



Table of Contents

Comments Received from Aamjiwnaang First Nation – Sarnia 45 (Aamjiwnaang) and Consideration by Project Team	1
Comments Received from Bkejwanong Territory Walpole Island First Nation – Walpole Island 46 (WIFN) and Consideration by Project Team	6
Comments Received from Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation (KSPFN) and Consideration by Project Team.....	9
Comments Received from Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) and Consideration by the Project Team.....	13
Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team.....	18
Comments Received from Métis Nation of Ontario / Great Lakes Métis Council (MNO) and Consideration by the Project Team	35
Comments Received from Six Nations of the Grand River and Consideration by the Project Team	41

Comments Received from Aamjiwnaang First Nation – Sarnia 45 (Aamjiwnaang) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
Aboriginal or Treaty Rights	
Aamjiwnaang would like to review Project related reports and studies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K2 Wind provided the Draft REA Reports (August 2012), the Project Summary Report (August 2012), the Natural Heritage Assessment and Environmental Impact Study (NHA/EIS), including Addenda (July 2012) and the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Reports (July 2012) for the Aamjiwnaang's review and comment.
Concern for Project related impacts on animal (e.g., deer) corridors during construction and operations phases and the impact this could have on the hunting rights that the First Nations peoples exercise in or near the affected areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the assessment of the Project Location, animal movement corridors are not expected to be impacted by the Project. The Project is primarily being constructed in actively farmed lands and within municipal road allowances, significantly reducing the possibility that it would impact deer or amphibian movement corridors. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Table 4-1, and Section 4.5.5. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Table 5-1 and Section 5.5.5. • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Sections 2.2.4, 2.2.4.4, 3.1.6, 3.1.6.6, 3.2.3, 3.2.3, 3.2.4.4, 4.1.3, 4.1.4.4.
Archaeology	
Aamjiwnaang has an archaeological protocol and would like to have monitors onsite during field studies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K2 Wind has had discussions with Aamjiwnaang regarding future archaeological field work including the possibility of having an archaeological monitor onsite. A monitor from Aamjiwnaang has been involved in the Stage 3 archaeological field work for the Project since August 2012.
Interest in knowing what happens to archaeological artifacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The archaeologists are required to properly maintain the findings of their investigations. • Additional information was provided in the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report.
Environment	
Interest in having the Project conduct bat and bird studies in the proposed Project area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant amount of work has been and will be done in advance of construction to document baseline environmental conditions. Studies focusing on birds and bats were conducted in the Project study area over several years. These studies and their results have been detailed in the Project's NHA Report and associated Addenda. • Bat Studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 3.1.6.2. - Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i> Appendix E: Kingsbridge II Bat Monitoring Pre-construction Risk Assessment Report. • Bird Studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 3.1.6.1, 4.1.4, Appendix D, and Appendix I.
Concern that migratory birds (e.g., Tundra Swans, geese) and migratory paths could be affected by the Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Sections 2.2.4.1, 3.2.4.1, 5.3.3, and 5.3.7 and Appendix D. • NHA references were provided which directed the community to information regarding migratory birds including the following information which is supported by: Section 2.2.4.1 of the NHA (Records review), and

Comments Received from Aamjiwnaang First Nation – Sarnia 45 (Aamjiwnaang) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
Interest in receiving studies on bird paths.	Section 3.2.4.1 (Site Investigation Results: Habitats of seasonal concentration areas of wildlife/ Waterfowl stopover and staging) : Through the work completed for the Natural Heritage Assessment an assessment of significant wildlife habitats for stopover and staging areas for both waterfowl and raptors was completed for lands where the Project is sited. The Project is sited primarily in actively managed agricultural fields and was not identified for significant wildlife habitat for migratory birds (including raptors and waterfowl).
Concern about potential Project related effects on earthworms and snakes during construction and operations phases. Concern that underground transmission cables could adversely affect earthworms and snakes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on a review by our consultant, there has been no scientifically documented effect of disturbance from wind turbines on earthworms or snakes. Based on Capital Power's experience on the Kingsbridge 1 Wind Operation construction and restoration post construction, farming activity readily returns to the areas around the turbines used for temporary construction. There is no indication that there is a significant impact to the surrounding crops, and farmers often crop right up to the base of the turbines. Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 2.2.4.1, 3.2.4.3, and 4.1.4.1.
Aamjiwnaang would like to see precautions taken to protect habitat of snakes in the area listed as Species at Risk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Snake habitat was studied as part of the NHA work and an assessment of possible snake habitat and mitigation can be found in that report. No suitable hibernation sites were identified in a site assessment of the Project Location. Field surveys were conducted to identify the presence of snakes, and critical habitat features (i.e. hibernation sites). No hibernation sites were observed in areas where the Project will be constructed and no removal of reptile hibernation sites is required for construction of the Project. Field survey methods and results are provided in the NHA. Mitigation measures to protect wildlife during construction and operation of the Project are provided in the EIS. Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 3.2.4.3 (ESA Special Concern Species). Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 5.3.7 (Wildlife Mitigation) K2 Wind will be submitting a Species at Risk (SAR) assessment to the MNR for review, which will assess proposed mitigation for possible Species at Risk.
Interest in plant and wetland areas near the Project sites being appropriately monitored and maintained, where possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where the construction is occurring within the vicinity of a wetland specific mitigation protocols are being put in place to mitigate the impact of the construction activities. This includes moving subsurface collector lines away from the edge of the wetland; during construction the installation and monitoring of silt fencing at the wetland edge, as appropriate; and development of a vegetated buffer as appropriate, between the access road and the wetland. Within the municipal road allowance where trenches are required for underground cabling, areas are expected to be reseeded with the appropriate indigenous species. Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 5.2.2 and Appendix B.
Interest in seeing studies on Project related magnetic fields and their potential to impact plants, animals and birds within the proposed Project location.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety is a top priority for K2 Wind Ontario and is extended to our employees, contractors and neighbours. In our view, it is the relevant government regulatory authorities' responsibility to establish public policy and regulations that protect public health and safety, and the environment, and our role is to comply with these regulations. With regards to your questions concerning electric and magnetic fields (EMF), K2 Wind's position is consistent with the consensus of large health organizations, such as Health Canada, the Federal-Provincial-

