waiting for an answer to their previous questions. Would like to know what Algonquin Power is doing to ensure that they can still rent their home on 11100 Front Road as a summer rental property. Requested a reply so that they can proceed.	Provided the following information: Appreciated comments and concern about the effect wind turbines may have on health condition. As presented in the recent public open houses health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsic Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents The current project as proposed will meet the requirements of Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the Green Energy Act, which ensures a project must be sited at least 550 meters from non-participating receptors (residences) provided a cumulative sound level does not exceed 40 dB(A). Other correspondence listed the following items of interest:1. Project location;2. Setbacks;3. Shadow flicker;4. Construction activities and impacts;5. Noise;6. Traffic;7. Visual Effects;7.8. Property values;8.9. Landowner lease agreements; and,9.10. Complaint response protocol.Enclosed a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on the topics listed above. Windlectric has created a list of common questions/concerns (similar to your questions) raised by stakeholders and has developed general responses to those inquiries. These responses will be made available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate.
February 1, 2012		13	Shocked to learn that turbines have been sited in the proximity of the Owl Woods. Specifically concerned about turbines S26, S30, S13 and S18. Stated that the average bird kill per turbine on Wolfe island is 13.4 birds per year. Would like to know how AP can contemplate siting turbines on the island.	No response required. Information only.
February 1, 2012	April 19, 2013	25	Concerned about bat mortalities relating to wind farms. Stated that 1270 bats were killed in a six month period at Wolfe island wind farm. Concerned about an epidemic of "white noise syndrome" in bats. Provided suggestions for strategies to reduce bat mortalities at IWT facilities. Would like to know what the company is doing to reduce bat mortalities. Encouraged them to join the Bats and Wind Energy Cooperative.	Provided a updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
February 1, 2012	June 19, 2012	121	Stated that they were under the assumption that crystallization for the project would not happen until the spring. Were supposed to receive information about the crystallization process from a project representative they met at the open house but have not received it. Believe that it was intentionally deceitful that the project crystallization has already occurred.	Thanked correspondent or emails submitted on January 31 and February 1. Summarized comments into 5 main areas of interest: 1. Distance of turbines from school 2. Draft site plan 3. Emergency response plan 4. ice throws 5. health and safety Provided the project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future inquiries.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
February 1, 2012		96	Listed main categories of concern: 1. impact that adjacent property owners will experience 2. Noise and flicker effects and the related health impacts 3. Well water issues from construction 4. Impact of turbines on flora and fauna Requested that the project be cancelled immediately.	No response required. Information only.
February 2, 2012	April 19, 2013	13	Devastated that their retirement home will be surrounded by wind turbines. Would like to know how landowners will be compensated for loss of enjoyment of property. Would like to know if AP will pay for a pre-construction home inspection. Would like to know how loss of property value would be compensated. Will properties damaged by the project be compensated by AP? Is AP willing to sign a property value guarantee?	Provided comprehensive responses to all queries in April 19, 2013 letter. Provided a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your previous comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
February 2, 2012	April 19, 2013	32	1. Where will the temporary dock be located? 2. Have construction traffic studies been done? 3. Is the project prepared to compensate property owners for lost value of properties? 4. Why is compensation only given to property owners with turbines on their land? 5. Will residents be able to be airlifted from the island during and after construction?	Provided a updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
February 2, 2012	June 19, 2012	181	Feels that the 40 dB threshold was not set with a defensible scientific rigour. How will sound levels be monitored once the project is operational? What recourse do citizens have if noise thresholds are exceeded? Requested that the company have a careful look at the letter from Eric Gillespie before the project proceeds.	Thanked correspondent for correspondence received during the public open house as well as on January 30, February 2 and 16, May 8 and May 14. Summarized comments and questions into 9 main areas: 1. property values 2. decommissioning 3. impacts to homes and properties 4. natural heritage 5. noise assessment 6. compensation 7. health 8. adequacy of size of land mass for project 9. turbine lighting Provided a copy of the project frequently asked questions which addresses the 9 categories listed. Provided project contact information for future comments and questions.
February 2, 2012	April 19, 2013	78	Concerned about noise levels and vibrations from turbines. Would like to know how much traffic disruption will be caused by construction and how much property values may decrease.	Provided a updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
February 2, 2012	April 19, 2013	196	Provided a 17 page letter regarding the project to which they would like to have their concerns addressed. Concerned about the lack of openness, the haste with which the project is proceeding and the superficial manner in which health concerns appeared to have been addressed during the first public open house. Major topic concerns were: health and safety, wildlife and habitat, heritage impacts, economic impacts for non-participating residents, turbine and ancillary structures, delivery and installation of turbines and road construction, maintenance and decommissioning, fulfillment of legal obligations, open house concerns, loss of wind subsidies.	Provided a updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. Additionally, all of the Draft Renewable Energy Approval reports are available on the Project website and should provide further explanations related to the concerns raised in your letter.
February 3, 2012	March 12, 2013	101	Provided questions at open house and requested information about the crystallization process. Would like to know why they have not received	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the public open house, on February 3 and February 8. Stated that the preliminary layout and other materials shown at the open house can be found on the project website.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			answers or requested information. Recently heard that crystallization has occurred. Believes that they have received false information and that comments and concerns are being ignored by the project. Would like to know when concerns will be addressed.	Summarized her concerns into 14 main areas and indicated that these are addressed by an attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Stated that tax calculations had been recalculated based on information provided by Loyalist township. No damages are anticipated to private property relating to project construction, however a complaint response protocol will be developed. Stated that the methodology used for natural heritage assessment will be described in the report. Stated if the project is located within 120 meters of a significant environmental feature a study will be conducted to identify potential impacts and processes for mitigation. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
February 5, 2012		56	Opposed to the installation of the project on the island. Concerned about the potential for turbines to obstruct views and create noise and vibration pollution. Believe the property values will decline, would like to know how residents will be compensate for this loss of value. Concerned that the installation will kill birds and bats and result in an increased threat of West Nile Virus.	No response required. Information only.
February 6, 2012	April 19, 2013	43	Close friends of two families that live on the island. Concerned about the health risks to their friends as well as themselves and their children when visiting friends. Would like to know what steps are being taken to protect human health. Would like to know what recourse is available to them should they develop health problems as a result of the project.	Provided a updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
February 6, 2012	June 19, 2012	87	Response to publication of Notice of Draft Site Plan posted in the Kingston Whig on February 2, 2012. Stated that if the project proceeds it will be in his view shed from his waterfront property. Believes that this project will depreciate the value of his property and his quality of life, as well as his enjoyment of his property. Would like to know: 1. what studies have been done to determine adverse impacts to shore front property owners? 2. what compensation is proposed for shore front owners? 3. how will property tax appraisals be adjusted? 4. who else can be contacted with concerns? 5. will the governing bodies of approval for this project have liability for injurious affection inflicted on owners? Will be organizing similarly affected residents so that views can be collectively expressed. Propose to call this collective "Shore Owners of the City of Kingston and Area., "Shock".	Thanked correspondent for email sent on February 6. Summarized main areas of concern: 1. visual impacts 2. property values and compensation 3. complaint response protocol Provided the project frequently asked questions to address these areas of concern. Stated commitment to the REA process and provided contact information.
February 6, 2012	June 19, 2012	11	Would like a reference provided supporting the WHO statement regarding noise thresholds. Believes this threshold was for road, rail and aircraft noise not wind turbine noise. Would like to know if Algonquin Power is willing to act on most recent health data which shows that setbacks of 1000 to 2000 meters are appropriate. If not, why not? Believe that information surrounding health effects was omitted and is misleading.	Thanked her for her correspondence sent on February 6 and 7. Summarized into 5 main areas: 1. Health and safety 2. Setbacks 3. Property values and compensation 4. Noise 5. Interference to TV and/or internet signals and service. Provided frequently asked questions to address concerns. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future inquiries.
February 6, 2012	June 19, 2012	11	How will property owners be compensated for loss of property value due to the siting of turbines within their view shed? Is AP willing to sign a property value guarantee agreement with landowners? Quoted property value compensation information from Danish Energy Agency Energinet.dk. Is there a guarantee that turbines will not interfere with satellite, cell phone or internet reception, and if there is interference how will it be mitigated? If a non-participating landowners home is damaged as a result of turbine operations who will compensate them?	Thanked correspondent for her correspondence sent on February 6 and 7. Summarized into 5 main areas: 1. Health and safety 2. Setbacks 3. Property values and compensation 4. Noise 5. Interference to TV and/or internet signals and service. Provided frequently asked questions to address concerns. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future inquiries.
February 6, 2012	April 18, 2012	23	Received notice of draft site plan and read it in the paper as well.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the public open house as well as on February 6, March 23

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			Concerned that questions posed at the open house had not yet been responded to and wondered when a response could be expected.	and April 17th. Indicated that materials from the open house were available on the project website and information about the REA process could be found on slide 12 of 26. Summarized her questions into five main points: 1. archaeological assessment 2. Shadow flicker 3. extreme weather events including lightening 4. project schedule 5. land owner lease agreement Stated that these topics are addressed in the attached frequently asked questions document. Provide contact information for the project.
February 6, 2012	June 19, 2012	11	Concerned that setback distances are inadequate and would like to know how new information is being incorporated into consideration of these distances.	Thanked correspondent for her correspondence sent on February 6 and 7. Summarized into 5 main areas: 1. Health and safety 2. Setbacks 3. Property values and compensation 4. Noise 5. Interference to TV and/or internet signals and service. Provided frequently asked questions to address concerns. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future inquiries.
February 6, 2012	February 17, 2012	72	Would like to know:1. When can an answer to questions sent on January 30th be expected?2. What is a REA water body?3. Who determines what is and isn't a REA water body?4. What requirements must be met when placing a turbine in an Important Bird Area?5. Do you have to gain regulatory permission to kill birds?6. What will the exact distance between turbine S06 and A.I.P.S. be?	Thanked correspondent for comments submitted during the Open House as well as on December 30th, January 30th and February 6th. Thanked her for forwarding the CRCA report. Summarized concerns into 11 main areas and indicated that they were addressed by the attached set of frequently asked questions. Responded to a question about uncertainty in noise modelling by stating that ISO 9613-2 is the methodology used for this calculation, as is approved by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment. Provided the definition for a water body as stated in O.Reg 359/09. Provided contact information for the project for future inquiries.
February 6, 2012	February 8, 2012	11	Requested that the contact information for Sean Fairfield be confirmed.	Responded to thank for correspondence to date and to indicate that her contact information is correct.
February 6, 2012	June 19, 2012	72	Confused that a second draft plan has been release, as it appears to be the same as the first draft plan. Believe that the concerns raised during the open house were not taken into consideration and the concerns of the CRCA were not considered either. Confused that the number make and location of turbines have not yet been confirmed. Concerned about the location of turbines S30, S26, S18, S13, S28, S33, S12, and S06.	Thanked correspondent for correspondence sent on February 6, 19, 24 and April 21. Summarized correspondence into 6 main areas of interest: 1. community benefits 2. impacts to homes and property 3. decommissioning 4. vibration 5. transportation plans 6. natural heritage Provided the project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future comments and questions
February 6, 2012		98	Angry that project crystallization occurred rapidly. Believes many property owners will not be able to build now due to insufficient funds at this time. Accused AP of having a lack of transparency with respect to the project. Stated that the liaison committee does not represent the interest of the majority of landowners and does not liaise with the community.	No response required. Information only.
February 7, 2012		15	Provided an article regarding residents suffering from negative health effects from turbines.	No response required. Information only.
February 7, 2012	April 19, 2013	22	Would like clarification as to whether or not power lines for the electrical power collection system will be buried. When will this decision be made?	Provided a updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
February 7, 2012	January 22, 2013	188	Would like to know when responses to questions asked at the open	Thanked correspondents for their correspondence and apologized for the lateness of the reply. Indicated that

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			house could be expected	their potential receptor number is R222. Provided information regarding where the design and operations report and noise report could be found. Gave the methodology for receptor identification used for the project. Indicated that their other concerns included project setbacks and health and safety and stated that these were addressed in the attached project FAQ.
February 7, 2012	June 19, 2012	11	Outraged by the project plans. Deliberate siting of turbine at the 40 dB contour of the island school. Concerned about the health effects of turbines. Believes that it is irresponsible to site turbines this close to children, and stated that this constitutes a form of child abuse. Would like to supply sources by McPherson, Salt, Nissenbaum and Pierpont should the project be interested in them.	Thanked correspondent for correspondence sent on February 6 and 7. Summarized into 5 main areas: 1. Health and safety 2. Setbacks 3. Property values and compensation 4. Noise 5. Interference to TV and/or internet signals and service. Provided frequently asked questions to address concerns. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future inquiries.
February 7, 2012	January 22, 2013	188	Received a response to her November 2 and 3rd questions and is responding to express her dissatisfaction with those answers provided. Stated that she did not believe that the responses she received were meaningful. Would like to know why there is secrecy surrounding the project.	Thanked them for their correspondence and apologized for the lateness of the reply. Indicated that their potential receptor number is R222. Provided information regarding where the design and operations report and noise report could be found. Gave the methodology for receptor identification used for the project. Indicated that their other concerns included project setbacks and health and safety and stated that these were addressed in the attached project FAQ.
February 8, 2012		15	Algonquin Power was CC'd on a letter to the Ontario Power Authority appealing to them that the FIT contract for the project is not advisable due to what they believe is an unprofitable site for the generation of wind energy.	No response required. Information only.
February 8, 2012	June 19, 2012	11	Questions the siting of 4 turbines in the vicinity of Owl Woods. Indicated that at least 7 owl species are either resident or breed in these woods. Requested that this be corrected.	Thanked correspondent for correspondence sent on February 6 and 7. Summarized into 5 main areas: 1. Health and safety 2. Setbacks 3. Property values and compensation 4. Noise 5. Interference to TV and/or internet signals and service. Provided frequently asked questions to address concerns. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future inquiries.
February 8, 2012	March 12 2012	101	Provided questions at open house and requested information about the crystallization process. Would like to know why they have not received answers or requested information. Recently heard that crystallization has occurred. Believes that they have received false information and that comments and concerns are being ignored by the project. Would like to know when concerns will be addressed.	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the public open house, on February 3 and February 8. Stated that the preliminary layout and other materials shown at the open house can be found on the project website. Summarized concerns into 14 main areas and indicated that these are addressed by an attached list of Frequently asked Questions. Stated that tax calculations had been recalculated based on information provided by Loyalist township. No damages are anticipated to private property relating to project construction, however a complaint response protocol will be developed. Stated that the methodology used for natural heritage assessment will be described in the report. Stated if the project is located within 120 meters of a significant environmental feature a study will be conducted to identify potential impacts and processes for mitigation. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
February 9, 2012	January 22, 2013	188	Requested clarification regarding Appendix B of the Draft Report regarding the UTM coordinates of noise receptors. Is confused about the coding system relating to noise receptors and would like to know which receptor code belongs to her house. Would like the system for designation to be explained and would like to know why the system was not made more clear so that the information could be used by the residents of the island.	Thanked them for their correspondence and apologized for the lateness of the reply. Indicated that their potential receptor number is R222. Provided information regarding where the design and operations report and noise report could be found. Gave the methodology for receptor identification used for the project. Indicated that their other concerns included project setbacks and health and safety and stated that these were addressed in the attached project FAQ.
February 10, 2012		118	Offered their Café's services in feeding workers for the project. Indicated that a sandwich truck could be arranged.	No response required. Information only.
February 10, 2012		170	Wrote a letter to Mr. Chris Huskison of Emera Inc., appealing that they	No response required. Information only.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			persuade Algonquin Power not to build turbines on Amherst Island. Sited reasons for the project to be discontinued including: 1. hatred of AP by residents 2. the green energy act 3. difficulty for AP to profit 4. bird and bat kills 5. owl woods 6. health of families 7. property devaluation	
February 11, 2012	April 19, 2013	10	Expressed objection to siting of turbines near the school, the owl woods and significant raptor habitat areas. Stated that they feel the company has not been diligent with respect to responding to these concerns. Requested that a response show scientific evidence to suggest that the locations sited for turbines are acceptable near sensitive environments.	Provided a updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
February 11, 2012	June 19, 2012	72	Provided a list of all questions she has sent to date that have not yet received a response.	Thanked correspondent for correspondence sent on February 6, 19, 24 and April 21. Summarized correspondence into 6 main areas of interest: 1. community benefits 2. impacts to homes and property 3. decommissioning 4. vibration 5. transportation plans 6. natural heritage Provided the project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future comments and questions
February 12, 2012	February 24, 2012	9	Would like to know when answers to open house questions will be received. Indicated that two months have passed since questions were submitted.	Thanked correspondent for comments submitted at the first public open house and on December 8, January 30th and February 12th. Stated that maps and all information from the public open house are available on the project website. Stated that the project received a 75 MW contract from the OPA and that proposed turbines are Siemens 2.3 MW units. Thanked for the recommendation to post notice at the two ferry docks and this will be taken into consideration for the second open house. Stated that transport Canada will provide input into considerations for lighting of turbines. Summarized concerns into 8 main topics and indicated that these were covered by the attached list of FAQ. Provided project contact information for future inquiries.
February 13, 2012	February 13, 2012	105	Provided the new mailing address for the Quinte Community Pasture	Thanked Johanne for the updated contact information and indicated that the project mailing list would be updated accordingly.
February 13, 2012	April 19, 2013	156	Indicated that by 2013 they expect to be renting their property full time during the summers. Believe that because they were renting their property out prior to the project commencement that they have legal grounds against the project, but have not confirmed this belief. Would like a formal response from the project to their questions posed in November. Indicated that they cannot wait indefinitely for a response.	Provided the following information. Appreciated comments and concern about the effect wind turbines may have on health condition. As presented in the recent public open houses health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsik Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents The current project as proposed will meet the requirements of Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the Green Energy Act, which ensures a project must be sited at least 550 meters from non-participating receptors (residences) provided a cumulative sound level does not exceed 40 dB(A). Other correspondence listed the following items of interest: 1. Project location; 2. Setbacks; 3. Shadow flicker; 4. Construction activities and impacts; 5. Noise; 6. Traffic;