Comments Received from Aamjiwnaang First Nation – Sarnia 45 (Aamjiwnaang) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<p>Territorial Radiation Protection Committee and the World Health Organization, which have reviewed the literature related to EMF and possible adverse health effects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specifically with regards to wind operations, at present we are unaware of any scientific research that has been conducted on possible impacts on farm animal health from wind turbines. We would note that there are thousands of turbines operating across Europe, Australia, the United States and Canada; this issue does not appear to have surfaced around these existing facilities, some of which have been in operation for decades.
Employment/Contract Opportunities	
<p>Interest in opportunity for community to learn more about and share in Project related business and employment opportunities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> K2 Wind will continue to update Aamjiwnaang with Project updates and timelines, including Project contracting and construction timelines. <p>General Information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.5.8. Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 4.5.7. Please refer to Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Appendix B.
<p>Aamjiwnaang may have community members who are able to conduct post-construction monitoring work for the Project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment has been noted by the Project Team and discussions will continue regarding the potential for Aamjiwnaang's involvement in the post-construction monitoring for the Project.
Health/Safety	
<p>Concern about potential health impacts of wind turbines on nearby residents. Aamjiwnaang would like to see reports or studies relating to these residents medical issues attributed to windmill operation near their residence.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about the relationship between wind turbines and possible health effects was provided in ongoing Project update correspondence to the community, including Project update newsletters, information on the Project website and through Open house display boards. 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: <i>"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."</i> In fact, a recent review of the scientific literature, conducted by a group of independent medical and scientific experts stated that there is "no evidence for a set of health effects, from exposure to wind turbines that could be characterized as a 'Wind Turbine Syndrome.'" (The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection and Public Health, 2012) Shadow Flicker: Scientific evidence suggests that shadow flicker from wind turbines does not pose a risk of

Comments Received from Aamjiwnaang First Nation – Sarnia 45 (Aamjiwnaang) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<p>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).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMF: Health Canada (2010) has stated: <i>"You do not need to take action regarding daily exposures to electric and magnetic fields at extremely low frequencies. 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"</i>. • 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. • 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. K2 Wind engaged recognized environmental health experts to assist us in assessing the science and to helping the company stay informed on this issue. • Through our environmental health consultants, K2 Wind is committed to keeping informed on this issue. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 4.8. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Appendix D. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.8. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Appendix F. <p>*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.</p>
Do wind turbines contribute to stray voltage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stray voltage may result from imbalances on the electrical distribution system, particularly in rural areas, in areas where the distribution system may be less robust. • Wind energy has been incorrectly associated with stray voltage because wind turbines are often installed in agricultural areas. Stray voltage is not a consequence of wind energy, but rather changes in the use pattern of the existing electrical system. Wind turbines are not the root of the problem, but the addition of this or any other generation source may expose faults in that system. • K2 Wind will attempt to minimize the risk of stray voltage and ensure the Project is built and maintained within acceptable levels as prescribed by the local safety code. We will investigate any situation in which a farmer suspects that stray voltage may be affecting his or her livestock. Studies, reports, and other

Comments Received from Aamjiwnaang First Nation – Sarnia 45 (Aamjiwnaang) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	information on stray voltage can be found on the Ontario Energy Board's website about this issue at www.ontarioenergyboard.ca .
Sound	
What type of noise modeling software was used in the noise modeling studies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Appendix D: <i>Noise Assessment Report</i>.
Concern that areas close to the turbines may not be suitable for vegetation restoration due to vibration once turbines are operating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas disturbed during construction would be re-vegetated as soon as conditions allow to prevent erosion and to restore habitat functions (Please refer to the Draft Construction Plan Report, Section 4.3.2).
Cumulative Effects	
Aamjiwnaang concerned about cumulative effects and would like to see this addressed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under O. Reg. 359/09, the <i>Noise Impact Assessment</i> must consider the cumulative impact of all turbines within a 3km radius of the Project. • In reviewing the REA application, the MOE must also consider the cumulative noise impact of other existing and planned renewable energy projects in the region.
Interested in understanding if increased numbers of operating turbines affect the atmosphere at windmill heights which may cause changes to upper level wind flows and impact on weather patterns in proposed Project area and areas outside of wind farm projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wake effect of wind turbines dissipates within a few hundred metres. Given that the atmosphere is many kilometres deep and that wind turbines extract a small fraction in the least energetic section nearest the ground, the atmospheric effect is negligible. Our Project Team is aware of a study published in Nature Climate Change in April 29, 2012 of wind projects in Texas which indicates that as wind turbine wakes mix up the atmosphere, they may bring warmer air from upper levels down to the surface near the wind projects at night. The effect is small (a fraction of a degree), and has only been identified to date in the Texas location. As noted previously, the effect is small and localized.
Setbacks	
Concern about shadow flicker; Aamjiwnaang would like to see flicker or shadow reports prepared.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current REA required turbine setback distances of 550m from residences reduces shadow flicker by placing residences outside the typical blade shadow. Currently there is not a requirement under the REA to complete flicker or shadow reports.
Visual	
Aamjiwnaang would like to see any changes to the areas affected by construction minimized and restored as close as possible to the original pre-construction condition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following construction activities, all of the temporary locations would be restored to pre-construction conditions. Restoration work would start following installation of each wind turbine and removal of all construction materials and equipment from each turbine site. This includes removal of the granular and geotextile material from applicable areas. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>.

Comments Received from Bkejwanong Territory Walpole Island First Nation – Walpole Island 46 (WIFN) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
Archaeology	
Interest in being involved with archaeological work. Interested in the archaeological studies for the Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K2 Wind has provided archaeological updates to WIFN and has contacted the community about the possibility of their involvement in archaeological monitoring for the Project. • Members of the Project Team have provided numerous updates on the archaeological field investigations conducted for the Project through written correspondence, phone calls, e-mail and in-person meetings. • All Project impact areas were surveyed as part of the archaeological field studies, including: turbine footprints, access roads, crane paths, substation, transformer station, switchyard, temporary construction areas, and transmission lines.
Interest in monitoring Stage 4 archaeological studies for the Project and what happens if a Stage 4 archaeological study is conducted and a cultural feature is found. WIFN would like to be involved in the protection of sites if cultural features are found.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K2 Wind is still waiting to hear from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport regarding the Stage 4 archaeological studies for the Project. Once this information is received, the Project will follow-up with WIFN. • Avoidance is the first approach in the MTCS guideline. It may be possible to alter the Project Location to remove it from the impacted lands. The Project Team will review this when there is more information. • The Project Team noted that avoidance of Stage 4 sites is preferred where possible.
Environment	
Concern about potential impacts of wind projects on the flight patterns of migratory birds and waterfowl.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i> Section 2.2.4.1 (Habitats of Seasonal Concentrations of Wildlife), 3.2.4.1 (Habitats of Seasonal Concentrations of Wildlife), Section 4.2.4.1 (Seasons Concentration Areas), Section 5.2.4.2 (Significant Waterfowl Nesting Habitat), Section 5.3.7 (Wildlife Mitigation), Appendix D (Kingsbridge II Wind Power Project: Bird Report). • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Appendix I (Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan for Wildlife).
Preference for an ecosystem approach to habitat restoration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K2 Wind requested more information about this approach in order to understand WIFN's interest better. • In some areas, such as locations adjacent to significant wetlands, a buffer will be created between farmland and the wetland. • K2 Wind will continue to discuss potential ecosystem restoration initiatives outside of the REA with the WIFN.
Tundra swan activity in the Project area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although fields could be considered Swan staging areas, the <i>NHA</i> indicates that there are no significant staging or nesting areas for Tundra Swans within the Project area. • Studies at currently operating wind facilities indicate bird mortality is very low. To date no Tundra Swan fatalities have been observed at operating wind facilities.
Post-construction monitoring plans. Concern about methodology / post-construction monitoring surveys of waterfowl.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information regarding post-construction monitoring plans for the Project is included in the Draft REA Reports. • K2 Wind committed to continuing discussions with WIFN regarding the Project, as appropriate.
Interested in a plan to turn off turbines if migrating birds are flying through the area at an	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment was noted by the Project Team and plans for mitigation for any potential impacts as a result of the Project, were provided in the Draft REA Reports.

Comments Received from Bkejwanong Territory Walpole Island First Nation – Walpole Island 46 (WIFN) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
affected altitude.	
Interested in K2 Wind's plans regarding habitat creation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project is being proposed on actively farmed lands and within the municipal road allowance, so is not expected to impact habitat. There are some discussions with the MNR regarding Species at Risk habitat, where species reside in farm fields. This will likely be determined in consultation with MNR; we expect that MNR will provide feedback to the Project Team regarding the Species at Risk report. • Given that the Project is proposed in actively managed lands, habitat creation is not something that the Project Team has been specifically looking at, but welcomed the opportunity to receive more information from WIFN about the request. • K2 Wind committed to continuing discussions with WIFN with regards to their interest in habitat creation.
Employment/Contract Opportunities	
Interest in potential Project related economic opportunities (e.g., supply of goods and services).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K2 Wind will continue to update WIFN with Project updates and timelines, including Project contracting and construction timelines. • If developed, the Project would bring positive community benefits in the form of jobs, taxation, tourism and increased revenue to local farmers and businesses. The Project would create significant economic stimulus and employment opportunities while it is being constructed and would provide longer term employment opportunities once the Project was in operation. Where possible, local hiring would be maximized during Project operations, providing work for qualified tradespersons and labourers. Trades that could be required and provided locally include pipefitters, electricians, ironworkers, millwrights and carpenters. • Although still in the planning stages, it is anticipated that once in operation, up to approximately 18 to 24 full-time jobs would be created in Ontario as a result of the Project. • It is also expected up to approximately 350 person years of direct labour would be generated over the construction period for the Project. • Operations of the Project would also result in indirect and induced employment, the majority of which is anticipated to be filled by local businesses. • Indirect employment is considered jobs and income in other businesses/industries in the community that would supply inputs to the Project and Project employees. Induced employment would include jobs and income changes occurring in other businesses/ industries in the community from spending activities of directly and indirectly employed individuals. <p>General Information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.5.8. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 4.5.7.
Decommissioning	
Project's plans for the transformer station at the end of the Project lifespan.	Hydro One will determine the fate of their switching station constructed for the Project. The Project's substation and transformer station would be decommissioned once the Project was decommissioned, in the same manner

Comments Received from Bkejwanong Territory Walpole Island First Nation – Walpole Island 46 (WIFN) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	as all other Project infrastructure. Please refer to the Draft <i>Decommissioning Report</i> .
Cumulative Effects	
Cumulative effects of wind projects.	The Project Team took into account any neighbouring wind projects when siting the Project's turbine locations as required under the REA process.

Comments Received from Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation (KSPFN) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
Aboriginal or Treaty Rights	
Interest in information about potential adverse impacts of the Project on Aboriginal or treaty rights.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project updates and information were sent to Aboriginal communities as the planning progressed for the Project. • The NHA/EIS and NHA/EIS Addendum 1 were provided on July 27, 2012. • The Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Reports were provided on July 27, 2012. • Draft REA Reports were provided on August 15, 2012. • Please see the attached Draft REA Reports for additional information regarding the Project. • As part of the REA process (Ontario Regulation 359/09), the Project Team has been engaging Aboriginal communities to identify potential impacts to their treaty and/or Aboriginal interests. Specifically, subsection 17.1.4 of the Regulation, requires that we seek information, in writing, from communities that should be considered in the preparation of the reports listed in <i>Table 1</i>, and particularly adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights and any measures for mitigating those adverse impacts.
Potential impacts on hunting and traditional gathering sites for plants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.5.5 (Game and Fishery Resources). • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 4.5.5 (Game and Fishery Resources). • As part of the REA process (Ontario Regulation 359/09), the Project Team has been engaging Aboriginal communities to identify potential impacts to their treaty and/or Aboriginal interests. Specifically, subsection 17.1.4 of the Regulation, requires that we seek information, in writing, from communities that should be considered in the preparation of the reports listed in <i>Table 1</i>, and particularly adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights and any measures for mitigating those adverse impacts.
Archaeology	
Interest in archaeological findings related to Aboriginal villages or grave sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of the Project Team have provided numerous updates on the archaeological field investigations conducted for the Project through written correspondence, phone calls, e-mail and in-person meetings. • All Project impact areas were surveyed as part of the archaeological field studies, including: turbine footprints, access roads, crane paths, substation, transformer station, switchyard, temporary construction areas, and transmission lines. • An offer was extended in response to interest in archaeological monitoring including assisting in organizing activities around their possible involvement in the monitoring. • Please refer to the <i>Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Reports</i>.
Interest in reviewing archaeological reports.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Reports</i>.
Environment	
Potential environmental impacts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Appendix B. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 4.0 (Potential Negative Environmental Effects