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				7. Visual Effects; 7.8. Property values; 8.9. Landowner lease agreements; and, 9.10. Complaint response protocol. Enclosed a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on the topics listed above. Windlectric has created a list of common questions/concerns (similar to your questions) raised by stakeholders and has developed general responses to those inquiries. These responses will be made available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate.
February 14, 2012	June 19, 2012	37	Indicated that they asked to receive a response to their letter informing AP of their intention to build sent on January 6th. Stated that they did not receive a response and have received notice of a final draft plan. Stated that they will continue to pursue the construction of their home and hope that AP will honour the set back distance.	Thanked correspondents for correspondence received on January 9, 20, February 14 and June 11. Indicated that at the time of creation of the draft site plan no permits had been filed or approved for the construction planned by the Papertzians at Lot 12 South Shore Concession. Stated that proposed turbine location S13 will remain static, in accordance with O. Reg 359/09. Summarized additional items of interest: 1. ground vibrations during operations 2. shadow flicker 3. setbacks 4. owls and important bird areas 5. turbine sound level Provided project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided project contact information for future inquiries.
February 15, 2012	February 15, 2012	70	Does not wish to obstruct the environmental survey and would like Stantec to contact her if they are interested in performing a survey on her property so that she can arrange for a KFN representative to accompany them. Indicated that if it is too late in the season to undertake a winter raptor study, KFN has objective data available that may be useful	Thanked correspondent and stated that information would be passed to the Natural Heritage group. Stated that she would be contacted if arrangements were required
February 15, 2012	February 21, 2012	176	Does not believe that the Liaison committee is within the requirements of the GEA and believes that the MOE disallow the legitimacy of public open house #1 should and it should be redone	Thanked correspondent for questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
February 15, 2012		200	Would like to be sent a copy of all responses sent to the APAI	No response required. Information only.
February 16, 2012		65	Would like to be added to the contact list. Interested in information about setbacks, bird and bat migration, and economic reasoning for the project.	No response required. Information only.
February 16, 2012	February 21, 2012	176	Does not believe that the Liaison committee is within the requirements of the GEA and believes that the MOE disallow the legitimacy of public open house #1 should and it should be redone	Thanked correspondent for questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. His concerns were grouped into sixteen main categories and these were addressed by the attached list of frequently asked questions. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
February 16, 2012	June 19, 2012	181	Cited information given to him at public open houses that the next public meetings would not be held until July or August. Concerned that the project schedule had accelerated and would like to know how this affects the timing of the next community meeting. Requests a response to his questions submitted at the public open houses. Concerned that information provision has slowed but project crystallization and other project aspects have increased in speed.	Thanked correspondent for correspondence received during the public open house as well as on January 30, February 2 and 16, May 8 and May 14. Summarized comments and questions into 9 main areas:1. property values2. decommissioning3. impacts to homes and properties4. natural heritage5. noise assessment6. compensation7. health8. adequacy of size of land mass for project9. turbine lightingProvided a copy of the project frequently asked questions which addresses the 9 categories listed. Provided project contact information for future comments and questions.
February 18, 2012	April 19, 2013	110	Not satisfied with the list of frequently asked questions received, would like a specific answer to the questions sent. Would like a specific geological answer to questions about how foundations of turbines will affect his drinking well.	Provided the following information:. Impacts of Turbine foundations on domestic wells: • There should be no impact (on drinking water / to groundwater) as a result of the project. Before excavation

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				commences, a geotechnical study is completed at all potential sites for ground water depth as well as to determine necessary parameters required for foundation design. For stability reasons, turbine foundations cannot be built in areas where the ground water is too close to the surface. If water is encountered at any time, good construction practices will be used such as minimizing the length of time that the excavation is open and monitoring seepage during excavation. Should pumping be required to dewater excavated areas, water will be directed to the closest drain or spread across the construction area and appropriate energy dissipation techniques will be used to reduce the potential for erosion and sourcing. It is unlikely that quantities withdrawn will exceed the threshold for the MOE's requirement for a Temporary Permit to Take Water (i.e. >50,000 L per day) let alone negatively affect off-site groundwater quality, quantity, or movement. Concrete used during the building process becomes inert once it is cured and should cause no damage to the water table.
February 19, 2012	June 19, 2012	72	<p>Provided a list of questions including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why are Liaison Committee meeting minutes sketchy or non existent, why? 2. Are Siemens prototype turbines still being considered? 3. Why aren't Ontario built turbines being used? 4. Why was inaccurate tax information initially given? When will these taxes begin being paid? 5. Are projected tax payments considered equitable? 6. Why does Windlectric consider itself to be a good corporate citizen? 7. Is Loyalist Township being compensated for additional workload associated with the project? 8. Will a local craftsman be used to rebuild stone fences? 9. Is it possible for the company to 'walk away' from the project when it is nearing the end of its productivity? 10. What percentage of the project profit/value will be put in the decommissioning fund? 11. What assurance is given that Windlectric will be involved in the project after ten years, when she alleges she was told the deposit into the decommissioning fund will be made. 12. What mitigation steps will be taken to protect owls? 13. Will turbines be shut down at night when owls are active? Would Windlectric expect compensation for this down time? 14. Do or would your staff live within 750 meters of a wind turbine? 15. When can she expect an answer? 	<p>Thanked the correspondent for correspondence sent on February 6, 19, 24 and April 21. Summarized correspondence into 6 main areas of interest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. community benefits 2. impacts to homes and property 3. decommissioning 4. vibration 5. transportation plans 6. natural heritage <p>Provided the project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future comments and questions</p>
February 20, 2012		62	Upset that turbines will affect her view shed. Concerned that the project has divided the community. Concerned about migratory bird kills.	No response required. Information only.
February 21, 2012	February 21, 2012	176	Would like to know if Algonquin has informed the Amherst Island residents who make up part of the Liaison Committee about Mr. Gillespie's letter, and has Algonquin described 'fully and accurately' the health issues related to the proposed Amherst Island project, in accordance with obligations as part of the Renewable Energy Approval process?	Thanked the correspondent for his questions and information submitted at the Public Open house as well as via email on December 10, 15, 17, 18; January 2, 5, 6, 7, 17, 29; and February 15 and 21. Stated that with respect to concerns about social impacts, an assessment of these potential impacts will be made as part of the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries relating to the project.
February 24, 2012	June 19, 2012	72	Thanked Mr. Fairfield for attempting to answer her questions. Feels that some responses are too general or have not been addressed. Resent her previous questions in hopes that they will be answered more satisfactorily.	<p>Thanked the correspondent for correspondence sent on February 6, 19, 24 and April 21. Summarized correspondence into 6 main areas of interest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. community benefits 2. impacts to homes and property 3. decommissioning 4. vibration 5. transportation plans 6. natural heritage <p>Provided the project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future comments and questions</p>

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
February 25, 2012	June 19, 2012	1	Concerned about the project and the future of her home on the island. Asked how homeowners loss of peace and quiet will be addressed as well as the safety of animals and the road widening process. Would like her questions submitted in November to be answered.	Thanked the correspondent for her letter submitted on February 25. Indicated that a response to open house questions submitted had been provided on March 5. Provided a list of frequently asked questions. Stated commitment of the project to the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
February 26, 2012		24	Concerned about wildlife, property values, human health, and economic impacts.	No response required. Information only.
February 27, 2012	February 27, 2012	70	Requested ability to come on her property for a bird survey on March 2nd	Correspondent stated that she would contact Kingston Field Naturalists to see if anyone is available and would let Stantec know as soon as possible.
February 27, 2012	February 27, 2012	126	Provided him with a map of the nearest turbine to his house, S30, and the 500 meter setback surrounding it.	No response required. Information only.
February 29, 2012	February 29, 2012	89	Could not view the pdf file sent to them. Requested that it be sent in a different format.	Provided pdf file again, requested that if the document still could not be opened that they send their mailing address so that they may receive a hard copy.
February 29, 2012		207	Do not believe that wind energy benefits anyone. Object to the turbines and do not want them in their neighbourhood. Believe that the turbines are ugly and noisy, are a waste of land, make people sick and kill wildlife. Stated that the Ontario Federation of Agriculture is also opposed to turbines. Provided documentation regarding the position of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture on wind turbines	No response required. Information only.
March 2, 2012	April 19, 2013	156	Still waiting for a response.	<p>Provided the following information: Appreciated comments and concern about the effect wind turbines may have on health condition. As presented in the recent public open houses health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsic Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents</p> <p>The current project as proposed will meet the requirements of Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the Green Energy Act, which ensures a project must be sited at least 550 meters from non-participating receptors (residences) provided a cumulative sound level does not exceed 40 dB(A).</p> <p>Other correspondence listed the following items of interest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project location; 2. Setbacks; 3. Shadow flicker; 4. Construction activities and impacts; 5. Noise; 6. Traffic; 7. Visual Effects; 8. Landowner lease agreements; and, 9. Complaint response protocol. <p>Enclosed a Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on the topics listed above. Windlectric has created a list of common questions/concerns (similar to your questions) raised by stakeholders and has developed general responses to those inquiries. These responses will be made available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate.</p>
March 2, 2012		173	Stated that does not believe that the responses received were satisfactory or correct. Would like the project to update their information regarding health issues. Would like greater disclosure regarding the contracts that have been signed.	No response required. Information only.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
March 3, 2012		165	Faxed an article pertaining to the position of farm organizations on wind energy	No response required. Information only.
March 5, 2012		151	Algonquin Power representative spoke with correspondent regarding the fencing of construction areas. Explained that no construction activity would be happening in 2012. Stated that prior to construction the project would work with Mark and landowners to arrange for fencing around construction areas. Committed to providing more detailed plans as they are developed.	No response required. Information only.
March 5, 2012		88	Was not satisfied with the frequently asked questions provided as a response to open house questions. Is not satisfied that Windlectric deems some turbine noise as acceptable and that he and his wife will have to endure it. Would like to register their disappointment with the method in which the project consultation and consideration of stakeholder input has been conducted.	No response required. Information only.
March 6, 2012		88	Believe that the requirements for the first public open house were not met. Not satisfied that they were supplied with a list of FAQ in response to their specific questions.	No response required. Information only.
March 9, 2012		29	Interested in catering for the work crews that will be working on the island	No response required. Information only.
March 21, 2012		104	Stated that she feels it is unfair to construct a wind farm in the area. Stated that as a tourist she loves the owls and natural areas. Insinuated that there was bribery involved.	No response required. Information only.
March 23, 2012	April 18, 2012	23	Provided address and indicated that proposed turbine sites are northwest and northeast of her home. Is concerned about potential for shadow flicker. Quoted a statement from another province's wind development website stating that shadow flicker areas could be predicted. Requested a timely response predicting the shadow flicker for her home.	Thanked correspondent for her questions submitted at the public open house as well as on February 6, March 23 and April 17th. Indicated that materials from the open house were available on the project website and information about the REA process could be found on slide 12 of 26. Summarized her questions into five main points: 1. archaeological assessment 2. Shadow flicker 3. extreme weather events including lightening 4. project schedule 5. land owner lease agreement Stated that these topics are addressed in the attached frequently asked questions document. Provide contact information for the project.
March 26, 2012	June 19, 2012	134	Requested information about which side of Second Concession and the Stella Forty-Foot the cable will be laid	Thanked correspondent for correspondence received on March 26. Further detail is not yet available surrounding where the collection line on Second Concession Road and Forty Foot Road will be located. This will be finalized after more consultation with the township. Provided frequently asked questions document, stated commitment to REA process and provided contact information for future correspondence.
March 28, 2012	March 28, 2012	177	Indicated that the proposed site for a turbine would severely limit, or inhibit, the construction of their retirement home on the property opposite their home on 8420 Front Road. Requested that Algonquin Power not be permitted to build the turbine at that proposed location.	Municipality responded to say that the zoning bylaw had been amended so that no new dwelling or house can be built within 500 meters of a waste disposal site and that this will affect their building plans. Also indicated that another of the proposed locations did not fit the road setback common to the planning layout of the area
March 29, 2012	June 19, 2012	152	Concerned that as a large property owner he was not contacted by the proponents or the consultant. Indicated that in the absence of this engagement he will not be cooperating in the construction of turbines on properties adjacent to his. Indicated that he is the owner of the ROW at the front of his property and stated that he will not give consent for a transmission line to be installed there. Indicated that he wishes for the project map to be redrawn to correct this error. Stated that he will not	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted on March 29th. Stated that public consultation will continue to occur for the project through mechanisms including public open houses, liaison committee, website postings and local newspapers. Public consultation will occur regarding use of public roadways and road allowances, and regulations will be followed. Provided the project frequently asked questions. Provided project contact information for future comments and questions

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			permit the use of this roadway for any purpose other than transportation purposes prescribed by law.	
April 2, 2012	-	15	A letter from APAl to dispute and clarify statements made by Michael Gravel of the MNR in a letter to the APAl in March. This included clarifications surrounding public consultation, bird and bat mortality, biodiversity, and habitat degradation. APAl also asked several questions including: 1. Since mitigation is out of the question, will the ministry now recommend that no turbines be built on the island? 2. Why would such a recommendation not be made? 3. What reasons would be sufficient to stop construction of turbines on the island?	No response required. Information only.
April 12, 2012		15	Submitted concerns about ice throws and provided a report entitled "Report on Potential Ice Throw by Siemens 2.3-113 Wind Turbines". Indicated that they do not believe that the setbacks for the project are adequate based on the information provided in the report.	No response required. Information only.
April 13, 2012	April 19, 2013	212	In response to correspondence sent by Algonquin Power following up with questions from the Open House, indicated that he would like to have his questions answered specifically and a list of similar frequently asked questions is not acceptable. Would like his property excluded from the project map. Provided copies of previous correspondence where he requested his property be removed from the map. Would like to know who trespassed on his property at 3710 South Shore Road on March 20th, 2011. Stated that if the identity of the person and their purpose for trespassing is not provided he will use other legal means to determine this information. Also provided copies of the questions he submitted during the public open house, a copy of the project map that he is contesting and a copy of his letter to Samit Sharma in October 2008.	Provided the following information: 1. 2008 mapping: • The information provided illustrated the Project Study Area which was delineated, at that time, in order to comply with the Provincial Environmental Assessment process (note: in September 2009 the government instituted the Green Energy Act which amended the assessment process for renewable energy projects). 2. Current Project Study Area mapping that has been presented to the public: • This map illustrates project boundaries which are publicly available and illustrates the Project Study Area. 3. Number of employees living within one kilometer of wind turbines: • I do not know this level of information; however, I am aware of at least one employee of our contract operator, working at a company wind project (i.e. "St. Leon Wind Project") that lives within one kilometer of a wind turbine. 4. Health concerns: • Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on the topic listed above. Windlectric has created a list of common questions/concerns (similar to your questions) raised by stakeholders and has developed general responses to those inquiries. These responses will be made available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. • A copy of the Health information board panel that was presented at the March 5th and March 6th open house is attached (note: all of the information panels have been uploaded to the project web site – www.amherstislandwindproject.com). • Repowering wind projects – the following examples are provided: o Vattenfall's Nørrekær Enge project was originally constructed with 77 small turbines in the late 1980's in 2009, the project was repowered by removing the small turbines and replacing them with 13 larger turbines which produce significantly more energy each year. More information can be found here: http://powerplants.vattenfall.com/node/251 o The Delabole wind farm in North Cornwall UK was constructed as a 10 turbine site with 4MW of capacity in 1991 and we repowered with 4 turbines for a total of 9.2MW of capacity in 2011. http://www.goodenergy.co.uk/our-wind-and-solar-farms/delabole-wind-farm-redevelopment o Please see the web links below for general repowering information: § http://www.farmrenewableenergyoptions.co.uk/farmrenewableenergyoptions/sustainability/repowering-wind-turbines.html § http://www.juwi.com/wind_energy/repowering.html § http://www.grontmij.com/highlights/water-and-energy/Pages/Repowering-of-wind-turbines-in-the-Netherlands-produces-more-sustainable-energy.aspx
April 17, 2012	April 18, 2012	23	Stated that they have sent many questions that date back to the open house and have not yet received a response. Stated that they have requested flicker information for their civic address. Would like details	Thanked correspondent for questions submitted at the public open house as well as on February 6, March 23 and April 17th. Indicated that materials from the open house were available on the project website and information about the REA process could be found on slide 12 of 26. Summarized her questions into five main