Comments Received from Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation (KSPFN) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	and Mitigation). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.0 (Potential Effects and Mitigation). • Please refer to the <i>Natural Heritage Assessment / Environmental Impact Study (NHA/EIS)</i> and <i>Addenda 1 and 2</i>. • Please refer to the <i>Water Assessment Report</i>, the <i>Water Bodies Report</i> and the <i>Addendum to the Water Assessment Report</i>.
Bird migration disruption is a concern, particularly swans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to <i>the NHA/EIS</i> Section 2.2.4.1 (Habitats of Seasonal Concentrations of Wildlife), 3.2.4.1 (Habitats of Seasonal Concentrations of Wildlife), Section 5.3.7 (Wildlife Mitigation), Appendix D (Kingsbridge II Wind Power Project: Bird Report), and <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Appendix I (Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan for Wildlife). • NHA references were provided which directed the community to information regarding migratory birds including the following information which is supported by: Section 2.2.4.1 of the NHA (Records review), and Section 3.2.4.1 (Site Investigation Results: Habitats of seasonal concentration areas of wildlife/ Waterfowl stopover and staging) : Through the work completed for the Natural Heritage Assessment an assessment of significant wildlife habitats for stopover and staging areas for both waterfowl and raptors was completed for lands where the Project is sited. The Project is sited primarily in actively managed agricultural fields and was not identified for significant wildlife habitat for migratory birds (including raptors and waterfowl).
Employment/Contract Opportunities	
Interested in Project related employment opportunities. Employment and training opportunities as a result of the Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K2 Wind will continue to update KSPFN with Project updates and timelines, including Project contracting and construction timelines. • If developed, the Project would bring positive community benefits in the form of jobs, taxation, tourism and increased revenue to local farmers and businesses. The Project would create significant economic stimulus and employment opportunities while it is being constructed and would provide longer term employment opportunities once the Project was in operation. Where possible, local hiring would be maximized during Project operations, providing work for qualified tradespersons and labourers. Trades that could be required and provided locally include pipefitters, electricians, ironworkers, millwrights and carpenters. • Although still in the planning stages, it is anticipated that once in operation, up to approximately 18 to 24 full-time jobs would be created in Ontario as a result of the Project. • It is also expected up to approximately 350 person years of direct labour would be generated over the construction period for the Project. • Operations of the Project would also result in indirect and induced employment, the majority of which is anticipated to be filled by local businesses. • Indirect employment is considered jobs and income in other businesses/industries in the community that would supply inputs to the Project and Project employees. Induced employment would include jobs and

Comments Received from Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation (KSPFN) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<p>income changes occurring in other businesses/ industries in the community from spending activities of directly and indirectly employed individuals.</p> <p>General Information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.5.8. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 4.5.7.
<p>Health/Safety</p> <p>Concern about elders living close to wind turbines and potential health effects (referencing an existing wind project near the Kettle and Stony Point community).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about the relationship between wind turbines and possible health effects was provided in written correspondence to the community, including Project update newsletters, information on the Project website and through Open house display boards. • All turbines associated with the K2 Wind Power Project meet the minimum setback distance of 550 m from a noise receptor. • The K2 Wind Power Project is being proposed north of Goderich in the Township of Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh. Please refer to the <i>Project Description Report</i>, Section 2.2 for the Project Location. • All turbines associated with the Project meet the minimum setback distance of 550 m from a noise receptor. • Safety is a top priority for the K2 Wind and is extended to our employees, contractors and neighbours. In our view, it is the relevant government regulatory authorities' responsibility to establish public policy and regulations that protect public health and safety, and the environment, and our role is to comply with these regulations. • 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)). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Audible / Inaudible Noise</u>: 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." In fact, a recent review of the scientific literature, conducted by a group of independent medical and scientific experts stated that there is "no evidence for a set of health effects, from exposure to wind turbines that could be characterized as a 'Wind Turbine Syndrome.'" (The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection and Public Health, 2012). - <u>Shadow flicker</u>: 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).

Comments Received from Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation (KSPFN) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>EME</u>: Health Canada (2010) has stated: “You do not need to take action regarding daily exposures to electric and magnetic fields at extremely low frequencies. 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. - 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. Capital Power has engaged recognized environmental health experts to assist us in assessing the science and to helping the company stay informed on this issue.
<p>Concern about lights on wind turbines causing confusion for boats using buoy lights for navigation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This should not be an issue for the K2 Project since all Project turbines will be located on the east side of Highway 21, and are at least 2 kilometers from the lakeshore. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i> Section 5.6.3 (Aeronautical Systems) and Section 5.5.7 (Viewscape).

Comments Received from Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) and Consideration by the Project Team

Comment	Project Response
Aboriginal or Treaty Rights	
Consultation activities with Aboriginal communities should be initiated prior to the completion of the environmental studies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project Team has been communicating with the SON community for several years about the possibility of a wind development in the proposed Project study area and continues to be interested in receiving SON's input into the proposed Project.
SON requested an opportunity to discuss natural heritage matters.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings were held with SON's Environmental Office and SON's environmental consultants throughout discussions regarding the Project.
Archaeology	
<p>Preference for complete lot assessments for the archaeological field work for the Project (no test pitting) where possible, and require one representative from Saugeen First Nation and one from Nawash Unceded First Nation to participate in the monitoring of the archaeological field work.</p> <p>Interest in participating in archaeological fieldwork and the results of the archaeological studies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Project impact areas were surveyed as part of the archaeological field studies, including: turbine footprints, access roads, crane paths, substation, transformer station, switchyard, temporary construction areas, and transmission lines. Representatives from Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation and Saugeen First Nation were present during the archaeological field work for the Project. Please refer to the <i>Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Reports</i> conducted by Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants, the archaeological consultants retained by the Project.
Interested in knowing when the Stage 3 and 4 archaeological studies would be completed for the Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants, the archaeological consultants retained by the Project, conducted the archaeological studies for the Project following the Ministry of Tourism and Culture's Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. K2 Wind continued and will continue to update Aboriginal communities regarding the archaeological field work required for the Project. Representatives from Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation and Saugeen First Nation were present during the archaeological field work for the Project. Please refer to the <i>Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Reports</i>.
<p>SON noted that they have different requirements for Stage 3 archaeological studies than the Ministry of Tourism and Culture guidelines.</p> <p>SON is pleased that the Stage 3 field investigations are being completed as requested by SON.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants, the archaeological consultants for the Project, adhered to SON requirements related to Stage 3 archaeological studies. Meetings took place between SON, SON's archaeological consultant, the Project Team and Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants, the archaeological consultants for the Project. Comment was also noted by Project Team.
SON would like to have a presentation on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> K2 Wind and Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants, the archaeological consultants for the Project, met

Comments Received from Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) and Consideration by the Project Team

Comment	Project Response
archaeological findings, if there are any.	with SON on March 22, 2011, October 12, 2011 and July 3, 2012 for the purposes of reviewing archaeological findings of interest to date and to discuss next steps regarding the archaeological field work.
Concern that SON archaeological field studies monitors were not present for all field investigations. This was believed to be due to lack of advance notice provided for archaeological field work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members of the Project Team followed up on this point during a meeting with SON held October 12, 2011 and it was noted that SON in fact, had no concerns with the archaeological field work for the Project at this point in time and monitors from Nawash Unceded First Nation and Saugeen First Nation communities were and continued to be present for the archaeological field monitoring.
Environment	
Impact of the Project on fish and waterways – SAAR’s (SON’s Environmental Consultant) preference for species sampling at all watercourses, particularly those that contained water in late summer; suggested methods included baited minnow traps and dip nets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the <i>Water Assessment/ Bodies Report</i>, Section 4.0 (Summary of Potential Impacts). Please refer to the Supplemental <i>Water Body Information Report for Project Modifications</i>, Section 4.0 (Existing Conditions and Potential Impacts), Appendix B to the Addendum to the <i>Water Assessment Report</i>. Field studies were not conducted to confirm species assemblages as there was sufficient background data available for the Project Team, therefore avoiding the requirement of the species sampling.
<p>Concern regarding impact of wind projects and this Project on bat mortality and concerns about bat study methodology (e.g., understanding potential mortality patterns) Concern that one year of bat studies is not sufficient.</p> <p>Concerned about the bat mortality rates for the Project and would like to know more about bat study methodology and potential mortality patterns.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> K2 Wind has completed three years of bat studies to date in the Project region. Bat Studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 3.1.6.2 (Bat and Bat Habitat Surveys). Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 5.6 (Construction and Post-Construction Monitoring Plans). Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Appendix I (Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan for Wildlife). Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Appendix E (Kingsbridge II Bat Monitoring Pre-Construction Risk Assessment Report). Echo Tracks bat report is included as Appendix E of the <i>NHA/EIS</i>.
SAAR requested raw data summaries from bat studies conducted for Capital Power’s existing Kingsbridge I Wind Power Project (e.g., carcass counts graphed by species, mortality, date) and information about the kind of bats coming through the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A copy of the Echo Tracks bat study was provided to SAAR on August 25, 2010. Echo Tracks bat report is included as Appendix E of the <i>NHA/EIS</i>.
Potential for the Project to impact sandpipers and grassland creatures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the <i>Natural Heritage Assessment/Environmental Impact Study</i>, Sections 2.2.4.1 (Habitats of Seasonal Concentrations of Wildlife) and 2.2.4.2 (Rare Vegetation Communities or Specialized Habitat for Wildlife) and Section 5.0 (<i>Environmental Impact Study Report</i>).
SON does not always agree with thresholds set by the government in environmental guidelines.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the <i>Natural Heritage Assessment/Environmental Impact Study</i>, Sections 5.3 (General Mitigation Measures and Best Management Practices) and 5.4 (Significant Natural Features).

Comments Received from Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) and Consideration by the Project Team

Comment	Project Response
From SON's perspective, even if one animal is killed, this is one too many. Mitigation strategies are extremely important.	
Concern for wildlife mortality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>Natural Heritage Assessment/Environmental Impact Study</i>, Section 5 (Environmental Impact Study) and Appendix I (Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan).
SAAR and SON requested a species list and expressed interest in being involved in future field work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A vascular plant species list and wildlife species list was provided to SON on May 8, 2011.
Concern about potential effects of the Project on raptors in the area as a stick nest was discovered by SON and SAAR during the August 25, 2010 site visit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i> Sections 2.2.4.1, 2.2.4.2, 2.2.4.3, 3.1.6.1, 3.2.4.1, 3.2.4.2, 4.1.4.1, 4.2.4.1, 5.2.4.3 and 5.4. • A biologist visited the Feature containing the stick nest and it was noted that the nest did not appear to be actively used and was in significant disrepair.
Interest in winter wildlife track surveys that show wildlife movement patterns across the proposed Project site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife track surveys fall outside of the requirements for the REA process. • The Project Team remains committed to continuing discussions with SON regarding their survey interest.
Deer are important to SON for hunting and SON is interested in their movements, as well as the number and placement of turbines and how this will affect deer movement between habitats. Concerned with deer crossings and any impacts to these.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Sections 2.2.4.1.
Interested in monitoring and it will be a part of SON's pre-monitoring plan. Interested in bird and bat monitoring as part of the post construction monitoring.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bird and Bat Monitoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 5.6 (Construction and Post-Construction Monitoring Plans), Appendix B Table 5.2 and Appendix I.
Interest in a meeting between SON and Capital Power's environmental specialists to help facilitate the initial sharing of information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numerous meetings have been held between SON and the Project Team regarding the Project and additional information sharing regarding the REA studies and Reports. • A meeting was held on August 4, 2010 with SON, SAR, SON's environmental consultants, the Project Team