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			regarding protection of turbines from fires resulting from lightning strikes. Requested a timely response and a response to her question about shadow flicker at the same time.	points: 1. archaeological assessment 2. Shadow flicker 3. extreme weather events including lightening 4. project schedule 5. land owner lease agreement Stated that these topics are addressed in the attached frequently asked questions document. Provide contact information for the project.
April 21, 2012	June 19, 2012	72	Feels that the proposed community benefit agreement is not adequate compensation for the loss of property values and natural heritage assets due to the project. Also feels that this fund will come at the cost of higher hydro bills.	Thanked her for correspondence sent on February 6, 19, 24 and April 21. Summarized correspondence into 6 main areas of interest: 1. community benefits 2. impacts to homes and property 3. decommissioning 4. vibration 5. transportation plans 6. natural heritage Provided the project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future comments and questions
April 22, 2012		7	Contesting the statement that wind turbines on Amherst Island will bring community benefits and improvements. Believes that the presence of wind turbines on the island will be detrimental to the health of children living there. Quoted a study stating that there is a probability of adverse health effects for all humans living within 2 kilometers of turbines.	No response required. Information only.
April 23, 2012		138	Stated that the project is not welcomed by the majority of landowners and is seen as a "disgusting money grab". Stated that the project has destroyed the once vibrant community. Also stated that the most recent press release is a "joke".	No response required. Information only.
April 25, 2012	April 19, 2013	41	Stated that he has not yet received responses to his questions submitted during the open houses. Requested an estimate of when he can expect to receive these responses.	Thanked the correspondent for questions and information submitted at the initial public open house. A summary of the items of interest were listed and provided a copy of an updated Frequently asked Questions document regarding these topics.
April 25, 2012		208	Stated that their comments provided to date have been as landowners and not as an agency. Wish to separate interactions in an agency role from those as a landowner as they are trying to keep these roles distinct. As a landowner, requesting updates for the Board meeting in May or June	No response required. Information only.
April 27, 2012		15	Contacted Emera, an investor with Algonquin Power, to give their opinion that the Amherst Island wind project is not financially viable. Provided supporting information surrounding their predicted capacity factors and generation values for the project. Also predicted a number of other factors that may negatively impact project revenues such as noncompliance with noise regulations and complications arising from construction on the island.	No response required. Information only.
April 27, 2012	June 19, 2012	23	Concerned about the ability of helicopters to land on the island during emergency situations. Would like to know what considerations have been made regarding the flight path of emergency helicopters and the turbines. Would also like a response to her previous question regarding the potential for shadow flicker at her home.	Thanked correspondent for comments submitted on April 27, March 23, and April 17. Summarized comments: 1. Emergency helicopter pad 2. Shadow flicker 3. Lightning strikes Provided project frequently asked questions to address her comments. Stated commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future inquiries.
April 27, 2012		106	Quoted the premier in saying that the communities who are not in favour	No response required. Information only.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			of wind projects will be placed at the back of the line and be less likely to receive them. Stated that Amherst Island residents, as well as the county, have indicated that they do not want the project to proceed. Stated that they believe that the cost of the transmission cable will be prohibitive, that the density of turbines is too high, that the noise contours are too close to many homes, there is danger of ice throw, and that the project will harm birds and other species. Would like the premier to stop the project, believes it is justifiable that it should be stopped for a number of reasons.	
April 30, 2012		184	Stated that the island is known for its birds and people come from around the world to see them. Stated that if the birds are harmed by the project it will be on the proponent's conscience forever. Enclosed a picture of geese in a yard during winter.	No response required. Information only.
April 30, 2012		184	Stated that the island is known for its birds and people come from around the world to see them. Stated that if the birds are harmed by the project it will be on the proponent's conscience forever. Enclosed a picture of geese in a yard during winter. This letter was sent to the Algonquin Power CEO as well as the President.	No response required. Information only.
May 1, 2012	June 19, 2012	155	Concerned about the possibility of turbine fires from malfunction or lightning strikes. Worried about potential for damage to property and people, and about the difficulty the volunteer fire department may experience in fighting turbine fires. Would like to know of special provisions Algonquin Power has in place for turbine fires on the island.	Thanked correspondent for the letter submitted on May 1st. Addressed concerns about turbine fires by indicating that an emergency response plan for the turbines will be developed in collaboration between the operations and maintenance contractor and the township and county's emergency services department. Provided project frequently asked questions. Stated project commitment to the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
May 1, 2012	June 19, 2012	191	Stated that greater than 90 percent of landowners on the island oppose the project. Concerned about turbine related fires and fire response. Concerned about potential for damage to infrastructure relating to project construction. Concerned that her health will be disrupted by energy fields from the project. Concerned about the impacts to wildlife, birds and bats.	Thanked correspondent for letter sent on May 1st. Summarized correspondence into three areas of interest:1. health and safety2. damage to roads and properties3. concerns about wildlife and the natural environmentProvided project FAQ. Stated commitment to REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
May 2, 2012		17	Stated that the majority of residents are opposed to the project and that they do not want turbines near their homes. Stated that there is no local ownership of the project. Stated that the impact upon climate change from these initiatives is negligible and that green energy is a ploy by the McGuinty government to lull voters into thinking the government is interested in alternative energy.	No response required. Information only.
May 2, 2012		205	Concerned about the potential for property value decreases. Stated that research in Europe shows that this technology does not reduce carbon emissions and destroys communities and negatively effect animals and human health. Believes that proposed setback distances are insufficient. Requested that AP offer homeowners who would like to sell a fair market price for their homes.	No response required. Information only.
May 5, 2012		110	Writing to indicate opposition to the wind farm. States that wind turbines are inefficient at producing energy. States that wind turbines have been shown to have irreversible effects on the environment and on bird and bad populations and human health. Requested that the project be cancelled.	No response required. Information only.
May 7, 2012		13	Stated that they understand May 11 is the last day that the project can be withdrawn without penalty. Indicated that the majority of residents of the island oppose the project and are retired professionals willing to dedicate their time to stopping the project. Stated that if the project does proceed,	No response required. Information only.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			they will make it their duty to sue the project for all actionable items. Stated that as 'old hippies' they know how to protest and will be the story the media will love to follow.	
May 7, 2012		157	Investigated legal action against the placement of turbine S29 across from their property. Believe they have cause for action based on the fact that they were there first and have renters on the books for their vacation rental business. Requested that this turbine be relocated so that this legal action would not be necessary.	No response required. Information only.
May 8, 2012		73	Opposes the project. Believes it will disturb the natural beauty of the island and damage its ecology. Feels that the project has divided the community. Appeal to cancel the project.	No response required. Information only.
May 8, 2012	June 19, 2012	181	Stated their opposition to the proposed project, and that they believe the majority of residents and landowners on the island are also opposed to the project. Requested that the project be stopped, stated that May 11th is the date at which the project can be aborted with minimal cost to the company. Stated that the island is poorly suited to the project. Believes that the project will not provide financial return required by shareholders. Stated that the Green Energy Act is a fiasco. Stated that if the project proceeds there is a strong possibility that the residents will take litigative action	Thanked correspondent for correspondence received during the public open house as well as on January 30, February 2 and 16, May 8 and May 14. Summarized comments and questions into 9 main areas:1. property values2. decommissioning3. impacts to homes and properties4. natural heritage5. noise assessment6. compensation7. health8. adequacy of size of land mass for project9. turbine lightingProvided a copy of the project frequently asked questions which addresses the 9 categories listed. Provided project contact information for future comments and questions.
May 10, 2012	January 22, 2013	188	Indicated that she opposes the project. Concerned about the potential for negative health impacts from the turbines. Concerned for her health, the health of her husband, and the health of all of the children on the island. Does not believe that the turbines will reduce carbon emissions. Gave examples to show that the project has divided the community. Requested that the project be stopped.	Thanked correspondents for their correspondence and apologized for the lateness of the reply. Indicated that their potential receptor number is R222. Provided information regarding where the design and operations report and noise report could be found. Gave the methodology for receptor identification used for the project. Indicated that their other concerns included project setbacks and health and safety and stated that these were addressed in the attached project FAQ.
May 11, 2012	June 19, 2012	116	Stated that understands the need for renewable energy but is distressed by the proposed Amherst project. Opposed to the proximity of the turbines to schools and homes, does not believe that turbines should be put in anyone's backyard. Requested that the project be reconsidered and not proceed.	Thanked correspondent for letters submitted on December 6th and May 11. Summarized her comments and concerns into 10 main areas: 1. health and safety 2. setbacks 3. property values and compensation 4. noise 5. natural environment 6. decommissioning 7. community benefits 8. project economics 9. traffic management 10. turbine to close to school Provided project frequently asked questions to address these areas, and indicated the project commitment to the REA process. Provided contact information for future inquiries.
May 14, 2012	May 25, 2012	141	Writing on behalf of the Amherst Island Recreation Association. Requesting a donation to the fireworks fund for the Community Canada Day Celebration. Stated that they would display the company logo and information as part of the event if donations were given.	Responded to donate 1000 dollars to the Canada Day celebration event.
May 14, 2012	June 19, 2012	181	Disagree with the project and believe that it is harmful to: -Community (over 90% of landowners do not want this project to proceed) -local residents. -extensive bird/bat population & many other species at risk -environment, peace, tranquility of this small agrarian island.	Thanked correspondent for correspondence received during the public open house as well as on January 30, February 2 and 16, May 8 and May 14. Summarized comments and questions into 9 main areas: 1. property values 2. decommissioning 3. impacts to homes and properties

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			Stated that all companies associated with the project are unfavourably regarded by the community.	4. natural heritage 5. noise assessment 6. compensation 7. health 8. adequacy of size of land mass for project 9. turbine lighting Provided a copy of the project frequently asked questions which addresses the 9 categories listed. Provided project contact information for future comments and questions.
May 14, 2012		174	Concerned about potential for health effects. Concerned about impacts to wildlife.	No response required. Information only.
May 14, 2012		215	Feels that the project has divided the community. Concerned about potential health effects. Frustrated about building restrictions. Concerned about potential impact on migratory birds. Concerned about the potential for turbine fire and the response rate of emergency crews in the event of an incident. Believes that there should be a moratorium on industrial wind projects until more research has been done and there is a provincial plan for acceptable wind development areas.	No response required. Information only.
May 17, 2012		8	Opposes the project because he believes that turbines will have negative health effects on residents. Does not think the island is windy enough to make the project economically feasible. Feels that the island is not large enough to support the project and that the land uses are not compatible. Opposed to placement of turbines in an Important Bird Area and is concerned about the potential for a high bird kill to turbine ratio.	No response required. Information only.
May 17, 2012		15	A postcard requesting a moratorium on wind projects, minimum setbacks of 2 kilometers from schools and residences, and a ban on turbines in Important Bird Areas. Stated that they do not believe their fire protection on the island is adequate on the island. Stated concern for raptors and bird populations. Does not believe the island is large enough to support the project.	No response required. Information only.
June 1, 2012		14	Worried that the project will turn the island into an industrial park. Stated that they do not want the project.	No response required. Information only.
June 1, 2012		177	Provided a draft of the report he generated, "An Assessment of Social and Economic Impacts from an Island-wide Wind Energy Generating System on Amherst Island, Ontario"	No response required. Information only.
June 11, 2012	June 19, 2012	37	Provided full address for their property on the island. Indicated that they have not received responses to their correspondence sent on January 6 or February 14. Provided UTM coordinates for the location at which they would like to build, and requested that turbine setbacks be adjusted accordingly.	Thanked correspondents for correspondence received on January 9, 20, February 14 and June 11. Indicated that at the time of creation of the draft site plan no permits had been filed or approved for the construction planned by the Papertzians at Lot 12 South Shore Concession. Stated that proposed turbine location S13 will remain static, in accordance with O. Reg 359/09. Summarized additional items of interest: 1. ground vibrations during operations 2. shadow flicker 3. setbacks 4. owls and important bird areas 5. turbine sound level Provided project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided project contact information for future inquiries.
June 14, 2012	August 13, 2012	38	Would like to know how the significance of the Owl Woods were considered if there are plans to open a road allowance through them	With regard to KFN concern of the use of unopened road allowances; the design of the project layout and the significance of Owl Woods were considered. The only portions of the unopened road allowance that are being assessed for the project, on the eastern end of the island, are the small portion that intersects with the Marshall

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				Forty Foot Road moving immediately west to access the proposed turbines S18 and S13 and a small section west of Lower Forty Foot Road to access the proposed turbines S28, S33 and S12. There are no plans to utilize the portion of the unopened road allowance that travels through Owl Woods east of Marshall Forty Foot Road to where it intersects with the portion being proposed to access turbines S28, S33 and S12. The information from Stantec biologists indicates that the specific areas, in this unopened road allowance, could be used without significant concerns from an environmental or regulatory perspective.
June 15, 2012		133	Further discussion of Chris Hargreaves' email regarding road allowances in the Owl Woods. Concerned that this will require removal of hardwood trees and digging in the woods. Also concerned about the potential for road allowances bordering the Kingston Field naturalist property and who will be liable if someone hurts themselves on those allowances	No response required. Information only.
June 19, 2012		72	Does not feel that the project response sent to her on June 19th was satisfactory. Listed the questions that she had posed in the area of decommissioning:1.Does Algonquin have a decommissioning plan in place?2 Could you describe it?3. Have you set aside funds for decommissioning?4. Do you have a plan for decommissioning during the construction period if necessary?5 How will you remove the concrete base?6. What would be the estimated time to remove transformer station, transmission lines, access roads etc.?7. Will you build temporary docking facilities to remove this equipment by barge?8. Will Algonquin foot the bill for building this temporary dock?9. Will Algonquin foot the bill for removing the temporary dock after decommissioning takes place.10. Will you compensate landowners for the loss of use of their land while decommissioning takes place.She then quoted the response she received and stated that it did not adequately address her questions.	No response required. A response was sent out June 19 by AP same day as this was received. Thanked the correspondent for correspondence sent on February 6, 19, 24 and April 21. Summarized correspondence into 6 main areas of interest:1. community benefits2. impacts to homes and property3. decommissioning4. vibration5. transportation plans6. natural heritageProvided the project frequently asked questions to address these areas of interest. Stated the project commitment to the REA process and provided contact information for future comments and questions
June 19, 2012		72	Not satisfied with the project response she received on June 19. Stated that she did not feel there were enough specific details in the response. Upset that specific turbine numbers and capacities have not yet been determined. Does not feel that her concerns are being taken seriously.	No response required. Information only.
June 27, 2012		93	Resident of Bath who has been a turbine technician for a few years and has experience with the Siemens 2.3 MW turbines. Would like to discuss the potential for job opportunities.	No response required. Information only.
July 2, 2012		152	Was not satisfied with the response that he received. Which to clarify that the road in front of his property is a right of way and not a road allowance. Stated that he will not authorize Algonquin Power to use his lands for the placement of turbines or the transmission of power, also stated that the roadway in front of his property will not be used. Stated that in the movement of equipment his property shall not be damaged. Stated that if a detailed response to this communication is not provided, and if further consultation with him is not made, he will take legal action. Stated that if his property is damaged he will seek an injunction to stop all traffic related to the project passing by his property. Indicated that as a major landowner on the island he is disappointed in the consultation process so far.	No response required. Information only.
July 15, 2012	October 5, 2012	46	Purchased property on Amherst Island with the intention of building a retirement home. Are not opposed to wind energy but are opposed to having industrial wind turbines in their 'back yard'	Stated that in summary their correspondence had three main concerns: 1. health 2. rationale for project location on Amherst island 3. concerns about wildlife and natural environment Provided a list of frequently asked questions to address these concerns.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
July 16, 2012	April 19, 2013	155	Concerned that a response received with respect to her questions about emergency fire response did not adequately consider factors relating to emergency response. Reiterated these factors including the composition of the volunteer fire fighters, isolation from the mainland and equipment constraints.	Provided a updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
July 17, 2012	January 22, 2013	188	A letter written in response to a Kingston Whig article in which Honourable John Gerretsen, the Attorney General for Ontario was quoted as saying that new health studies regarding exposure to wind turbines would not likely find any new conclusions. APAI took the opportunity to refute these claims by citing setback changes in Australia and noise research in Germany	Thanked correspondents for their correspondence and apologized for the lateness of the reply. Indicated that their potential receptor number is R222. Provided information regarding where the design and operations report and noise report could be found. Gave the methodology for receptor identification used for the project. Indicated that their other concerns included project setbacks and health and safety and stated that these were addressed in the attached project FAQ.
July 23, 2012	August 30, 2012	106	Would like to know why a meteorological tower is being constructed on Art McGinn Road, and the time lines for the data it is to be used for.	Thanked correspondents for their emails on July 23 and August 3. Stated that the MET tower is 100 meters tall and is being used for future performance tests and wind forecasting.
July 23, 2012	August 13, 2012	38	Following up with an email sent on June 14th. Indicated that he had not yet received a response and requested that either a response be sent or confirmation of receipt and an expected date of response are given.	With regard to KFN concern of the use of unopened road allowances; the design of the project layout and the significance of Owl Woods were considered. The only portions of the unopened road allowance that are being assessed for the project, on the eastern end of the island, are the small portion that intersects with the Marshall Forty Foot Road moving immediately west to access the proposed turbines S18 and S13 and a small section west of Lower Forty Foot Road to access the proposed turbines S28, S33 and S12. There are no plans to utilize the portion of the unopened road allowance that travels through Owl Woods east of Marshall Forty Foot Road to where it intersects with the portion being proposed to access turbines S28, S33 and S12. The information from Stantec biologists indicates that the specific areas, in this unopened road allowance, could be used without significant concerns from an environmental or regulatory perspective.
August 3, 2012	August 30, 2012	72	Would like to know the height of the anemometer that has just been erected on David and Betty Wemp's property adjoining Art McGinn Road. Is interested in comparing it with the height of the turbine planned for construction in that area.	Thanked them for their emails on July 23 and August 3. Stated that the MET tower is 100 meters tall and is being used for future performance tests and wind forecasting.
August 19, 2012	March 4, 2013	46	Indicated that they are a property owner on the island and requested that they be mailed a document showing clear locations where the turbines have been proposed to be sited.	Summarized that the content of their email submitted February 28th was concerned with Health and Safety and wildlife and the natural environment. Provided a frequently asked questions to address these concerns. Provided information regarding the final public open houses for the project.
August 24, 2012	August 24, 2012	81	Indicated that he had been sent the wrong response letter.	Followed up to provide him with the correct response letter.
August 27, 2012	November 2, 2012	22	Would like to know the lighting requirements for turbines. Indicated that they had seen the turbines at Shelburne and they did not all have lights. Also stated that they would prefer lights that shine up and not out.	No response required. Letter provided to query on November 2, 2012.
September 4, 2012	-	1	Stated that they spoke with Stantec representatives at the first public open house. Shocked that despite all of the public resistance to the project it is still proceeding.	No response required. Information only.
September 11, 2012	September 11, 2012	106	Asked Hatch to distribute the attached documents to the team members of the joint study. The first is a letter and comment sent to the Minister of Health concerning the recently announced Health Canada study. Of particular note is the section on recent studies of the wind turbine noise problem. The second concerns the propagation of wind turbine sound over water, submitted some time ago to the Ministry of the Environment. However, the discussion of the shift from spherical to cylindrical spreading of sound is also relevant to propagation over land, particularly in winter when ground cover is covered by wind-blown snow and many trees have shed their leaves.	Indicated that the information would be forwarded along to the rest of the project team for consideration.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
October 2, 2012	October 6, 2012	130	Provided a letter objecting to the placement of turbines T04 and T29. Requested the Property Line Assessment Report be provided to them for T04 as they believe that the setback distance from their property line appears to be reduced. Would like to know why the turbine has been sited 700 meters from their house when they believe that a greater amount of property is available for this turbine to be sited further.	Stated that email was received. Responded on October 6, 2012 to say that the setback distance used is the height of the turbine as per regulations. Provided project contact information for future correspondence.
October 25, 2012	November 2, 2012	22	Would like to know if lights on top of wind turbines will be oriented up, or out? Would like to know what the regulated orientation is	Stated that lighting requirements are stipulated by Transport Canada, and Windlectric is consulting with them to determine how many and which turbines will require lighting as well as lighting specifications. Indicated that lighting would likely be similar to the type used on Wolfe Island but specifications have not yet been finalized. Provided list of project frequently asked questions.
October 25, 2012	November 2, 2012	134	Would like a list of the aboriginal groups that have been consulted with.	Thanked correspondent for questions regarding archaeology and aboriginal consultation. Stated that the stage 2 archaeological study was conducted by an archaeologist licensed with the ministry of tourism and culture who holds a professional archaeology license. Provided a list of the aboriginal communities being consulted with. Provided project contact information for future questions and concerns
October 25, 2012	November 2, 2012	134	In conducting the archaeological survey, have the archaeologists spoken to locals to identify archaeological sites that exist on the Island but may not be formally recorded? Are the four members of the archaeological team licensed archaeologists? Could you please provide the names of these individuals.	Thanked correspondent for questions regarding archaeology and aboriginal consultation. Stated that the stage 2 archaeological study was conducted by an archaeologist licensed with the ministry of tourism and culture who holds a professional archaeology license. Provided a list of the aboriginal communities being consulted with. Provided project contact information for future questions and concerns
November 7, 2012	November 19, 2012	106	Found that in the recent liaison committee minutes a reference was made to a final public meeting in January 2012. Asked if this was meant to be January 2013, in which case Loyalist township would have received the draft REA reports in October and the public can expect them in November. Asked if the date was meant to be January 2014.	Thanked correspondents for their question submitted by email on November 7. Summarized that they were inquiring regarding the recent liaison committee meeting records. Stated that as of the week of November 12 the liaison committee meeting minutes for September had not yet been finalized and this was why they were not yet available on the project website. Also stated that there was an error in the draft document which listed January 2012 as the date for the final open house, when it should have been January 2013. Stated that the draft REA documents had not yet been provided to Loyalist Township, and that the plan is to ensure that the public has 60 days to review the draft documents prior to the final public open house as per REA regulations.
December 7, 2012	December 7, 2012	9	Would like to know why the municipal consultation package has not yet been posted to the project website. Stated that it was supposed to be available to the public as of December 3rd. Would like to be notified when information has been posted to the project website. Requested that the documents be emailed to them directly.	Look forward to the correspondents participation in the public consultation process. Indicated that draft REA documents had been submitted to the Loyalist Township on December 3rd for the 90 day review period. Stated that documents have not yet been released to the public, but a minimum 60 day review period would be given prior to the final public open house. When the documents are released to the public, notification and directions on how to access these documents will be provided in a letter to residents as well as information posted in local newspapers.
January 2, 2013	January 2, 2013	106	Stated that there have been no changes to the health report written by Dr. Ollsen since the initial open house even though there have been substantial developments in this area. Stated that they intend to challenge this original work based on the bias in the work as well as new material.	The draft Design and Operation Technical Report assesses adverse environmental effects of the proposed project (section 5.0) - including Environmental Noise as well as Public Health and Safety. Algonquin continues to retain Intrinsic Environmental to keep us upraised of the latest science with respect to wind turbines and health effects. Our plan is to have representative(s) from Intrinsic Environmental Sciences (either Dr. Ollson or Dr. Knopper) in attendance at the final open house(s) that could answer questions with respect to health effects and will address any up to date information.
January 2, 2013	January 4, 2013	106	Thanked Algonquin Power for their previous response. Requested a copy of the shadow flicker report as soon as it becomes available. Stated that they have estimated that 50 homes and home-sites would be subject to more than 30 hours of shadow-flicker per annum, the internationally-accepted limit	Stated that the results of the shadow flicker report will be made available at the final public open house. The company will be working with the engineering consultant on this item and prior to the open house (March 5 & 6) the final the shadow flicker map results will be completed and incorporated on an open house board panel for presentation. A copy of the information can be given to you at the initial open house (March 5th). Please note: the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) requirements do not prescribe that a shadow flicker analysis be completed and therefore is not required for the REA submission (the plan will not be to include this study mapping with the project REA submission).