Comments Received from Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) and Consideration by the Project Team

Comment	Project Response
<p>regarding the Project.</p> <p>SON looks for a collaborative approach to studies (e.g., getting involved in setting the terms of reference for the studies) and noted that the status report provided to SON on the AMEC studies does not provide enough information.</p>	<p>and the Project's environmental consultants, AMEC to discuss the environmental studies and REA field work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two site visits were held with SON including a site visit on August 25, 2010 which included SON's environmental consultant, SAR and four SON environmental monitoring students, as well as the Project Team's including aquatic and terrestrial specialists. An additional site visit was held on August 20, 2012 which included members of the Project Team, as well as SON and SON's environmental consultant Dougan & Associates. A full listing of meetings with SON in regards to Project is included in the <i>Consultation Report</i>.
<p>Use of data from studies conducted for the previous planned Kingsbridge II Wind Power Project. Interest in the Project Team's previous work done prior to the REA.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some previous work has been used as a basis for the current studies required for the <i>NHA</i> and additional studies have been completed, including amphibian and bat studies. It was noted by the Project Team that previous environmental studies completed in the area were not relied upon for the <i>NHA</i>. It was indicated that this information is still seen as valuable information and the Project Team has decided to include this information to help characterize the Project area.
<p>Interest in discussions regarding a post-monitoring data program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan included as Appendix I of the <i>NHA/EIS</i>.
<p>Interest in erosion control.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the <i>Natural Heritage Assessment/Environmental Impact Study</i>, Section 5.3.4 (Sediment and Erosion Control).
<p>Groundwater</p>	
<p>Interest in whether the Project would cross any waterways.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the <i>Water Bodies Report</i> and the <i>Water Assessment Report</i>, Section 3.0, the figures in Appendix A, and Table 4-1; and to Section 4.0 of Appendix B in the <i>Addendum to the Water Assessment Report</i>.
<p>Interest in where the stormwater drains would be located.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the <i>Stormwater Management Plan</i> included as Appendix C of the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>.
<p>Interest in information on source water protection.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Sections 4.6 (Spill Response) and 7.0 (Emergency Response and Communications Plan) for information related to accidental spills and the Emergency Response and Communications Plan.
<p>REA Process</p>	
<p>Interest in capacity funding to facilitate participation in REA process, including monitoring of archaeological field investigations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project Team worked closely with SON to develop an agreement and budget in support of SON's participation in the REA process, including funding for technical reviews and archaeological monitoring. Funding for archaeology monitors was provided throughout the archaeological field work investigations.
<p>SON expressed interest in receiving the Draft REA Reports for review.</p> <p>What is the process for sharing draft Project reports with SON?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> K2 Wind suggested it could send the <i>NHA/EIS</i> to SON once MNR has provided initial comments regarding possible additions to the draft. The draft <i>NHA/EIS</i> and <i>NHA/EIS Addendum 1</i> were provided on July 27, 2012. The <i>Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Reports</i> were provided on July 27, 2012. Commitment to provide the SON with the Draft REA Reports as required by Regulation and will seek a time to discuss those studies as early as possible.

Comments Received from Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) and Consideration by the Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft REA Reports was provided to SON on August 15, 2012.
<p>SON would like to get a sense of timing for the Project to allow for planning and coordination with SON technical reviewers and key decision makers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project updates were provided to SON throughout the Project planning, including updates through letters, e-mails, phone conversations, in-person meetings, Project Update Community Newsletters and information updates on the Project website. Please refer to the <i>Project Description Report</i>, Section 4.0 (Project Activities).
<p>SON proposed a leadership meeting between principals of SON and the Project to discuss current status of relationship and discuss next steps.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A meeting was held on July 29, 2010 to discuss the Project plans with members of the Saugeen First Nation and Nawash Unceded First Nation Chiefs, Councils and Staff; and members of the Project Team. Further discussions with the SON Environment Office indicated that discussions with Chief and Council will continue after the completion of the technical review of the Draft REA Reports.
Project Infrastructure Siting	
<p>Size of the final Project layout (MW).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please see the Draft Project Description Report for a description of the proposed Project including size.
<p>Interest in how turbines are sited.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Verbally provided information on turbine siting, which involves the evaluation of a number of criteria including: land lease options; long-term wind data; proximity to access roads; proximity to electrical transmission lines; site topography; results from environmental and cultural heritage studies, setback requirements and consultation with community members. Information regarding Project siting was also included in Project Update Community Newsletters.
<p>Size of turbines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please see the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> for the turbine details.
<p>Interested in the proximity of turbines to forest edges.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project Team will meet o the setbacks outlined by the REA process.
Employment/Contract Opportunities	
<p>Interest in developing partnerships with proponents that will result in economic benefits for SON.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> K2 Wind is considering best practices for local community members and Aboriginal community members to benefit from the Project. K2 Wind will provide additional information to Aboriginal communities about potential training, employment opportunities, and contracting opportunities as a result of the Project, as it becomes available.
Visual	
<p>The location of the Project is close to the waterfront (Lake Huron). SON will be looking to mitigate possible risks for the Project that may be of concern for the leadership.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As provided to the community within the NHA, the Project is located 2 to 4 km away from the shorefront. Additionally, as part of the REA process, mitigation measures are a part of Project design, planning and operations and have been identified within the Draft REA Reports.