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
January 6, 2013		106	Provided a story from the Hamilton Spectator regarding the removal of a tree holding an eagle nest as part of the Nextera Corp. wind project. Asked what might the project has in mind for the Owl Woods. Asked how they feel being associated with the wind industry in Ontario. Asked how they sleep at night.	No response required. Information only.
January 7, 2013		106	Is looking to receive a health report at least 60 days prior to the final public meeting so that he can have it reviewed by an expert reviewer. Is also looking for a shadow flicker report. Stated that he will be contacting the MOE to request that the REA process for the project be put on hold until he and his reviewer have been given 60 days to respond to the reports.	No response required. Information only.
January 13, 2013	January 22, 2013	178	Interested in : Project Viability Approval Process Setbacks Property Values Land Use Visual Impacts Community Benefits	Indicated that their concerns involved: Project Viability Approval Process Setbacks Property Values Land Use Visual Impacts Community Benefits Stated that these were addressed in the attached project Frequently asked Questions.
January 21, 2013		72	Letter to indicate that she believes the dates for the second public meeting are not suitable as they are set during mid week in the winter. Believes that this schedule will cause people to be unable to attend as many of the residents spend the winter months in warmer areas. Requested that they ask Algonquin Power to set the meetings during the spring and summer months so that more residents may attend.	Letter sent to MOE. No response required. Information only.
January 25, 2013	January 25, 2013	3	Would like a ball park estimate of the installation of one turbine for the project.	Responded to state that the estimated cost had been projected to be \$230 million per turbine for the project.
January 25, 2013	January 25, 2013	92	Would like an update regarding where the project is in the provincial approval process.	Indicated that the draft REA technical documents had been provided to Loyalist Township and the final public openhouse had been scheduled for March 5th, 2013. Stated that the submission of the final REA would happen several weeks after the final open house.
January 29, 2013	February 28, 2013	170	Provided a list of 10 questions pertaining to the project: clarification of reference to Hatch, will Stantec take place in the meeting, which consultant will be retained for road design, what is the relationship between consultants, road design footing, construction traffic, liability of engineering consultants, length of public meeting. Additional questions were provided by Loyalist Township, which were received from Mr. Moody on February 11. These included : who are the registered professional engineers responsible for safety of the public on the project, how will safety of children be assured, do designs meet building codes, which parties will be liable for mistakes, attitude of professionals at Cataraqui Conservation Centre to construction, effects of weather on construction timing, windmill collapse due to high winds, blasting during construction, excavation during construction.	Letter sent to Loyalist Township. Algonquin Power responded on February 28, and CC'd Loyalist Township. All 21 questions were addressed in this email.
January 29, 2013		50	Proponent attended a municipal lead Public Town Hall Meeting on January 29th, 2013. The presentation they made at the meeting and Q/As was provided.	No response required. Information only.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
February 1, 2013	February 8, 2013	134	Corresponded provide thanks for information provided at Amherst Island Roads meeting. Feels that questions have been unanswered relating to staging area locations and construction routing near school. Asked if at least one more public meeting on the roads agreement could be held. Asked if Algonquin Power would use a Town Hall format for the March 5 and 6 meetings.	Stated that Algonquin has been reviewing transportation route options for the project and operational plans will be developed and reviewed with Town staff. Indicated that if the Council determines that another meeting should be held Algonquin would participate. Stated that the format for the public information sessions will be open house, drop in style.
February 5, 2013	February 21, 2013	72	Concerned about the number of truckloads required to transport aggregate for the project, and the road use agreement for the project. Concerned about safety of children walking to school. Concerned about the setback distance of a proposed turbine site from the school.	In response to correspondence received on February 5 regarding the coordinated island road infrastructure town hall meeting. Indicated that the project considers public safety seriously and emphasized this during the meeting. Stated that the information gathered during the meeting will be part of the development of appropriate transportation, safety and communications plans for Township review.
February 8, 2013	February 12, 2013	157	Would like to know the meaning of the term 'rea water' as this area seems to include part of their property.	Indicated that as part of the project a Water Body Assessment was done for the project's 120 meter zone of investigation. The mapping indicates what consultants deemed to be a REA water body as defined by Reg 359/09
February 11, 2013	February 12, 2013	92	Asked if any provincial approvals still need to be granted for the project	Indicated that the draft PDR has a list of provincial authorizations required for the project, and that the company is working on these in communication with the appropriate provincial agencies. Provided a link to the draft PDR.
February 12, 2013	February 21, 2013	176	Provided an extract from an APAL newsletter regarding the public meeting concerning the proposed road-use agreement.	Indicated that the format for the upcoming public information sessions would be open house (drop in style) similar to the meetings conducted for the initial public openhouses.
February 14, 2013	February 21, 2013	176	Provided a letter from APAL regarding risks of turbine fires, and the requirement of fire departments to develop response safety plans to address related issues. Asked if Algonquin Power has prepared these plans in conjunction with local firefighting services. Another letter from APAL, dated the same day, requests a change to the format of the final public meeting to a town hall format.	In response to correspondence received on February 14 regarding the coordinated island road infrastructure town hall meeting. Indicated that the project considers public safety seriously and emphasized this during the meeting. Stated that the information gathered during the meeting will be part of the development of appropriate transportation, safety and communications plans for Township review. Stated that there will be an emergency response plan including fire preparedness for use during construction and operations, which it is anticipated the Township's emergency fire services would participate in discussion of.
February 15, 2013	February 25, 2013	72	Requested an alternate format to the open house on March 5.	In response to correspondence received on February 15. Indicated that the format for the upcoming public information sessions would be open house (drop in style) similar to the meetings conducted for the initial public openhouses.
February 17, 2013	-	72	Request for guidelines from the MOE for meetings mandated by the Green Energy Act. Believes that the date of the meeting should be changed, and the 'story board' format do not lead to open and recorded discussion of issues.	No response required. Information only.
February 18, 2013	February 25, 2013	36	Correspondents have reviewed the draft protected properties report and find it to be incomplete. Asked: 1) What are you prepared to do to protect my house and barn during the construction? 2) Will you revisit our community and identify properties that may be impacted by the construction phase of your project and reassure property owners that their homes will be not be damaged? 3)What steps are you prepared to take to protect the Historic village of Stella, it's buildings and it's inhabitants? 4)What are the dotted lines on our property on either side of Front Road? 5)Will you agree to a meeting between the community, the heritage consultants and Algonquin Power to address these concerns?	Thanked them for correspondence sent February 19th. Responded to indicate that project construction activity is not anticipated to affect their barn or home. Indicated that the detailed plan for the construction phase of the project has not yet been completed. Stated that future traffic plans for the project will consider the safety and protection of the public, and that the Draft Heritage Assessment report has proposed mitigation strategies for construction. Stated that the dotted lines on either side of Front Road illustrates the zone of investigation for the project. Indicated that a public open house will be conducted on march 5 and 6 to address public concerns.
February 19, 2013	February 25, 2013	72	A letter concerning the Draft Heritage Assessment for the project. Concerned about the length of time the individuals conducting the study were present on the island. Concerned about: lack of tree cover for mitigation, representation of turbines and hedgerows on diagrams, reinforcement of fence around Pentland Cemetery, aesthetics of views, light emitted from turbines, damage to trees, native encampment, ferry	Summarized the items of interest provided in the correspondence including a visual survey of the island, plantings around turbines, the pentland cemetery stone fence and navigation lighting.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			landscape	
February 22, 2013	April 19, 2013	110	President of BOD of the Neilson Store Museum and Culture Centre, finds the Draft Heritage Assessment for the project unacceptable. Reasons: Front road too close to the entrance of the building to allow construction traffic, vibrations resulting from construction could damage the foundation of the heritage building, shadow flicker, concerns regarding other heritage sites on the island.	<p>•Provided the following information: The project consultant,(Stantec Consulting Ltd.) undertook a detailed assessment of heritage resources compliant with the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) regulations and guidelines. Stantec has also provided monitoring recommendations in their draft report pertaining to those buildings identified in their analysis.</p> <p>The company has will commit to these recommendations as discussed and presented at the Loyalist tow ship town hall meeting January 29, 2013 (copy of the information – which also discuss items for public safety – can be found at the project web site www.amherstislandwindproject.com)</p>
February 23, 2013	February 28, 2013	7	Concerned that the playground area of the school is within the 550 meter setback of a proposed turbine site. Concerned about traffic volume relating to the construction phase of the project. Concerned about health, and provided links to articles regarding impacts on health. Feels that her previous questions have not been properly addressed.	Thanked correspondent for correspondence on February 23, 2013. Stated that the placement of proposed turbines adheres to the siting requirements of the regulations. Indicated that the project considers public safety seriously and emphasized this during the meeting. Stated that the information gathered during the meeting will be part of the development of appropriate transportation, safety and communications plans for Township review. Stated that the final public meeting would be an open house format.
February 23, 2013		176	A response to Algonquin Power Report: Construction and Operations Use of Loyalist Township Roads and Right of Way Space on Amherst Island . The response registers opposition to the project an they do not believe it is economically viable. Require a viable road use agreement for the project. Raised issues of: use of present island roads, the school and Stella, the batch plant, ownership of the island roads, environmental impact, noise bylaw, tree bylaw, transmission lines, ferry use, extended hours, dispute resolution, and traffic management.	No response required. Information only. Correspondence directed to Loyalist Township Mayor.
February 24, 2013	-	7	Feels that the information in the Heritage Assessment report disregards community heritage. Feels that the dry stone fence in front of Poplar Dell should be mentioned in the report. Feels that Poplar Dell's significance was not properly considered. Request that the minister not sign off on the report due to inaccuracies regarding Poplar Dell and other heritage buildings in the village of Stella which were not mentioned.	No response required. Information only. Comments covered under ongoing revisions and discussions with MTCS.
February 27, 2013	March 1, 2013	134	Requested clarification regarding the deadline for submission of comments and questions following the final public meeting.	All comments received by March 15th will be included in the consultation report to be submitted to the MOE.
February 28, 2013		80	Indicated that he is a participating landowner who has not received mail outs. Provided his contact information.	No response required. Information only.
February 28, 2013	March 4, 2013	46	Purchased a property on the island with intent of retiring there. Concerned about health and impacts to wildlife resulting from the project.	Summarized that the content of their email submitted February 28th was concerned with Health and Safety and wildlife and the natural environment. Provided a frequently asked questions to address these concerns. Provided information regarding the final public open houses for the project.
March 2, 2013		9	Feels that a baseline survey of the health of residents should be conducted prior to the commencement of the project. Concerned that the project may force people to leave their homes.	No response required. Information only.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	36	Feels that there needs to be a pre and post construction inspection of heritage properties to determine that no damage has occurred to these properties. Requesting a change in meeting format as many people are overwhelmed by the project and thrown off by the poster board format. Would like an open forum style meeting like the one held on January 29th.	Response provided indicated that at this time there is no plan to pre-inspect specific property structures, however, the decision on this item is not final and may be considered by the project management team and contractor. The open style information board format that was used at the recent March 5th and 6th public open houses with respect to updating the public on the project (complying with the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) requirements) allows for more in depth one on one discussion of items of interest to individuals as well as allowing those less comfortable with speaking publically to voice their opinions and concerns to the subject matter experts. In addition this format allows individuals the opportunity to effectively obtain the information related to the subject matter they are interested in and formally submit questions and comments which become part of the public record without requiring them to attend the entire session. There is no upcoming future plan to

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				coordinate another meeting to update the public on the project prior to the submission of REA application.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	101	<p>Provided a letter with comments and questions for Algonquin Power/Windlectric Inc. Questions were in regards to: expected answers for questions submitted on December 6 & 7; format of the public meeting and ability for community to have question/answer session; information included in Heritage Assessment report in regards to property is incorrect; research completed on the local power grid ability to support turbines; community benefits and Vibrancy fund; the non-support for the project by most islanders; jobs for the project; supplemental income for participating landowners; damages encountered during construction/operations and the procedure or process in place for compensation; protection of the Village of Stella/ children /businesses and the plans in place; and when the consultation report is available and can be reviewed?</p>	<p>Provided the following information: • Public Open House format – as mentioned in the January 29th Loyalist Township town hall meeting the format for the public information sessions was an open house (drop in style) meetings similar to what was coordinated for the initial public open houses. This method is accepted by the Ministry of Environment for consultation. The open style format allows for more in depth one on one discussion of items of interest to individuals as well as allowing those less comfortable with speaking publically to voice their opinions and concerns to the subject matter experts. In addition this format allows individuals the opportunity to effectively obtain the information related to the subject matter they are interested in and formally submit questions and comments which become part of the public record without requiring them to attend the entire session.. • Estimated permanent employment – there could be approximately 4-6 full time jobs related to the operation of the project. These individuals will live in the area and will be at the site during normal business hours. Detailed qualifications for the Windlectric positions have not yet been developed but individuals would likely require, among other things, experience in facilities management preferably in the energy sector. • Draft Heritage Assessment Report: o The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) subject matter expert assessed the island and determined (based on Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport requirements and guidelines) which buildings should be designated as Heritage Resources. On a case by case basis we will consider requests for assessing residences potentially impacted by construction, in coordination with advice from a qualified and competent engineer with previous experience working with heritage buildings under similar circumstances. o The project consultant met with the local Heritage Committee and on March 5th and 6th toured the island with local residents to discuss the report and potential heritage resources. These comments have been incorporated into the reports where applicable. • As described in the Draft Design and Operation report a Complaint protocol will be developed and presented public when completed. In general any damage should be brought to the attention of Windlectric's site manager who will be on site and available throughout the construction process. The site manager with support from head office in Oakville will coordinate with the landowner to assess any damage caused by the construction activities and determine the appropriate course of action to repair or replace the damage if possible or otherwise to reasonably compensate the landowner for the damage. • The project will provide additional tax revenue for the township, a portion of which directly benefits the school board. The remainder of the tax revenue may be used by the township in whatever manner the administration deems most appropriate at that time. In addition, Windlectric is negotiating a Community Benefits Agreement, details of which were provided at the Public Open Houses. • Public Safety – as discussed at the January 29th Township Town hall meeting the plan will be to develop the necessary Transportation/ Traffic management plan to discuss and present to the Township. Public safety (including children safety) is extremely important and the company will be working with the appropriate subject matter experts to develop the necessary planning document with the appropriate and reasonable controls are in place. The concern over child safety around the island and particularly near the school is one that Windlectric understands is very important to all of the residents on Amherst Island. • The Consultation Report will be submitted to the Ministry of Environment at the time of the Renewable Energy Approval application. This report will be posted on the project web site at that time as well.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	5	<p>Indicated attendance at the public meeting was to gather further information on the project as appears to impact retirement home. Indicated that information on noise, flicker and property has contradicted public documents, veiwscapes, and images were unrealistic and ignored impacts. Appropriate siting of power project, so that construction and operation do not harm people or environment or cause loses. Advised that the project is very close to rural areas, and near owls and eagles. Suggested mitigation for noise, especially low frequency and infrasound so people are not driven from their homes by project operation.</p>	<p>Provided the following information: Windlectric will not be completing any assessments at this time. We will at a later date and prior to construction be completing assessment for individual buildings and buildings within cultural heritage landscapes identified in the Heritage Assessment and Protected Properties Reports. On a case by case basis we will consider requests for assessing buildings potentially impacted by construction, in coordination with advice from a qualified and competent engineer with previous experience working with heritage buildings under similar circumstances.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	9	<p>Commented that the noise from wind turbines will impact sites across the entire landscape on the Island. There will be no place on can go to get away from this. Inquired as to the levels of noise on any given day. Questioned why in the Protected Properties and Heritage Assessment documents there was not Noise included or destruction, alteration, shadows , and isolation etc.? Indicated that noise is a definite quantifiable impact that could affect people's health and personal or</p>	<p>• Health effects – as presented in the recent public open houses health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsik Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents. • The company communicates with Doris Dumais, Director, office at the Ministry of Environment. • Estimated permanent employment – there could be a potential expected for approximately 4-6 full time jobs</p>

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			public property enjoyment/use. Inquired as to what the name and contact information is for the person at MOE the proponent is communication with regarding this file and what is the project file number? Also, had a number of questions concerning: jobs produced by project, information that turbines that ensures they will not impact quality of life, property values and health. Stated that it is completely unbelievable and ethically unacceptable that Algonquin Power proposes to severely impact island public school/community centre and Village of Stella. Inquired if Algonquin Power ever bought out a non-participating receptor on any past project? If so, which project and why?	related to the operation of the project. These individuals will live in the area and will be at the site during normal business hours. Detailed qualifications for the Windlectric positions have not yet been developed but individuals would likely require, among other things, experience in facilities management preferably in the renewable energy sector. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The company has never purchased the property of a non-participating receptor for any past projects.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	125	Opposed to the project as they feel the island is not a suitable site. Concerned about construction traffic, bird and bat deaths, and human health.	Indicated that their concerns involved health and safety and concerns about wildlife and the natural environment. Stated that these were addressed in the attached project FAQ
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	212	Resubmitting questions submitted on December 6, 2011 and requesting answers before March 21, 2013. Requested a copy of the Proposed project area map. Questions relate to: legal right to include properties from non-participating landowners in project map, legal right to trespass on properties of non-participating landowners, health, property values, and proximity of employees homes to turbines.	The information provided illustrated the Project Study Area which was delineated, at that time, in order to comply with the Provincial Environmental Assessment process (note: in September 2009 the government instituted the Green Energy Act which amended the assessment process for renewable energy projects).2. Current Project Study Area mapping that has been presented to the public. The map illustrates project boundaries which are publicly available and illustrates the Project Study Area. Stated that not aware of the number of employees living within one kilometer of wind turbines however of an employee of our contract operator, working at a company wind project (i.e. "St. Leon Wind Project") that lives within one kilometer of a wind turbine. Stated that health queries were addressed in the attached project Frequently asked Questions. Also a copy of the Health information board panel that was presented at the March 5th and March 6th open house is attached (note: all of the information panels have been uploaded to the project web site – www.amherstislandwindproject.com .)
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	83	Indicated attendance at the public meeting was to gather further information on the project as appears to impact retirement home. Indicated that information on noise, flicker and property has contradicted public documents, veiwscapes, and images were unrealistic and ignored impacts. Appropriate siting of power project, so that construction and operation do not harm people or environment or cause loses. Advised that the project is very close to rural areas, and near owls and eagles. Suggested mitigation for noise, especially low frequency and infrasound so people are not driven from their homes by project operation.	Provided the following response about noise, please review the Noise Assessment Report(Attachment B to the Design and Operations Report) provided on the Project website identified below. Additionally, the Project website provides several other resources on current research into noise impacts from wind turbines. Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	38	Requested to be sent any information on numbers of migrating birds through Amherst Island and Wolfe Island.	Your request was to obtain information with respect to avian migration for Amherst Island and Wolfe Island. The Amherst Island wind project web site (www.amherstislandwindproject.com) has a copy of the Draft Natural Heritage Assessment Report which will have all the information that the project consultant (Stantec) accumulated during their field assessment. With respect to the TransAlta Wolfe Island wind project I would encourage you to contact the company for details on their project, however, the TransAlta web link (http://www.transalta.com/facilities/plants-operation/wolfe-island) will take you to the Wolfe Island project (which includes post construction monitoring and related reports)
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	7	Provided a letter with comments and questions at final public meeting. Questions were in regards to community partnership with Algonquin Power, format of the public meeting and ability for community to review reports; heritage properties and features; compensation for damage to buildings; historic properties, community benefits and Vibrancy fund; supplemental income for participating landowners; Natural Heritage Report's exclusion of bats and bat monitoring; construction transport route to avoid school zone and the Village of Stella; dangerous proximity of turbines to children play areas. Indicated that the project is not welcomed by the majority of residents and the community does not	Provided the following information: o The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) subject matter expert assessed the island and determined (based on Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport requirements and guidelines) which buildings should be designated as Heritage Resources. On a case by case basis we will consider requests for assessing residences potentially impacted by construction, in coordination with advice from a qualified and competent engineer with previous experience working with heritage buildings under similar circumstances. o The project consultant met with the local Heritage Committee and on March 5th and 6th toured the island with local residents to discuss the report and potential heritage resources. These comments have been incorporated into the reports where applicable. o The report considers the buildings located within the Village of Stella.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			support. Requested that a comment be made to this.	<p>o As described in the Draft Design and Operation report a Complaint protocol will be developed and presented public when completed. In general any damage should be brought to the attention of Windlectric's site manager who will be on site and available throughout the construction process. The site manager with support from head office in Oakville will coordinate with the landowner to assess any damage caused by the construction activities and determine the appropriate course of action to repair or replace the damage if possible or otherwise to reasonably compensate the landowner for the damage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project will provide additional tax revenue for the township, a portion of which directly benefits the school board. The remainder of the tax revenue may be used by the township in whatever manner the administration deems most appropriate at that time. In addition, Windlectric is negotiating a Community Benefits Agreement similar to the one from Haldimand County which was forwarded to you by Jeff Norman. • Draft Natural Heritage Assessment Report - the project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) completed a comprehensive assessment of the project study area in order to comply with the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) requirements and guidelines. The MNR has provided a letter of confirmation indicating the report was prepared (including mitigation measures) using established MNR procedures and is acceptable. This letter will be included in the future Renewable Energy Approval application package. • Bats - The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) undertook a detailed field assessment for the project and complied with the Ministry of Natural Resources protocol for assessing bat habitat on Amherst Island. The company is confident in the consultant's analysis and comments in the draft for the Natural Heritage Assessment and Environmental Impact Study report. Note: this information has also been discussed with the Ministry of Natural Resources. • Public Safety – as discussed at the January 29th Township Town hall meeting the plan will be to develop the necessary Transportation/ Traffic management plan to discuss and present to the Township. Public safety (including children safety) is extremely important and the company will be working with the appropriate subject matter experts to develop the necessary planning document with the appropriate and reasonable controls are in place. The concern over child safety around the island and particularly near the school is one that Windlectric understands is very important to all of the residents on Amherst Island. • Health effects – as presented in the recent public open houses health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the public meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsic Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	85	Supports project. Advised that the most important issues to island residents is the safety of island school children during construction. Suggested if there were a way to avoid village and school area it would help establish good faith with community.	Provided the following information: Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	91	Indicated that they can provide services that might be useful during construction or operation of the wind facility. Inquired as to whether the contract is transferable, if someone buys or sells a farm that was sited for a turbine.	Provided the following information: Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	98	Suggested review of Ben Lansink's recent report Oct, 2012. Report Feb, 2010, is not updated and is incorrect. Need to reimburse property owners who do not have turbines. Inquires as to how the people will be compensated?	Provided the following information::You inquired as to how Windlectric Inc. will compensate people (island landowners) who do not have wind turbines on their property (or for loss of property value - you recommended that we review the recent Ben Lansink report (October 2012) on the subject). As mentioned the company does not believe there will be any loss to property values. Based upon the published reports reviewed to date in other areas with established wind plants, there is little evidence of a material negative effect on property value as a result of the presence of wind plants. Windlectric Inc. does not intend to compensate home owners for any changes (either positive or negative) to property values. Windlectric acknowledges public comments and concerns related to potential property value impacts. Based

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				<p>upon the published reports reviewed to date based on data from other areas with established wind plants, there is little evidence of a material negative effect on property value as a result of the presence of a wind project. A recent decision in 2012 by the Ontario Assessment Review Board ruled that there is no evidence that the presence of a wind farm affected the value of a waterfront property on Wolfe Island located in the Township of Frontenac Islands on Lake Ontario. As a result of their review and subsequent findings, the Board concluded that there was nothing to indicate that the value of the property had been negatively affected by the creation or operation of the wind farm and confirmed Municipal Property Assessment Corporation's (MPAC) assessment of the property. To date, MPAC's analysis of sales has not indicated that the presence of wind turbines that are either abutting or in proximity to a property has either a positive or negative impact on its value.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	141	<p>Supports project. Indicated that Project Team left almost no unanswered questions. Advised that key issue to address through public consultation would be providing public information.</p>	<p>Provided the following information: Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.</p> <p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	194	<p>Opposed to the project. Indicated disagreement with the findings presented at the public meeting. Advised that some key issues that need to be addressed, include: impacts to way of life, birds, bats and turtles; noise; flicker; and property values. Requested that turbines no be put on Amherst Island.</p>	<p>Provided the following information: Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.</p> <p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	202	<p>Advised that the Heritage Report was 'laughable', short sighted, full of errors, and significant properties that were not included. Inquired as to where the criteria was obtained for judgments made to each property. Requested further explanation as to the action that will be taken to preserve the island heritage once the report has been corrected.</p>	<p>Provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insurance – Section 2.8 of the project feed in Tariff Contract with the Ontario Power Authority requires that Windlectric Inc. maintain appropriate levels of insurance coverage throughout the life of the contract. You can find a copy of the FIT Contract version 1.3 here http://fit.powerauthority.on.ca/program-resources/program-archives • Draft Heritage Assessment Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) subject matter expert assessed the island and determined (based on Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport requirements and guidelines) which buildings should be designated as Heritage Resources. On a case by case basis we will consider requests for assessing buildings potentially impacted by construction, in coordination with advice from a qualified and competent engineer with previous experience working with heritage buildings under similar circumstances. o The project consultant met with the local Heritage Committee and on March 5th and 6th toured the island with local residents to discuss the report and potential heritage resources. These comments have been incorporated into the reports where applicable. • Bunkie – thank you for information pertaining to your Bunkie. Based on the description you provided, and photographic information, we believe this structure does not comply with the Ministry of Environment definition of a noise receptor. • Project components are located on properties owned by individuals that have signed landowner lease agreements. • Heritage resources - The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) subject matter expert assessed the island and determined (based on Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport requirements and guidelines) which buildings should be designated as Heritage Resources. Their assessment also considered the stone fences. Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				<p>information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	202	<p>Submitted questions regarding the decommissioning, including: who will in trust of this; when will fund be in place and who will govern fund for decommission; how cable is buried; cement removal and rehab of agricultural land. Requested truthful answers to decommissioning questions to be answered by Sean Fairfield.</p>	<p>Provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insurance – Section 2.8 of the project feed in Tariff Contract with the Ontario Power Authority requires that Windlectric Inc. maintain appropriate levels of insurance coverage throughout the life of the contract. You can find a copy of the FIT Contract version 1.3 here http://fit.powerauthority.on.ca/program-resources/program-archives • Draft Heritage Assessment Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) subject matter expert assessed the island and determined (based on Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport requirements and guidelines) which buildings should be designated as Heritage Resources. On a case by case basis we will consider requests for assessing buildings potentially impacted by construction, in coordination with advice from a qualified and competent engineer with previous experience working with heritage buildings under similar circumstances. o The project consultant met with the local Heritage Committee and on March 5th and 6th toured the island with local residents to discuss the report and potential heritage resources. These comments have been incorporated into the reports where applicable. • Bunkie – thank you for information pertaining to your Bunkie. Based on the description you provided, and photographic information, we believe this structure does not comply with the Ministry of Environment definition of a noise receptor. • Project components are located on properties owned by individuals that have signed landowner lease agreements. • Heritage resources - The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) subject matter expert assessed the island and determined (based on Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport requirements and guidelines) which buildings should be designated as Heritage Resources. Their assessment also considered the stone fences. <p>Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	202	<p>Inquired as to who provided the liability insurance coverage for the total time the turbine is constructed, functioning and decommissioned?; does this coverage cove the Proponent leasing out their land as well as Algonquin? Indicated that the possible liability issues are endless, and can include oils spills, fires, fallen blades, ice flinging, property and human damage, stray voltage, health issues, interruption in drainage systems, disruption of wells, and destruction of heritage landmark. Requested information as to what the plan is to guarantee the liability insurance is in place for the length of the project, including decommissioning. Indicated disappointment with the carbon copy responses from questions at the first information meeting.</p>	<p>Provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insurance – Section 2.8 of the project feed in Tariff Contract with the Ontario Power Authority requires that Windlectric Inc. maintain appropriate levels of insurance coverage throughout the life of the contract. You can find a copy of the FIT Contract version 1.3 here http://fit.powerauthority.on.ca/program-resources/program-archives • Draft Heritage Assessment Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) subject matter expert assessed the island and determined (based on Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport requirements and guidelines) which buildings should be designated as Heritage Resources. On a case by case basis we will consider requests for assessing buildings potentially impacted by construction, in coordination with advice from a qualified and competent engineer with previous experience working with heritage buildings under similar circumstances. o The project consultant met with the local Heritage Committee and on March 5th and 6th toured the island with local residents to discuss the report and potential heritage resources. These comments have been incorporated into the reports where applicable. • Bunkie – thank you for information pertaining to your Bunkie. Based on the description you provided, and photographic information, we believe this structure does not comply with the Ministry of Environment definition of a noise receptor. • Project components are located on properties owned by individuals that have signed landowner lease agreements. • Heritage resources - The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) subject matter expert assessed the island and determined (based on Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport requirements and guidelines) which buildings should be designated as Heritage Resources. Their assessment also considered the stone fences. Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	28	Correspondent indicated that he is a farmer who raises registered Holstein Cattle and standard bred horses and the proposed transmission line which traverses property is not permitted and shall not be accepted in this location. Advised that the cattle regularly cross the road allowance and electrocution has been experienced in such situation; and an alternate route must replace this plan of cable transmission. Also, indicated that the proposed cable is too close to renovated historic stone dwelling and dry stone fence. Requested a reply to alternative route and plan within four days.	<p>Provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insurance – Section 2.8 of the project feed in Tariff Contract with the Ontario Power Authority requires that Windlectric Inc. maintain appropriate levels of insurance coverage throughout the life of the contract. You can find a copy of the FIT Contract version 1.3 here http://fit.powerauthority.on.ca/program-resources/program-archives • Draft Heritage Assessment Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) subject matter expert assessed the island and determined (based on Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport requirements and guidelines) which buildings should be designated as Heritage Resources. On a case by case basis we will consider requests for assessing buildings potentially impacted by construction, in coordination with advice from a qualified and competent engineer with previous experience working with heritage buildings under similar circumstances. o The project consultant met with the local Heritage Committee and on March 5th and 6th toured the island with local residents to discuss the report and potential heritage resources. These comments have been incorporated into the reports where applicable. • Bunkie – thank you for information pertaining to your Bunkie. Based on the description you provided, and photographic information, we believe this structure does not comply with the Ministry of Environment definition of a noise receptor. • Project components are located on properties owned by individuals that have signed landowner lease agreements. • Heritage resources - The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) subject matter expert assessed the island and determined (based on Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport requirements and guidelines) which buildings should be designated as Heritage Resources. Their assessment also considered the stone fences. <p>Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	184	Needs will only be met once the project is cancelled. Indicated ,that people should have the right to peace and quiet in their homes and on their property. Also, children should not have a turbine towering over their school and yard. Advised that the area is the eastern North American migration flyway, and there should not be turbines here. Questioned in decision to remove the 3 turbines necessary to comply with limits of project, why not remove turbine right behind the school, and this would sooth the fears of community. If this turbine in not removed the proponent will be disrespecting community.	<p>Provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of S06 - Your comments about removing turbine S06 from the project layout will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval consultation report. • Health Effects - Health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsik Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents. • Property Values - Windlectric acknowledges public comments and concerns related to potential property value impacts. Based upon the published reports reviewed to date based on data from other areas with established wind plants, there is little evidence of a material negative effect on property value as a result of the presence of a wind project. A recent decision in 2012 by the Ontario Assessment Review Board ruled that there is no evidence that the presence of a wind farm affected the value of a waterfront property on Wolfe Island located in the Township of Frontenac Islands on Lake Ontario. As a result of their review and subsequent findings, the Board concluded that there was nothing to indicate that the value of the property had been negatively affected by the creation or operation of the wind farm and confirmed the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation's (MPAC) assessment of the property. To date, MPAC's analysis of sales has not indicated that the presence of wind turbines that are either abutting or in proximity to a property has either a positive or negative impact on its value. <p>Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	51	Correspondent indicated he has severe tinnitus, which is documented, and the condition is greatly exacerbated by low frequency vibration and noise. Indicated concerns that the turbines will negatively impact health and reduce enjoyment of peaceful rural setting. Inquired as to what plan	<p>Provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of S06 - Your comments about removing turbine S06 from the project layout will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval consultation report. • Health Effects - Health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			is in place to recompense neighboring homeowners adjacent to turbines in the event they must move. Advised that there are over 100 bird dwellings near property and a turbine would destroy the bird environment; and questioned how this can be justified?	discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsic Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents. • Property Values - Windlectric acknowledges public comments and concerns related to potential property value impacts. Based upon the published reports reviewed to date based on data from other areas with established wind plants, there is little evidence of a material negative effect on property value as a result of the presence of a wind project. A recent decision in 2012 by the Ontario Assessment Review Board ruled that there is no evidence that the presence of a wind farm affected the value of a waterfront property on Wolfe Island located in the Township of Frontenac Islands on Lake Ontario. As a result of their review and subsequent findings, the Board concluded that there was nothing to indicate that the value of the property had been negatively affected by the creation or operation of the wind farm and confirmed the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation's (MPAC) assessment of the property. To date, MPAC's analysis of sales has not indicated that the presence of wind turbines that are either abutting or in proximity to a property has either a positive or negative impact on its value. Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	154	Opposed to the entire project. Indicated that information continues to ignore existing gaps in what is known and studies are still incomplete. Concerned about the lack of democratic process and most islanders are against the turbine project. An industrial wind project should not be set up within a small community; it should be in an uninhabited area. One turbine specifically is too close to school, and the Village of Stella is at risk with the construction traffic which will go through it.	<p>Provided the following information: Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p> <p>With the assistance of Stantec Consulting Ltd., Windlectric is consulting and engaging with various stakeholders including agencies, Aboriginal communities, members of the public, and non-governmental organizations regarding this Project, which will include responding to comments received from these parties. While responding to input does not always require agreement with comments being provided, we will ensure that all comments are taken into consideration and are responded to in a meaningful manner.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	114	Stated that the project is too large for this small peaceful island. Suggested to choose an area that is less populated for the project. Concerned for the birds (i.e., bird sanctuary) and unreasonable setbacks and disturbing their peaceful lifestyle. Questioned how the proponent can with a clear conscience go ahead with this proposal, knowing so many people are unhappy about he and not enough health studies have been completed regarding large turbines.	<p>Provided the following information:: Provided the following information: One item of interest you identified pertained to the lack of health studies regarding large wind turbines. Health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsic Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents.</p> <p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	13	Correspondent commented that she is a victim of the proposed project. The project has taken away the municipalities power to say NO. Advised that the story board at the public meeting all tell Algonquin Power's story denying much research that has been done about aspects of the project such as health, property value, and wildlife kills etc. Indicated that key issues to consider during consultation would be: health effects of turbines; bird kills (especially raptors); and bat mortality. Would like the project to consider the fact that island is a peaceful quiet rural area. Does not	Provided the following information: In response to your specific question about pedestrian safety in the village, we are confident that through careful planning, marshaling, strict enforcement of speed limits and other safety measures that we will be able to maintain public safety. We will be developing a comprehensive transportation and traffic management plan which will outline all of the procedures that will be in place to ensure public safety and we will endeavour to notify all stakeholders when the plan is available for review. Loyalist Township will be consulted about the transportation and traffic management plan. Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your previous comments) brought forward by stakeholders was