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
Aboriginal or Treaty Rights	
<p>What process is in place to ensure that local Aboriginal communities with long-term concerns over the potential impact of the Project on their traditional territories have opportunity for ongoing notification and input during the operational phase of the commercial project? Be specific.</p> <p>What process is in place to notify and consult with local Aboriginal communities should upgrades to larger infrastructure, with potential for greater long-lasting impact on traditional territory, be considered? Be specific.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project Team has committed to continuing dialogue with HSM, as appropriate. • Please refer to the Emergency Response and Communications Plan in the Draft Design and Operations Report, Section 7.0.
<p>What process is in place to ensure that local Aboriginal communities with long-term concerns relating to s. 35 Constitution 1982 Aboriginal rights and environmental interests have opportunity for ongoing consultation and input during the operational phase of the commercial Project that is in traditional territories?</p> <p>What process is in place to notify and consult with local Aboriginal communities should upgrades to larger infrastructure with potential for greater long-lasting impact be considered?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project Team has committed to continuing dialogue with HSM, as appropriate. • Please refer to the Emergency Response and Communications Plan in the Draft Design and Operations Report, Section 7.0.
<p>If these evaluations indicate needed changes in the operation of the facility, how will such a decision be made and how will their implementation be assured, and how will HSM be notified and updated?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project Team has committed to continuing dialogue with HSM, as appropriate. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 7.2 (Communications Plan for Project Updates and Activities) and Appendix F - Summary of the Potential Environmental Effects and the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan during Operation.
<p>Has there been a careful assessment of the direct economic costs and benefits, including opportunity costs and the distribution of monetary and non-monetary benefits and costs,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of the REA process (Ontario Regulation 359/09), the Project Team is in the process of engaging Aboriginal communities to identify potential impacts to their treaty and/or Aboriginal interests. Specifically, subsection 17.1.4 of the Regulation, requires that we seek information, in writing, from communities that should be considered in the preparation of the reports listed in <i>Table 1</i>, and particularly adverse impacts the

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
<p>to the Aboriginal communities in the area of the Project? If so, what are these?</p> <p>Has there been a careful assessment of the direct negative economic impacts of the Project to Aboriginal communities as a result of the duty to consult and need for engagement to ensure protection of Section 35 Constitution 1982 Aboriginal rights in traditional territory?</p>	<p>Project may have on constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights and any measures for mitigating those adverse impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future discussions and the nature of those discussions, with Aboriginal communities potentially impacted by the Project will be based largely on the information we receive from the communities and the results of the environmental and cultural heritage studies which are currently on-going.
<p>What provision is there, designed to fit the Project, to provide capacity for Aboriginal community engagement in the pre-construction and construction phases of the Project?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K2 Wind will continue discussions targeted to capacity funding for Aboriginal community engagement with regards to the Project. • Capital Power and HSM completed an REA Participation Agreement in June 2011.
<p>What provision is there, designed to fit the Project, for guarantees and mitigation measures that specifically address the Aboriginal interests of the rights-bearing communities in the project area? Provide detail.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of the REA process (Ontario Regulation 359/09), the Project Team is in the process of working with Aboriginal communities to identify potential impacts to their treaty and/or Aboriginal interests. Specifically, subsection 17.1.4 of the Regulation, requires that we seek information, in writing, from communities that should be considered in the preparation of the reports listed in <i>Table 1</i>, and particularly adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights and any measures for mitigating those adverse impacts. • Future discussions, and the nature of those discussions, with Aboriginal communities potentially impacted by the Project will be based largely on the information we receive from the communities and the results of the environmental and cultural heritage studies which are currently on-going.
<p>Provide any particular assessments of risk to the Aboriginal Métis community's rights and interests that were completed or shared by the Provincial Ministries or their agencies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial response provided in correspondence dated June 17, 2011: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We are currently in the process of assessing any environmental and cultural heritage impacts if the Project were to be developed. The results of this assessment are provided in the Draft REA Reports, for your community's review and comment. - As part of this investigation, some of the specific studies and surveys that have been undertaken for the proposed Project include: Ecological Land Classification Mapping; Vegetation Surveys; Spring and Fall Migratory Bird Surveys; Wildlife Habitat Assessment; Winter Raptor Surveys; Wetland Evaluations; Spring Waterfowl Surveys; Bat Surveys; Breeding Bird Surveys; Crepuscular Bird Surveys; Herpetile (Amphibian and Reptile) Surveys; Species At Risk Surveys; Aquatic Surveys. - As part of this assessment, any potential issues will be identified and managed, and/or proposed mitigation measures would be established. - The results of our Project studies and any potential issues and mitigation measures have been included as part of the Draft REA Reports and will be provided in the Project's final REA application. - In addition, we are communicating with interested Aboriginal communities to understand any additional

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
<p>What process is in place to ensure that local Aboriginal communities with long-term concerns relating to s. 35 Constitution 1982 Aboriginal rights and environmental interests have opportunity for ongoing consultation and input during the operational phase of the commercial Project that is in traditional territories?</p>	<p>interests the community may have based on the results of the REA studies completed for the Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital Power has a consultation process established that we are utilizing for this Project and any other Project we engage in. Yes, we would consult, as appropriate with local Aboriginal communities if changes or modifications to the Project needed to be communicated. • The Project Team has committed to continuing dialogue with HSM, as appropriate.
<p>What process is in place to notify and consult with local Aboriginal communities should upgrades to larger infrastructure with potential for greater long-lasting impact be considered?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project has a consultation process established that we are utilizing for this Project and any other Project we engage in. This includes communicating our Project plans and design to various community members. As part of the REA process, the Project Team will communicate details of the collector system and switchyard, as well as the proposed turbine layout to community members. The final plans for the Project, including detailed design elements will be based on the consultations that have been undertaken for the Project and submitted to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) as part of the final REA application. If significant changes were to be made to the Project plans, we would be required to work with the MOE on determining what additional consultation activities as required under the REA process if any, would need to occur. As always, the Project team would continue to update Aboriginal communities of our Project plans. • Any significant changes to a Renewable Energy Approval, which would include expansion, would most likely require an amendment. The Amendment process would be expected to include requirements for consultation, similar to those that are contained within the REA Regulation. The Project would meet the applicable regulatory requirements. • The Project Team has committed to continuing dialogue with HSM, as appropriate.
<p>What process is in place to ensure that potential long-term impacts of the Project and concerns of local Aboriginal communities are mitigated? What are the proposed elements of that mitigation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial response provided in correspondence dated June 17, 2011: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As part of the REA process, the Project Team will continue to share the results of cultural heritage and environmental studies (Draft REA Reports) with your community and will discuss the development of appropriate mitigation strategies. • The <i>NHA/EIS</i> and the <i>Addendum</i> to the <i>NHA/EIS</i> were provided to the HSM on July 27, 2012. • The <i>Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment</i> reports were provided on July 27, 2012. • The Draft REA Reports were provided to the HSM on August 15, 2012. • Any changes that are made to the Project design as a result of consultation will be noted in the <i>Consultation Report</i> that will be submitted as part of the REA application.
<p>Please identify and describe the Aboriginal communities per direction from Bulletin One.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Director, MOE Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch as per Section 14 of the Ontario Regulation 359/09 identified the following Aboriginal communities who have or may have constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights that may be adversely impacted by the Project (s.14 (b)(i)) or otherwise may be interested in any negative environmental effects of the Project (s.14 (b)(ii)): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aamjiwnaang First Nation – Sarnia 45;