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			believe the project will use services from community, but will bring in big machinery and operators from off shore. Stated that Ontario has lost manufactories and the demand for energy is low and Ontario pays to have wind turbine energy taken by the USA. Questions then why is Ontario 'hell-bent' on producing more?? Also, question why is Kathleen Wynne saying nothing about resolving municipal governments the rest are to manage their own decision e.g.. Repeal that part of the GEA. A conservative have put forth Bill 2- will the Liberals support it?	developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	186	Advised that the shadow flicker question from the first public meeting has not had a proper response. Inquired as to what impacts turbines, S30, S26, S18, S13 and possible S07 will have on their property? Also, questioned, how many hours per day do Algonquin/Windlectric feel is acceptable for shadow flicker on a residence? Asked if the proponent is considering the type of red lights on the top of the turbines to be ones operated with radar that only come on with an oncoming plane? If not, why not? And where is the dock to be located on the mainland?	<p>Provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Shadow Flicker report – as presented in the recent public open houses the project health consultant (Intrinsic) stipulated that there is no scientific evidence suggesting that shadow flicker from wind turbines poses a health risk. A copy of the Shadow Flicker report was made available at the Public Open Houses. An electronic copy is available on the project website. • Draft Heritage Assessment and Protected Properties report – your recommendations have been noted and some of them have already been documented by the consultant in their report. Your additional items will be considered. • Location of mainland dock – the proposed location was presented at the Public Open Houses and is made available in the draft REA documents. The storyboards from the public meeting and the draft reports are available on the project website. • Lights - Transport Canada will provide recommendations as to lighting requirements for the turbine towers and Windlectric Inc. will examine all options in order to satisfy Transport Canada. <p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	75	Concerned about habit, bird and bat mortality and environmental surveys. Advised that woodlands 25 and 26 are used by roosting short-eared owls. Commented that the Kingston Field Naturalist have sent a detailed list of deficient in the environment assessment.	<p>The company has received the Kingston Field Naturalist (KFN) comments regarding the Draft Natural Heritage Assessment Report. The project consultant (Stantec) completed a comprehensive assessment of the project study area in compliance with the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) reporting requirements. The MNR has provided a letter of confirmation indicating the report (including mitigation measures) was prepared using established MNR procedures and is acceptable. This letter will be included in the final Renewable Energy Approval application package. A separate response letter will be provided to KFN in response to their comments.</p> <p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	26	Advised that the Marine Archeology Report did not mention 'the Bulger' an 80 foot schooner with mast intact visible from Stella Bay which sank in the 1800s, and is a popular diving wreck. Concerned with VIA distortion, 18mm lens? Questioned if proponent can make the methodology and meta data available. Would like clarification on VIA methodology and confirmation if schooner was in the marine archeology study area boundaries.	Provided the following information: The Draft Underwater Archaeological Assessment Report, completed by the consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.), appropriately assessed (by a licensed archeologist) the area of interest. A letter of confirmation has been obtained from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) indicating the field assessments and reporting are consistent with their requirements. This document will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval application documentation.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	173	Advised that on property they have original house and barn, which include original beams and foundations, and is built by Irish immigrants in	Provided the following information: Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			1879. Also, indicated they could provide further information to be included in the Heritage Assessment Report.	documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 5, 2013		136	Provided information on building, advising that it was built in the 1860-1870s and was the Royal Hotel, Domain Hotel and the general store, used to be Glen store, there has since been a rear addition. Also provided, that the building was etched and owned by Jas McDonough, the counter top was bar in hotel, some original doors, built on bedrock, basement has long beams visible, has been a post office at least for the 20th Century, green coal shed to rear contemporaneous. Indicated that no response necessary, but would like the report to updated.	No response required. Information only
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	143	Indicated that the responses provided at public meeting were scripted. Key issues to be addressed would be approval only through referendum for property owners immediately impacts; in this case of Amherst Island. Advised that the pristine migratory bird area should be considered. Commented that whether the project proceeds or not, they require compensation for 100% loss in value to property. The only change to AI to impact our MPAC assessment is the introduction of this project, resulting in a depreciation in value of property by 42%.	Provided the following information: Windlectric acknowledges public comments and concerns related to potential property value impacts. Based upon the published reports reviewed to date based on data from other areas with established wind plants, there is little evidence of a material negative effect on property value as a result of the presence of a wind project. A recent decision in 2012 by the Ontario Assessment Review Board ruled that there is no evidence that the presence of a wind farm affected the value of a waterfront property on Wolfe Island located in the Township of Frontenac Islands on Lake Ontario. As a result of their review and subsequent findings, the Board concluded that there was nothing to indicate that the value of the property had been negatively affected by the creation or operation of the wind farm and confirmed the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation's (MPAC) assessment of the property. To date, MPAC's analysis of sales has not indicated that the presence of wind turbines that are either abutting or in proximity to a property has either a positive or negative impact on its value. Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	204	Indicated that the process is too long and complicated. Commented that he fully endorses the project and is disappointed there are so many misinformed people on the island.	Provided the following information: Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	102	Advised that the key issues are habitat protection. Indicated could provide services for project, such as P.Eng, project management and procurement skills.	Provided the following information: Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	108	Indicated that the key issues are people's health and not to take advantage of others. Commented that there is a natural feed spring pond on property that is a concern, and also the use and enjoyment of cabin beside the pond. Inquired as to the distance between S36 and the marsh? What is the noise level going to be at the pond and cabin (which should have been identified as a receptor)? Why was the cabin not	Provided the following information: The question of your cabin adjacent to your pond was discussed at the open house and based on the description (and photographic information) this structure does not comply with the Ministry of Environment definition of a noise receptor. Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			identified as a receptor? Advised that the cabin fits the description of the REA and could possibly change the location of the turbines.	describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	67	Indicated interest in the bird and bat survey results on Wolfe Island. Advised that he passed provincial security guard test, in regards to services to provide to project.	<p>Provided the following information::</p> <p>The storyboards displayed at the Public Open House (which includes information on the Wolfe Island wind project) are available on the project website.</p> <p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
March 5, 2013	April 19, 2013	68	Provided a series of questions for Windlectric: What measures are be taken to insure that children can walk safely to and from school during construction?; how are you going to prevent delays by construction vehicles preventing people from reaching the ferry in time?; why are plans on building turbines at the minimal allowed distance from school and exposing students to noise and flicker effects?; how are you going to prevent/repair the already fragile roads on the island from damage to the heavy construction vehicles?; what are the plans for decommissioning and who is going to pay for the dismantling of turbines at the end of their life?; and how will avoid interfering with normal movement of farm equipment during construction?	<p>Provided the following information: Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.</p>
March 6, 2013	April 19, 2013	72	Requested information regarding the five full time positions to be created on the island for the project. Would like details regarding job descriptions, qualifications, employment period, residency requirement, advertising of positions and competition.	<p>Provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wind Resource - Windlectric Inc. has undertaken the appropriate due diligence with respect to determining that the wind resources are sufficient for the construction of the proposal wind project. In addition, the internal business analysis has also determined that the land that is under signed agreement the will be sufficient for the development of the Project. • Important Bird Area (IBAs) - While IBAs do not have any legal protection under provincial government, the functions for which they are identified were assessed and considered within the project Natural Heritage Assessment. • Dock construction – the company discussed with expert navigation personnel the preferred location for a island dock location and the preferred location was chosen. The permitting of the docking infrastructure (temporary and permanent) will involve the consulting with the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Catteraqui Region Conservation Authority. • Shadow Flicker – Scientific evidence suggests that shadow flicker from wind turbines does not pose a risk of photo-induced seizures; modern wind turbines simply don't rotate at a speed that has been linked to this condition (generally less than 20 rpm vs. over 60 rpm). • Road Use Agreement – last year the company voluntarily submitted to the Township this agreement and as discussed in the Township town hall meeting (January 29th) desires to enter into this type of reasonable agreement which would prescribe the proponents legal obligations for any potential road upgrades and other infrastructure upgrades, including tree removal as well as any repairs to the roads required as a result of construction activities. • Details on potential job prospects – the details you requested in your letter have not been finalized, therefore, cannot be publicly released at this time. In the future any potential job description posting(s) will be developed by the company human resource department and operations senior management for their approval. <p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports</p>

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 6, 2013	April 19, 2013	164	Concerned about owls, and the proximity of the turbines to the owl woods.	Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 6, 2013	April 19, 2013	54	Provided key issues in regards to project were health, wildlife, noise pollution, finding a better balance between existing peoples economies (ie.B&Bs, farms, tourism) and wind turbines.	Provided the following information::Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.
March 6, 2013	April 19, 2013	151	Requested clarification regarding a damage deposit identified in the road use agreement of \$50,000. Believes this may be an error and they meant \$5,000,000 based on the size of the project.	Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 6, 2013	April 19, 2013	13	Correspondent commented that she feels like a turbine victim, and is angry about trucks going through Stella. Indicated that when she ask why the unopened road allowance east of second concession was not opened and made into a road, instead of the plan being to take big vehicles through Stella; nobody knew the answer. Indicated concern for heavy vehicles through Stella. Commented that children, elderly, tourist and all kinds of other people walk, cycle, ride and visit in the street of downtown Stella , and it would not be safe for big vehicles to come through. Questioned how the proponent will ensure the safety of the people who customarily walk in the streets in Stella at all hours? Also, how will the proponent keep people safe as they live there customary lives, of hanging out and walking in Stella?	<p>Provided the following information: In response to your specific question about pedestrian safety in the village, we are confident that through careful planning, marshaling, strict enforcement of speed limits and other safety measures that we will be able to maintain public safety. We will be developing a comprehensive transportation and traffic management plan which will outline all of the procedures that will be in place to ensure public safety and we will endeavour to notify all stakeholders when the plan is available for review. Loyalist Township will be consulted about the transportation and traffic management plan.</p> <p>Please find enclosed an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your previous comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.</p>
March 6, 2013	April 19, 2013	179	Advised that the representatives at the public meeting were to 'versed' when answering questions. Indicated that health issues are a concern and are being ignored. Traffic to the island will be horrendous, birds, trees and roads on and off island; the environment in general has to be affected. Questioned why the turbines could not be placed off shore.	Provided the following information::In response to your specific question: why is the project is being located on Amherst Island and not offshore in Lake Ontario. The original project proponent negotiated land option agreements with interested island landowners for the development of a wind project. Windlectric Inc. took over these land option agreements and desires to work with the interested land owners to develop the project. In early 2011 the project obtained power purchase contract from the Ontario Power Authority to develop the renewable energy project on the island. Note: the Province has placed a moratorium on the installation of wind turbines offshore in Lake Ontario.
March 6, 2013	April 19, 2013	84	Indicated that there was not enough evidence at the public meeting, and that Amherst is not Wolfe Island. Concerned for the protection of owl woods and also built heritage. Commented that communities should be allowed to decide what Municipal approvals should be in place. Suggested the that the proponent should consider the feelings of the real people. Advised that he prays the government changes and ends this	Provided an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns (similar to your comments) brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			undemocratic "bS," the proponent is ruining a peaceful serene island.	Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 6, 2013	April 19, 2013	4	Indicated that it seems some of the studies have only scratched the surface. Commented that they do not believe the proponent has completed an in depth study on wildlife, health issues, cost effectiveness of the wind turbines for Amherst Island. Advised that this is a major project that will destroy the island, its beauty and its environmental habitat. Inquired that if this has been put to a vote for all of the residents of the Island, in addition for all those on the mainland within visibility of the Island? If not, why not?	Provided the following information: The company was awarded a power purchase contract from the Ontario Power Authority (OPA) February 2011 (as part of the Provinces renewable energy initiative-Feed in Tariff program). A public referendum on the project has never been held or required by provincial regulation. Windlectric acknowledges public comments and concerns related to potential property value impacts. Based upon the published reports reviewed to date based on data from other areas with established wind plants, there is little evidence of a material negative effect on property value as a result of the presence of a wind project. A recent decision in 2012 by the Ontario Assessment Review Board ruled that there is no evidence that the presence of a wind farm affected the value of a waterfront property on Wolfe Island located in the Township of Frontenac Islands on Lake Ontario. As a result of their review and subsequent findings, the Board concluded that there was nothing to indicate that the value of the property had been negatively affected by the creation or operation of the wind farm and confirmed the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation's (MPAC) assessment of the property. To date, MPAC's analysis of sales has not indicated that the presence of wind turbines that are either abutting or in proximity to a property has either a positive or negative impact on its value. Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 6, 2013	April 19, 2013	214	Commented that nothing at the public meeting was satisfactory, specifically in terms of wildlife research, and migration claims. Key issues to be addressed include health, environment and democracy. Indicated that what is needed is satisfactory and honest consideration and a moral attitude to save Amherst Island from industrial waste.	Provided an updated Frequently Asked Questions document containing information on topics of interest related to wind power. This list of common questions/concerns brought forward by stakeholders was developed to provide general responses to those inquiries. This document is also responses available on the Project website and sent directly to individual stakeholders as appropriate. The comments/responses will be updated throughout the Project. Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 7, 2013		13	Provided a hyperlink to an article in The Whig titled "Islanders Vow Turbine Blockade". Stated that she feels the residents likely cannot stop the project as no community has yet. Feels that they have a lot of ideas for getting in Algonquin's way and are not concerned about being arrested. Stated they are gearing up for the start of construction.	No response required. Information only.
March 7, 2013	April 19, 2013	151	Stated that after the meeting conducted on March 6 the are concerned about the credibility of Algonquin Power and their disregard for the community. Provided a letter which indicated that it was their understanding that a sub-contractor for Algonquin Power failed financially following conclusion of their work on the island and the local contractor was left in debt. Asked if Algonquin Power has responsibility to rectify the situation.	Stated that that the on-going payment of project contractors or consultants is a private business matter; however, the local contractor was reimbursed by the Algonquin, when the financial circumstances of the sub-contractor that was hired by the project consultant was brought to our attention .

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
March 8, 2013	April 19, 2013	55	Asked if KFN as well as the public will be able to see the EIS report for the project with all of the recorded species at risk. Asked when a copy of the report would be made available.	The project EIS is available on the project web site and has been provided to the Kingston Field Naturalists (KFN). In a separate matter the Species at Risk (SAR) report is a separate topic from the Natural Heritage Assessment (Environmental Impact Study) and is provided only to the Ministry of Natural Resources and is not a public document. Nevertheless, our consultants have been speaking with KFN representative(s) and there has been a discussion about the SAR with them. We will be to continue to consult with the KFN in the future..
March 8, 2013	April 19, 2013	72	A letter requesting detailed responses to questions regarding: reasons for choosing Amherst as the site for the project, building additional docks to handle construction traffic, permit requirements for docking facilities, shadow flicker, heritage site lines, vibrancy fund.	<p>Provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wind Resource - Windlectric Inc. has undertaken the appropriate due diligence with respect to determining that the wind resources are sufficient for the construction of the proposal wind project. In addition, the internal business analysis has also determined that the land that is under signed agreement the will be sufficient for the development of the Project. • Important Bird Area (IBAs) - While IBAs do not have any legal protection under provincial government, the functions for which they are identified were assessed and considered within the project Natural Heritage Assessment. • Dock construction – the company discussed with expert navigation personnel the preferred location for a island dock location and the preferred location was chosen. The permitting of the docking infrastructure (temporary and permanent) will involve the consulting with the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Catteraqui Region Conservation Authority. • Shadow Flicker – Scientific evidence suggests that shadow flicker from wind turbines does not pose a risk of photo-induced seizures; modern wind turbines simply don't rotate at a speed that has been linked to this condition (generally less than 20 rpm vs. over 60 rpm). • Road Use Agreement – last year the company voluntarily submitted to the Township this agreement and as discussed in the Township town hall meeting (January 29th) desires to enter into this type of reasonable agreement which would prescribe the proponents legal obligations for any potential road upgrades and other infrastructure upgrades, including tree removal as well as any repairs to the roads required as a result of construction activities. • Details on potential job prospects – the details you requested in your letter have not been finalized, therefore, cannot be publicly released at this time. In the future any potential job description posting(s) will be developed by the company human resource department and operations senior management for their approval. <p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
March 8, 2013	April 19, 2013	203	Feels that the turbine proposed for the Eves property is close enough to the road to cause ice throw to be a danger to people using the road. Asked if they would consider resisting the turbine. Asked who would be responsible for damages caused as a result of ice throw. Indicated that they do not support the project and feel that the majority of residents do not support it either. Asked that the project be reconsidered.	With regards to ice throw the engineering consultant undertook the appropriate design assessment in developing the project layout to comply with the regulatory setback from public roads.
March 9, 2013	April 19, 2013	53	Provided a letter to Premier Wynne which reflects her comments on the proposal by Windlectric. Requested that their correspondence be included in the MOE submission and requested acknowledgement of receipt.	Acknowledged receipt of the letter and indicated that it would be included in the record.
March 9, 2013	April 19, 2013	189	Asked what Algonquin Power will be setting aside for performance bonds/credit, and how the bonds will be administered. Asked what will happen if Algonquin Power does not abide by the terms of the contract. Asked what measures will be put in place to ensure that if the project is sold to another interest that they must abide by the same terms.	With respect to Project Liability and Responsibility Windlectric Inc. (a subsidiary of Algonquin Power Co.) is the developer of the project and will be responsible for all liability with respect to the proposed wind energy project. The overall responsibility for operating and maintaining in the future the project will rest with the legal entity listed on the power purchase agreement and identified in the Renewable Energy Approval authorization. There is no security required by the Ontario Power Authority with respect to the power purchase agreement for the proposed

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				wind energy project after commercial operation.
March 11, 2013	April 19, 2013	70	Writing regarding errors she has found in the Draft Heritage Assessment for the project. Issues include: 1. entire island should be assessed as cultural heritage landscape 2. visual simulations and visual aids are distorted to minimize visual impact of proposed turbines 3. impact of the development is minimized throughout the draft heritage assessment 4. the assessment methodology is inadequate 5. the assessment omits the historic presence of first nations 6. omissions and inadequate consideration of significant buildings in Stella	The following information was provided: Draft Heritage Assessment Report: o The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) subject matter expert assessed the island and determined (based on Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport requirements and guidelines) which buildings should be designated as Heritage Resources. o The project consultant met with the local Heritage Committee and on March 5th and 6th toured the island with local residents to discuss the report and potential heritage resources. These comments have been incorporated into the reports where applicable. Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 12, 2013	April 19, 2013	79	A letter with comments and questions regarding the Construction Report and Design & Operations Report.	Provided the following responses with respect to the Draft Construction Plan Report: • Fuel Spills – as described in the draft report: o Storage of fuel and activities with the potential to cause contamination will occur in properly protected areas. o A detailed Construction Emergency Response and Communications Plan will be prepared by the construction contractor which will contain procedures for spill contingency and response plans, spill response training, notification procedures, and necessary cleanup materials and equipment. • Batch Plant - The necessary technical information pertaining to the proposed facility will be submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for their review, outside of the Renewable Energy Approval process. The temporary facility will be sited and operated in compliance with the appropriate provincial compliance requirements and municipal by-laws.. • Front Road – the consulting engineer has determined at this time that minimal work on the road is anticipated; however, more detailed investigations into the structural capacity of all roads to be used will be undertaken in the future to determine what upgrades are required to ensure there is no long-term damage to the roads. • Safety – as outlined in the Construction Plan Report, a comprehensive Traffic Management Plan will be developed in coordination with contractors and local officials and emergency responders and will include safety measures including (but not limited to): o Ensuring that roads will be kept in safe driving condition at all times; we will encourage the community to report any deficiencies to ensure they are repaired in a timely manner. o Strict enforcement of speed limits as well as traffic marshals and other techniques will be deployed to ensure the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. We do not expect any potential for interaction between construction traffic and homes or other buildings on the island. Design and Operations Report: • Water for Batch Plant –it is anticipated that water for the concrete will come either from Lake Ontario (if the water is suitable) or otherwise will be trucked from the mainland. The water will be stored on site in a water tank(s). • Washdown areas – the current plan will be located either in a central location likely near the batch plant or near individual turbine locations. The wastewater will be managed in accordance with appropriate regulations. • Storage of Chemicals – as described in the draft report any storage would be more than 30 m from any significant wetland or wildlife area. It should be noted it is anticipated that materials will come to the batch plant in as few separate components as possible and will be stored in containers at the batch plant in accordance with prudent industry practice and appropriate regulations.
March 12, 2013	April 19, 2013	110	Would like the Neilson Store Museum and Cultural Centre to be protected should the project proceed. Feels that the Draft Heritage Assessment is unacceptable because:1. Front road is too close to the front of the museum to allow truck transit2. Vibrations from large vehicles could damage the foundation of the museum3. Construction may cause	The following information was provided: • The project consultant, (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) undertook a detailed assessment of heritage resources compliant with the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) regulations and guidelines. Stantec has also provided monitoring recommendations in their draft report pertaining to those buildings identified in their analysis. The company will commit to these recommendations as discussed and presented at the Loyalist tow

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			damage to the building and limit access by visitors ⁴ . Flicker may cause a problem to the building ⁵ . Concerns extend to other heritage sites Provided letters from concerned citizens regarding the errors in the draft heritage report.	ship town hall meeting January 29, 2013 (copy of the information – which also discuss items for public safety – can be found at the project web site www.amherstislandwindproject.com)
March 12, 2013	April 19, 2013	135	Provided a response from the Association to Protect Amherst Island to the archaeological reports for the proposed Amherst Wind Project. Indicated that these reports were informed by input from the Catarauqui Archaeological Research Foundation.	Provide correspondent with information on: Draft Underwater Archaeological Assessment Report: • The consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) has undertaken this assessment work (by a licensed archeologist) in direct consultation with Parks Canada and following their requirements. A letter of confirmation has been obtained from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) indicating the field assessments and reporting are consistent with their requirements. This document will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval application documentation. • Kerr Bay – the consultant has conducted all appropriate underwater survey work associated with area of interest highlighted in the report. Draft Stage 1 & Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report: • The consultant complied with MTCS regulatory requirements and guidelines. Letters of confirmation have been obtained from the agency indicating the field assessments and reporting (for both phases) are consistent with their requirements. These letters will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval application package to the Ministry of Environment (which will be posted on the project web site when completed).
March 12, 2013	April 19, 2013	218	Provided three additional completed public meeting questionnaires. One from Nathan Eves indicating support for the project due to perception that it will bring economic prosperity. The second from Marianne Eves showing support, and the third from Sheila Eves indicating that she attended the meeting to gain information about the project. Provided three scanned questionnaires from the Final Public meetings. The first is from Vincent Eves who indicated that he is a landowner and strong supporter of the project, and that he is confident that the project will address questions and concerns of residents. The second was from Lance Eves and supported the project. The third was from Lance Edward Eves and indicated that they were concerned about the impact of construction for the project on roads.	The following information was provided: Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 12, 2013	April 19, 2013	219	Stated that it is impossible for them to express fully their opinion of what the project proposes to do to 'one of Ontario's most valuable gems'. Concerned about health, heritage, environment, archaeology, Owl Woods, migratory birds.	Provided acknowledgement letter and Frequently asked Questions.
March 13, 2013	April 19, 2013	186	Provided information on the a protected property, the Pentland Cemetery. Would like the stone fences of the cemetery to be protected and requested that the O&M building be relocated. Requested that the Township document the head and foot stones of the cemetery prior to the project construction. Requested that the collector cable be relocated.	The following information was provided: • Draft Shadow Flicker report – as presented in the recent public open houses the project health consultant (Intrinsic) stipulated that there is no scientific evidence suggesting that shadow flicker from wind turbines poses a health risk. A copy of the Shadow Flicker report was made available at the Public Open Houses. An electronic copy is available on the project website. • Draft Heritage Assessment and Protected Properties report – your recommendations have been noted and some of them have already been documented by the consultant in their report. Your additional items will be considered. • Location of mainland dock – the proposed location was presented at the Public Open Houses and is made available in the draft REA documents. The storyboards from the public meeting and the draft reports are available on the project website. • Lights - Transport Canada will provide recommendations as to lighting requirements for the turbine towers and Windlectric Inc. will examine all options in order to satisfy Transport Canada.
March 13, 2013	April 19, 2013	142	A public meeting questionnaire indicated that they require compensation for the loss in value of their property which they indicate has lost value in an MPAC assessment by 42% as a result of the project.	Based upon the published reports reviewed to date based on data from other areas with established wind plants, there is little evidence of a material negative effect on property value as a result of the presence of a wind project. A recent decision in 2012 by the Ontario Assessment Review Board ruled that there is no evidence that the presence of a wind farm affected the value of a waterfront property on Wolfe Island located in the Township of

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				Frontenac Islands on Lake Ontario. As a result of their review and subsequent findings, the Board concluded that there was nothing to indicate that the value of the property had been negatively affected by the creation or operation of the wind farm and confirmed the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation's (MPAC) assessment of the property. To date, MPAC's analysis of sales has not indicated that the presence of wind turbines that are either abutting or in proximity to a property has either a positive or negative impact on its value.
March 13, 2013		213	A public meeting questionnaire from the March 6th meeting indicating support for the residents of the island in opposition to the project.	No response required. Information only.
March 13, 2013	April 19, 2013	204	Public meeting questionnaire. Indicated that they fully endorse the project.	Provided acknowledgement and thank you letter.
March 14, 2013	April 19, 2013	26	<p>Provided a list of questions pertaining to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -substation: dirty electricity, noise, dimension, consultation -batch plant: noise, regulations, dust, school protection, health, water contamination -lay down and storage area: size, traffic, hours of operation, compensation tree removal , restoration -turbines: health, noise, receptor location, flicker, emergency plans -property: property value guarantee 	<p>The following information was provided:</p> <p>Sub Station:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As described in the draft Design and Operation Report the proposed barrier would be a sound attenuation wall that will be built at the substation transformer. The barrier will be continuous and its surface density will be 184 kg/m2, exceeding the 20-kg/m2 requirement established by MOE and further described in the Draft Noise Assessment Report. • The company is not aware of any health effects with respect to substation operations. • Dimensions will consist of a prepared area of approximately 80 m x 100 m in size, however, the actual measurements of the secured equipment will be smaller (approximately 8-10 m x 1-7 m). • Any issues at other wind project – Algonquin Power Co. is not aware of any problems at other wind projects. • Proposed location – the area was made available by the property owner and is situated centrally to the proposed wind turbines. Your comments have been noted and further assessment will be undertaken to consider them in relation to positioning on this parcel of land. <p>Batch Plant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The necessary technical information pertaining to the proposed facility will be submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for their review, outside of the Renewable Energy Approval process. The temporary facility will be sited and operated in compliance with the appropriate provincial compliance requirements and municipal by-laws. • The Renewable Energy Approval (REA) process does not require noise modelling of the batch plant operations for the project. • Setback - there are no minimum distance requirements to a non-participating receptor. • Noise – the modeled decibel levels in the Draft Noise Assessment Report were based on calculated sound pressure for the proposed closest turbine and substation. There is no predicted noise measure for the proposed batch plant. • Dust – as described in the Draft Construction Plan Report there are several methods proposed for dust mitigation – for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Applying dust suppressants (e.g. water, calcium chloride). o Enforce speed limits for trucks on site as appropriate. o As appropriate, protect stockpiles of friable material with a barrier or windscreen. o Consult with local authorities prior to application of dust suppressants (i.e. water) on public access roads. o Ensure dust generation is monitored and controlled in areas of sensitive land use. • Health effects – as presented and discussed at the open house the company does not believe there are any health effects as a result of construction or operation of the project. • Washdown areas – the current plan will be located either in a central location likely near the batch plant or near individual turbine locations. The wastewater will be managed in accordance with appropriate regulations. • Proposed location – the area was made available by the property owner and is situated centrally to the proposed wind turbines. Your comments have been noted and further assessment will be undertaken to consider them in relation to positioning on this parcel of land. • Water for Batch Plant – it is anticipated that water for the concrete will come either from Lake Ontario (if the water is suitable) or otherwise will be trucked from the mainland. The water will be stored on site in a water tank(s). <p>Lay Down and Storage Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The central staging areas are greater than 5 acres. • The regulatory REA requirements for noise pertain to turbine and substation noise modelling and are not

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				<p>required for the central staging areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing – a parameter fence may be considered, however, this level of detail has not been finalized. • Operating hours – as described in the Draft Construction Plan Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o To the greatest extent possible, activities that could create excessive noise would be restricted to construction daytime hours. o Construction will take place generally during regular construction hours. Extended hours may be needed for safety reasons or to meet other project commitments. • Public safety –as outlined in the Draft Construction Plan Report (and presented at the Township town hall meeting), a comprehensive Traffic Management Plan will be developed in coordination with contractors and local officials and emergency responders and will include safety measures including (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ensuring that roads will be kept in safe driving condition at all times; we will encourage the community to report any deficiencies to ensure they are repaired in a timely manner. o Strict enforcement of speed limits as well as traffic marshals and other techniques will be deployed to ensure the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. • Tree removal – as presented in the Township town hall meeting additional assessment work will be planned in order to determine which trees would need to be trimmed or removed (comply with Township bylaw). At this time this level of detail has not been completed. • Restoration – through discussion with the landowner reseeding the area may occur. <p>Turbines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health effects – as presented and discussed at the open house the company does not believe there are any health effects as a result of construction or operation of the project. • Noise – if the project obtains a Renewable Energy Approval, from the Ministry of Environment, this authorization will prescribe any post construction monitoring that would be required and mitigation requirements as well. • Emergency Response/ Fire Safety - as described in the Draft Design and Operations report this information will be part of an emergency response plan. The details for this plan have not been completed, but will be presented to the Township prior to construction. <p>You inquired if the methodology and data for the visual impact assessment could be provided publicly. The methodology used (as described to you at the open house) is attached; however, the raw data will not be released to the public. All relevant information regarding the visual impact assessment for the purposes of assessing the potential effects to the visual landscape are provided in the draft REA reports.</p> <p>The Draft Underwater Archaeological Assessment Report, completed by the consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.), appropriately assessed (by a licensed archeologist) the area of interest. A letter of confirmation has been obtained from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) indicating the field assessments and reporting are consistent with their requirements. This document will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval application documentation.</p>
March 14, 2013	April 19, 2013	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APAI comments on Adverse health effects • APAI comments on noise assessment • APAI comments on shadow flicker • Comments on Draft Construction plan • Comments on Draft D&O plan • Peter Large comments on Draft Decommissioning plan 	<p>Provided the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse Health, Shadow Flicker and Noise Effects Consulting companies – as you are aware the company has hired several reputable subject matter experts to work on the proposed Amherst Island wind energy project renewable energy approval process. Each consultant has provided advice, guidance, participated in consultation with government and stakeholder meetings, and technical reporting/ assessments, based on government guidelines and regulations. Their expertise will be used in order to assist in completing a Renewable Energy Approval application package that will be submitted to the Ministry of Environment. – Health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsic Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents. • Draft Construction Plan Report –this document was developed in compliance to the requirements for the renewable Energy Approval process. Further details will be completed during the permitting process. In addition, as discussed in the January 29th, 2013 Loyalist Township town hall meeting there will be a traffic/ transportation management plan, communication plan and emergency response plan developed, in consultation with the Township, prior to construction activities beginning. • Draft Design and Operation Plan - this document was developed in compliance to the requirements for the renewable Energy Approval process. Further details will be completed during the permitting process.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Decommissioning Plan - this document was developed in compliance to the requirements for the renewable Energy Approval process. Windlectric Inc., or its successor or assignee will be responsible for the removal of the project components at the time of decommissioning and shall be responsible to bear the entire cost. • Draft Natural Heritage Assessment and Environmental Impact Study - the project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) completed a comprehensive assessment of the project study area in order to comply with the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) requirements. The MNR has provided a letter of confirmation indicating the report was prepared (including mitigation measures) using established MNR procedures and guidelines and is acceptable. This letter will be included in the future Renewable Energy Approval application package. <p>We will be including a copy of all the materials provided by APAI to the MOE for consideration during their review of our REA submission.</p>
March 14, 2013	April 19, 2013	84	Completed public meeting questionnaire indicating that they hope the government revises this process as it is ruing the island.	<p>Provided acknowledgement and thank you letter. Also provide property value information. Based upon the published reports reviewed to date based on data from other areas with established wind plants, there is little evidence of a material negative effect on property value as a result of the presence of a wind project. A recent decision in 2012 by the Ontario Assessment Review Board ruled that there is no evidence that the presence of a wind farm affected the value of a waterfront property on Wolfe Island located in the Township of Frontenac Islands on Lake Ontario. As a result of their review and subsequent findings, the Board concluded that there was nothing to indicate that the value of the property had been negatively affected by the creation or operation of the wind farm and confirmed the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation's (MPAC) assessment of the property. To date, MPAC's analysis of sales has not indicated that the presence of wind turbines that are either abutting or in proximity to a property has either a positive or negative impact on its value.</p>
March 14, 2013	April 19, 2013	102	Completed public meeting questionnaire indicating that they were attending to gather information, and that the key issue is habitat protection.	<p>The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
March 14, 2013	April 19, 2013	139	Attended the second public meeting in Bath on March 6. Concerned regarding health, location of turbine near school, construction road use, wildlife. Feels that her voice was not heard.	<p>The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure. Also provided copy of the FAQ.</p>
March 14, 2013	April 19, 2013	212	<p>Provided a completed public meeting questionnaire. Would like a previous question answered regarding replacement of smaller turbines in Europe with larger ones. Requested the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where exactly the wind turbines facilities are located (country and town)? • How many wind turbines were and are replaced? • When the replacement took place? • Reasons, why the replacement took place? • And the size of the smaller and larger wind turbines. 	<p>Provided the following information on repowering of wind projects: Vattenfall's Nørrekær Enge project was originally constructed with 77 small turbines in the late 1980's in 2009, the project was repowered by removing the small turbines and replacing them with 13 larger turbines which produce significantly more energy each year. More information can be found here: http://powerplants.vattenfall.com/node/251. The Delabole wind farm in North Cornwall UK was constructed as a 10 turbine site with 4MW of capacity in 1991 and we repowered with 4 turbines for a total of 9.2MW of capacity in 2011. http://www.goodenergy.co.uk/our-wind-and-solar-farms/delabole-wind-farm-redevelopment. Please see the web links below for general repowering information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - http://www.farmrenewableenergyoptions.co.uk/farmrenewableenergyoptions/sustainability/repowering-wind-turbines.html - http://www.juwi.com/wind_energy/repowering.html - http://www.grontmij.com/highlights/water-and-energy/Pages/Repowering-of-wind-turbines-in-the-Netherlands-produces-more-sustainable-energy.aspx
March 14, 2013	April 19, 2013	214	Completed public meeting questionnaire indicating that they would like the island to be saved from this project. 'Green energy be damned in this instance'. Concerned about health, environment and democracy.	<p>The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the</p>

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	55	Provided questions from the association to protect Amherst island, collected from island residents and submitted on their behalf. Asked for confirmation of receipt. The document provides 22 pages of questions related to the areas of: turbines and ancillary structures, construction and maintenance, homeowners, health and safety, process and procedures, flora and fauna, and a set of miscellaneous questions.	<p>The following information was provided to the correspondent: Draft Environmental Impact Study (EIS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project EIS is available on the project web site and has been provided to the Kingston Field Naturalists (KFN). In a separate matter the Species at Risk (SAR) report is a separate topic from the Natural Heritage Assessment (Environmental Impact Study) and is provided only to the Ministry of Natural Resources and is not a public document. Nevertheless, our consultants have been speaking with KFN representative(s) and there has been a discussion about the SAR with them. We will be to continue to consult with the KFN in the future. <p>Oil Spills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The responsibility for clean-up of any oil spill related to the construction or operation of the project will be the responsibility of the project proponent (Windlectric Inc.) and/or the contractor. Compliance with the Ministry of Environment oil spill clean-up requirements will have to be followed. • A project specific clean- up protocol has not been completed. This task will be one segment of the future Emergency Response and Communication Plan which will be developed over the next several months. <p>o Note: there will be no PCB transformers associated with this proposed project.</p> <p>Turbine Vibrations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The company believes there will be no vibrations issues associated with the wind turbine operating. The development of a complaint protocol for operation periods will be developed in order for the public to contact operation management to discuss any concerns they believe are associated with the operation of the project. <p>Buried Collector Lines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The company has indicated that burying the collector lines along road allowances would be preferred, however, if there were significant engineering issues (geotechnical) then overhead would have to be considered. Note: the final collector line locations, along road allowances, have not been completed. This information will be part of the work that will be presented to the Township in the future. • Note: in early discussions with the Township representatives they have indicated they would prefer certain areas of the collector lines to be overhead. The plan would be to continue to work with the Township on future negotiations on this subject. <p>Navigation Lighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The company will comply with Transport Canada requirements for navigation lighting installed on the wind turbines. <p>Turbine Operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black-out – if there is a Hydro One Network transmission line outage the project protection and control system (required by Hydro one Networks) would automatically trip off the turbines, • The blades are not heated, however, the manufacturer does have this as an option. <p>Batch Plant:</p>

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The necessary technical information pertaining to the proposed facility will be submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for their review, outside of the Renewable Energy Approval process. The temporary facility will be sited and operated in compliance with the appropriate provincial compliance requirements and municipal by-laws. • The Renewable Energy Approval (REA) process does not require noise modelling of the batch plant operations for the project. • Setback - there are no minimum distance requirements to a non-participating receptor. • Dust – as described in the Draft Construction Plan Report there are several methods proposed for dust mitigation – for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Applying dust suppressants (e.g. water, calcium chloride). o Enforce speed limits for trucks on site as appropriate. o As appropriate, protect stockpiles of friable material with a barrier or windscreen. o Consult with local authorities prior to application of dust suppressants (i.e. water) on public access roads. o Ensure dust generation is monitored and controlled in areas of sensitive land use. • Washdown areas – the current plan will be located either in a central location likely near the batch plant or near individual turbine locations. The wastewater will be managed in accordance with appropriate regulations. • Water for Batch Plant – it is anticipated that water for the concrete will come either from Lake Ontario (if the water is suitable) or otherwise will be trucked from the mainland. The water will be stored on site in a water tank(s). <p>Substation: Algonquin Power Co. is not aware of any problems at other wind projects.</p> <p>Construction and Maintenance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snow plowing – this level of detail has not been completed. The company has experience in hiring local contractor to assist with this type of activity for existing power projects. • Operating hours – as described in the Draft Construction Plan Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Construction will take place generally during regular construction hours. Extended hours may be needed for safety reasons or to meet other project commitments. • The number of construction vehicles utilizing public roads at any one time has not been estimated. • Turbine erection schedule – this level of detail has not been finalized at this time. • Ground water – please see Appendix B of the Draft Construction Plan report pertaining to this topic. • Timing of re-seeding after decommissioning – this level of detail is unknown but will depend on weather conditions and discussions with the participating landowner. • A described in the Draft Design and Operations Report a complaint protocol will be developed in order for the public to communicate to operation management any concerns. Each complaint would be discussed on a case by case basis. <p>Property Owners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As described in the Draft Heritage Assessment Report the consultant has recommended assessment strategies with respect to certain heritage resources on the island. The company will follow these recommendations. • If it is determined, without a reasonable doubt, on a case by case basis, that there has been damage to homes due to construction or operation activity, for the project, then the company would be responsible for repairing the damage. • Any potential TV or internet issues that are determined, without a reasonable doubt, to be the result of project operation then the company would be responsible for the payment of the reasonable mitigation methods (i.e. as described in the project Frequently Asked Question document). <p>Health and Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposed project obtains a Ministry of Environment Renewable Energy Approval this authorization will prescribe terms and conditions with respect to dealing with complaints and any potential post construction monitoring requirement (i.e. noise). • The project proposed layout (using the Siemens turbine as described in the draft REA technical reports) is based on a 550 m setback from non-participating residents. This complies with Provincial regulations. • Emergency Response (includes fire safety) - as described in the Draft Design and Operations report this information will be part of an emergency response plan. The details for this plan have not been completed or presented to the Township for review, but will be prior to construction commencing.

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As presented in the recent public open houses health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsik Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents. • Transportation Management / Traffic Plan (Public safety)– as discussed in the recent Township town hall meeting this plan is required to be developed and reviewed with the Township designated representatives. This document must be in place prior to commencing construction activity. <p>Flora and Fauna:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree removal – as presented in the Township town hall meeting additional assessment work will be planned in order to determine which trees would need to be trimmed or removed (to comply with Township by-laws). At this time this level of detail has not been completed. • Draft Natural Heritage Assessment Report - the project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) completed a comprehensive assessment of the project study area in order to comply with the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) requirements. The MNR has provided a letter of confirmation indicating the report was prepared (including mitigation measures) using established MNR procedures and guidelines and is acceptable. This letter will be included in the future Renewable Energy Approval application package. <p>Miscellaneous:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commitment for decommissioning the project is incorporated in the Draft Decommissioning Plan Report. There is no requirement from the Ontario Power Authority or Ministry of Environment to post a bond or security for this activity. The obligation is mandated in the Ministry of Environment Renewable Energy Approval authorization – as a condition - which references the Decommissioning Plan Report. • Repowering - Please see the web links below for general repowering information: § http://www.farmrenewableenergyoptions.co.uk/farmrenewableenergyoptions/sustainability/repowering-wind-turbines.html § http://www.juwi.com/wind_energy/repowering.html § http://www.grontmij.com/highlights/water-and-energy/Pages/Repowering-of-wind-turbines-in-the-Netherlands-produces-more-sustainable-energy.aspx • Heritage fences – please refer to the Draft Heritage Assessment Report for work completed by the consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd). • Consulting companies – as you are aware the company has hired several reputable subject matter experts to work on the proposed Amherst Island Wind Energy Project Renewable Energy Approval process. Each consultant has provided advice, guidance, participated in consultation with government and stakeholder meetings, and technical reporting/ assessments, based on government guidelines and regulations. Their expertise will be used in order to assist in completing a Renewable Energy Approval application package that will be submitted to the Ministry of Environment. • Draft Underwater Archaeological Assessment Report - The consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) has undertaken this assessment work (by a licensed archeologist) in direct consultation with Parks Canada and with their requirements. A letter of confirmation has been obtained from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) indicating the field assessments and reporting are consistent with their requirements and guidelines. This document will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval application documentation. • Draft Stage 1 & Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report - the consultant complied with MTCS regulatory requirements and guidelines. Letters of confirmation have been obtained from the MTCS confirming the field assessments and reporting (for both phases) are consistent with their requirements and guidelines. These letters will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval application package to the Ministry of Environment.
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	4	Feel that the project will destroy the island and its environmental habitat. Thinks the project should be put to a vote by residents.	The company was awarded a power purchase contract from the Ontario Power Authority (OPA) February 2011 (as part of the Provinces renewable energy initiative-Feed in Tariff program). A public referendum on the project has never been held or required by provincial regulation.
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	9	Feels that the proposed project does not take into consideration the humans who live, operate businesses, and enjoy leisure activities on the island. Believes that residents should be surveyed for existing health issues at the outset of the project. Would like the project to buy out families who cannot live on the island as a result of the project.	No response required. Information only.

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			Concerned about the impact of construction traffic on pedestrian safety and ability to conduct parades and special events. Impact to tourism revenue both of construction and project operations. Location of a turbine near the school. Feels that the selection of the Community Liaison Committee was not transparent.	
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	36	Provided comments concerning the Natural Heritage Assessment and Environmental Impact Study. These comments primarily concerned bats on the island, including an assessment by COSEWIC suggesting that three species should be given endangered species status. Requested confirmation that monitoring for bat migration will be conducted at the island prior to proceeding with the project.	The following information was provided: . Bats: • The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) undertook a detailed field assessment for the project and complied with the Ministry of Natural Resources protocol for assessing bat habitat on Amherst Island. The company is confident in the consultant's analysis and comments in the draft for the Natural Heritage Assessment and Environmental Impact Study report. Note: this information has also been discussed with the Ministry of Natural Resources.
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	59	Registering objection to proposal. Feel that their home should be protected from the project. Feel that it is a village landmark due to the history of the site. Concerned about noise and dust from construction traffic effecting their home. Feels that the project will disturb the tranquil nature of the island.	The following information was provided: The project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) subject matter expert assessed the island and determined (based on Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport requirements and guidelines) which buildings should be designated as Built Heritage Resources including several dozen buildings within the village of Stella. • Safety – as outlined in the Construction Plan Report, a comprehensive Traffic Management Plan will be developed in coordination with contractors, and local officials and emergency responders and will outline include safety measures including (but not limited to): o Ensuring that roads will be kept in safe driving condition at all times; we will encourage the community to report any deficiencies to ensure they are repaired in a timely manner. o Strict enforcement of speed limits as well as traffic marshals and other techniques will be deployed to ensure the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. We do not expect any potential for interaction between construction traffic and homes or other buildings on the island.
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	67	Interested in the Wolfe Island bird and bat survey results.	The following information was provided: Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	101	Stated that the island is an unwilling host of the proposed project and residents do not support it.	No response required. Information only.
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	108	What is the distance between S36 and the marsh? What is the noise level going to be at my pond? Why was my cabin not identified as a receptor?	The question of your cabin adjacent to your pond was discussed at the open house and based on the description (and photographic information) this structure does not comply with the Ministry of Environment definition of a noise receptor. Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	110	Concerned about heritage buildings and the heritage report is unacceptable. Provided a list of comments to be considered regarding the heritage report.	• The project consultant, (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) undertook a detailed assessment of heritage resources compliant with the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) regulations and guidelines. Stantec has also provided monitoring recommendations in their draft report pertaining to those buildings identified in their analysis. The company has will commit to these recommendations as discussed and presented at the Loyalist tow ship

AMHERST ISLAND WIND ENERGY PROJECT
CONSULTATION REPORT
Appendix E7 - Public Comment/Response Summary
April 2013

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				town hall meeting January 29, 2013 (copy of the information – which also discuss items for public safety – can be found at the project web site www.amherstislandwindproject.com)
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	134	Provided a response to the Heritage Reports. This review is on behalf of the association to protect Amherst island. Would like a second draft of the assessment for the island residents to review and meet with the consultants before it is submitted to the Ministry. Would like comments to result in changes to the report, site plan and construction plan. Feel that the mitigation strategy for heritage should be avoidance.	<p>Provided the following information: Draft Underwater Archaeological Assessment Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) has undertaken this assessment work (by a licensed archeologist) in direct consultation with Parks Canada and following their requirements. A letter of confirmation has been obtained from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) indicating the field assessments and reporting are consistent with their requirements. This document will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval application documentation. • Kerr Bay – the consultant has conducted all appropriate underwater survey work associated with area of interest highlighted in the report. <p>Draft Stage 1 & Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultant complied with MTCS regulatory requirements and guidelines. Letters of confirmation have been obtained from the agency indicating the field assessments and reporting (for both phases) are consistent with their requirements. These letters will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval application package to the Ministry of Environment (which will be posted on the project web site when completed). <p>Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.</p>
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	166	Submitting questions related to the heritage studies for the project. Believes that Front Road, 3rd Concession and South Shore road should be assessed as cultural assets. Stage 1 testing should be done when excavating unpaved roads. Concerned about the project interference with food production. Requested academic CV of the individual who prepared the heritage component of the study. Feel that the overlays of the map are not satisfactory. Concerned about visual impacts of the turbines and movement of turbine blades.	The following information was provided: Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents, among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	166	Provided a letter via email regarding the disruptive turbine related effects on Amherst island inhabitants, Indicated that they suffer from tinnitus and inner ear/balance issues. Would like to know what the baseline ambient noise is at their house, and what noise associated vibrations could come from the project. Request that S34 be removed from the project. Concerned that industrial noise associated with the project will cause their home to become uninhabitable. Provided a doctor's note indicating that they are being treated for tinnitus.	The following information was provided: Health effects – as presented in the recent public open houses health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsic Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents.
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	176	Concerned about the answers received to questions during the public meetings on March 5 and 6. Feels that professional engineers are not following their obligation to protect the public from engineering that may cause harm to them. Concerned about noise and the effect on human health, damage to the environment, public welfare and the draft heritage assessment.	The following information was provided: Consulting companies – as you are aware the company has hired several reputable subject matter experts to work on the proposed Amherst Island wind energy project renewable energy approval process. Each consultant has provided advice, guidance, participated in consultation with government and stakeholder meetings, and technical reporting/ assessments, based on government guidelines and regulations. Their expertise will be used in order to assist in completing a Renewable Energy Approval application package that will be submitted to the Ministry of Environment.
March 15, 2013	March 16, 2013	109	Provided comments regarding concerns expressed at the March 5th public meeting. Feel that their questions were not addressed to their satisfaction. Requested confirmation of receipt. Questions pertain to:	Windlectric is committed to working with and supporting the communities in which our projects are developed. The work being conducted at present and to be conducted in the future will be documented in the suite of reports and documentation that constitute the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) application. The REA documents,

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
			south shore road, public road use plan, Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority, request for direction to use alternate road access,.	among other things, detail the existing environment and describe the effects of the proposed project on a wide range of natural, social and cultural criteria (including and in addition to those identified by you). Where necessary, the documents also detail measures to be taken by the proponent to mitigate potential effects to the natural and social environment; cultural resources and local infrastructure.
March 15, 2013	March 16, 2013	109	Concerned about public health in relation to the project. Feels that the public is not protected from low public health standards of the wind industry. Feels that the project should not proceed until research has concluded. Asked if the project will accept responsibility for the health impacts to residents.	The following information was provided: Health effects – as presented in the recent public open houses health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsik Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents.
March 15, 2013	April 19, 2013	55	Provided questions from the association to protect Amherst island, collected from island residents and submitted on their behalf. Asked for confirmation of receipt. The document provides 22 pages of questions related to the areas of: turbines and ancillary structures, construction and maintenance, homeowners, health and safety, process and procedures, flora and fauna, and a set of miscellaneous questions.	<p>The following information is provided: Draft Environmental Impact Study (EIS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project EIS is available on the project web site and has been provided to the Kingston Field Naturalists (KFN). In a separate matter the Species at Risk (SAR) report is a separate topic from the Natural Heritage Assessment (Environmental Impact Study) and is provided only to the Ministry of Natural Resources and is not a public document. Nevertheless, our consultants have been speaking with KFN representative(s) and there has been a discussion about the SAR with them. We will be to continue to consult with the KFN in the future. <p>Oil Spills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The responsibility for clean-up of any oil spill related to the construction or operation of the project will be the responsibility of the project proponent (Windlectric Inc.) and/or the contractor. Compliance with the Ministry of Environment oil spill clean-up requirements will have to be followed. • A project specific clean-up protocol has not been completed. This task will be one segment of the future Emergency Response and Communication Plan which will be developed over the next several months. <p>o Note: there will be no PCB transformers associated with this proposed project.</p> <p>Turbine Vibrations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The company believes there will be no vibrations issues associated with the wind turbine operating. The development of a complaint protocol for operation periods will be developed in order for the public to contact operation management to discuss any concerns they believe are associated with the operation of the project. <p>Buried Collector Lines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The company has indicated that burying the collector lines along road allowances would be preferred, however, if there were significant engineering issues (geotechnical) then overhead would have to be considered. Note: the final collector line locations, along road allowances, have not been completed. This information will be part of the work that will be presented to the Township in the future. • Note: in early discussions with the Township representatives they have indicated they would prefer certain areas of the collector lines to be overhead. The plan would be to continue to work with the Township on future negotiations on this subject. <p>Navigation Lighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The company will comply with Transport Canada requirements for navigation lighting installed on the wind turbines. <p>Turbine Operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black-out – if there is a Hydro One Network transmission line outage the project protection and control system (required by Hydro one Networks) would automatically trip off the turbines, • The blades are not heated, however, the manufacturer does have this as an option. <p>Batch Plant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The necessary technical information pertaining to the proposed facility will be submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for their review, outside of the Renewable Energy Approval process. The temporary facility will be sited and operated in compliance with the appropriate provincial compliance requirements and municipal by-laws. • The Renewable Energy Approval (REA) process does not require noise modelling of the batch plant operations for the project. • Setback - there are no minimum distance requirements to a non-participating receptor. • Dust – as described in the Draft Construction Plan Report there are several methods proposed for dust

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				<p>mitigation – for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Applying dust suppressants (e.g. water, calcium chloride). o Enforce speed limits for trucks on site as appropriate. o As appropriate, protect stockpiles of friable material with a barrier or windscreen. o Consult with local authorities prior to application of dust suppressants (i.e. water) on public access roads. o Ensure dust generation is monitored and controlled in areas of sensitive land use. • Washdown areas – the current plan will be located either in a central location likely near the batch plant or near individual turbine locations. The wastewater will be managed in accordance with appropriate regulations. • Water for Batch Plant – it is anticipated that water for the concrete will come either from Lake Ontario (if the water is suitable) or otherwise will be trucked from the mainland. The water will be stored on site in a water tank(s). <p>Substation: Algonquin Power Co. is not aware of any problems at other wind projects.</p> <p>Construction and Maintenance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snow plowing – this level of detail has not been completed. The company has experience in hiring local contractor to assist with this type of activity for existing power projects. • Operating hours – as described in the Draft Construction Plan Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Construction will take place generally during regular construction hours. Extended hours may be needed for safety reasons or to meet other project commitments. • The number of construction vehicles utilizing public roads at any one time has not been estimated. • Turbine erection schedule – this level of detail has not been finalized at this time. • Ground water – please see Appendix B of the Draft Construction Plan report pertaining to this topic. • Timing of re-seeding after decommissioning – this level of detail is unknown but will depend on weather conditions and discussions with the participating landowner. • A described in the Draft Design and Operations Report a complaint protocol will be developed in order for the public to communicate to operation management any concerns. Each complaint would be discussed on a case by case basis. <p>Property Owners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As described in the Draft Heritage Assessment Report the consultant has recommended assessment strategies with respect to certain heritage resources on the island. The company will follow these recommendations. • If it is determined, without a reasonable doubt, on a case by case basis, that there has been damage to homes due to construction or operation activity, for the project, then the company would be responsible for repairing the damage. • Any potential TV or internet issues that are determined, without a reasonable doubt, to be the result of project operation then the company would be responsible for the payment of the reasonable mitigation methods (i.e. as described in the project Frequently Asked Question document). <p>Health and Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the proposed project obtains a Ministry of Environment Renewable Energy Approval this authorization will prescribe terms and conditions with respect to dealing with complaints and any potential post construction monitoring requirement (i.e. noise). • The project proposed layout (using the Siemens turbine as described in the draft REA technical reports) is based on a 550 m setback from non-participating residents. This complies with Provincial regulations. • Emergency Response (includes fire safety) - as described in the Draft Design and Operations report this information will be part of an emergency response plan. The details for this plan have not been completed or presented to the Township for review, but will be prior to construction commencing. • As presented in the recent public open houses health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects. This information was discussed with many stakeholders during the meetings by the subject matter experts from Intrinsic Consulting. Note: the proposed Amherst Island wind project will adhere to the provincial regulations for setbacks related to non-participating residents. • Transportation Management / Traffic Plan (Public safety)– as discussed in the recent Township town hall meeting this plan is required to be developed and reviewed with the Township designated representatives. This document must be in place prior to commencing construction activity.

Date of Correspondence	Date of Response	From	Contents of Correspondence	Response
				<p>Flora and Fauna:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree removal – as presented in the Township town hall meeting additional assessment work will be planned in order to determine which trees would need to be trimmed or removed (to comply with Township by-laws). At this time this level of detail has not been completed. • Draft Natural Heritage Assessment Report - the project consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) completed a comprehensive assessment of the project study area in order to comply with the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) requirements. The MNR has provided a letter of confirmation indicating the report was prepared (including mitigation measures) using established MNR procedures and guidelines and is acceptable. This letter will be included in the future Renewable Energy Approval application package. <p>Miscellaneous:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commitment for decommissioning the project is incorporated in the Draft Decommissioning Plan Report. There is no requirement from the Ontario Power Authority or Ministry of Environment to post a bond or security for this activity. The obligation is mandated in the Ministry of Environment Renewable Energy Approval authorization – as a condition - which references the Decommissioning Plan Report. • Repowering - Please see the web links below for general repowering information: § http://www.farmrenewableenergyoptions.co.uk/farmrenewableenergyoptions/sustainability/repowering-wind-turbines.html § http://www.juwi.com/wind_energy/repowering.html § http://www.grontmij.com/highlights/water-and-energy/Pages/Repowering-of-wind-turbines-in-the-Netherlands-produces-more-sustainable-energy.aspx • Heritage fences – please refer to the Draft Heritage Assessment Report for work completed by the consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd). • Consulting companies – as you are aware the company has hired several reputable subject matter experts to work on the proposed Amherst Island Wind Energy Project Renewable Energy Approval process. Each consultant has provided advice, guidance, participated in consultation with government and stakeholder meetings, and technical reporting/ assessments, based on government guidelines and regulations. Their expertise will be used in order to assist in completing a Renewable Energy Approval application package that will be submitted to the Ministry of Environment. • Draft Underwater Archaeological Assessment Report - The consultant (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) has undertaken this assessment work (by a licensed archeologist) in direct consultation with Parks Canada and with their requirements. A letter of confirmation has been obtained from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) indicating the field assessments and reporting are consistent with their requirements and guidelines. This document will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval application documentation. • Draft Stage 1 & Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report - the consultant complied with MTCS regulatory requirements and guidelines. Letters of confirmation have been obtained from the MTCS confirming the field assessments and reporting (for both phases) are consistent with their requirements and guidelines. These letters will be included in the project Renewable Energy Approval application package to the Ministry of Environment.
Undated June	July 25, 2011	72	Voiced concerns over the impact industrial wind turbine installations will have on migratory birds and bat populations. Also concerned about potential for decreasing property values. Is worried about the health of residents and their children, she would like to know about setback distances for turbines and transformers from residences. Is concerned that environmentally sensitive areas of the island will be impacted by the project. She invites Mr. Robertson to visit the island.	Responded s in a combined response letter. He summarized their concerns in a list and indicated that public concerns are considered very seriously. Stated that all work being performed for this project will be documented as part of the REA process. Stated that public stakeholders are being engaged with the support of Stantec Consulting Ltd. to ensure that all comments are taken into consideration and are responded to meaningfully. Provided project website and contact information and indicated that a list of Frequently asked Questions would be made available.