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bkejwanong Territory Walpole Island First Nation – Walpole Island 46; - Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation – Kettle Point 44; - Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation; - Chippewas of the Thames First Nation; - Great Lakes Métis Council; - Historic Saugeen Métis; - Métis Nation of Ontario; - Saugeen First Nation; and - Saugeen Ojibway Nation.
<p>How will the Aboriginal s. 35 constitution and environment concerns of the HSM over the cumulative effects of the Project be mitigated?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response provided in correspondence dated June 17, 2011: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As part of our discussions around capacity funding for the Project, the Project welcomes the opportunity for additional clarity on HSM's interests in participating in the REA process for the Project. - Noted the commitment to provide HSM with the Draft REA Reports as required by Regulation and will seek a time to discuss those studies at the earliest possible time. • The <i>NHA/EIS</i> and Addendum to the <i>NHA/EIS</i> was provided to the HSM on July 27, 2012 • The <i>Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment</i> reports were provided on July 27, 2012 • The Draft REA Reports were provided to the HSM on August 15, 2012.
Archaeology	
<p>Interest in archaeological findings (e.g., evidence of European settlements dated 1700-1850s).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Section 3.3 and 3.4) and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment reports for background information about the Project Area.
<p>Interest in having an archaeological monitor present should an artifact(s) of cultural heritage value or interest be found that pertains to European history and/or settlement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project Team committed to notifying HSM if any artifacts of cultural heritage value or interest are found that are pertinent to European history and/or settlement. The Project Team offered HSM the opportunity to meet directly with the archaeological consultant, Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants, retained to complete the archaeological studies for the Project to discuss the field work and findings to date.
<p>What experts considered the possible impacts of the Project on recreational opportunities?</p> <p>What experts considered the possible impacts on historical, sacred, and archaeological sites?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants was retained to complete the archaeological field investigations for the Project with studies being led by Holly Martelle and John Sweeney, both Licensed Archaeologists. • The <i>Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment</i> was completed by AMEC personnel that specialized in their field including Linda Axford, MLA, Senior Heritage Specialist and Nancy Saxberg, M.A. Senior Archaeologist. • The Recreational sites are located within the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i> with the work being lead by Kara Hearne of Stantec Consulting. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Appendix B. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 4.5.2. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.5.2. • Please refer to the <i>Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment</i> and Addendum.

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
What Aboriginal archaeological sites been identified previously in the Project area? What are the specific sources of this information?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Reports</i>. • Please refer to the <i>Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Report</i>.
Requested more information on Stage 3 archaeology sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants conducted the archaeological studies for the Project following the Ministry of Tourism and Culture and Sports' Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. • K2 Wind will continue to update Aboriginal communities regarding the archaeological field work required for the Project. • Please refer to the <i>Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Reports</i>.
Community Benefits	
What are the direct economic impacts of the Project to the Aboriginal communities in the area of the Project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types and pay scales of the jobs produced during the construction and operational phases. • Other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If developed, the Project would bring positive community benefits in the form of jobs, taxation, tourism and increased revenue to local farmers and businesses. The Project would create significant economic stimulus and employment opportunities while it is being constructed and would provide longer term employment opportunities once the Project was in operation. Where possible, local hiring would be maximized during Project operations, providing work for qualified tradespersons and labourers. Trades that could be required and provided locally include pipefitters, electricians, ironworkers, millwrights and carpenters. • Although still in the planning stages, it is anticipated that once in operation, up to approximately 18 to 24 full-time jobs would be created in Ontario as a result of the Project. • It is also expected up to approximately 350 person years of direct labour would be generated over the construction period for the Project. • Operations of the Project would also result in indirect and induced employment, the majority of which is anticipated to be filled by local businesses. Indirect employment is considered jobs and income in other businesses/industries in the community that would supply inputs to the Project and Project employees. Induced employment would include jobs and income changes occurring in other businesses/industries in the community from spending activities of directly and indirectly employed individuals. • Other discussions related to potential employment will continue to be the subject of discussions with K2 Wind as the Project progresses.
Environment	
Impact of wind turbines on the movement of Canada Geese.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft <i>NHA/EIS</i> addresses effects on waterfowl in sections 2.2.4.1, 3.1.6.1, 3.2.4.1, 4.1.4.1 and 4.2.4.1. • The site investigations in the <i>NHA/EIS</i> concluded that "no areas within 120 m of the Project Location were identified as candidate significant waterfowl stopover and staging areas". NHA references were provided which directed the community to information regarding migratory birds including the following information which is supported by: Section 2.2.4.1 of the NHA (Records review), and Section 3.2.4.1 (Site Investigation

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<p>Results: Habitats of seasonal concentration areas of wildlife/ Waterfowl stopover and staging) : Through the work completed for the Natural Heritage Assessment an assessment of significant wildlife habitats for stopover and staging areas for both waterfowl and raptors was completed for lands where the Project is sited. The Project is sited primarily in actively managed agricultural fields and was not identified for significant wildlife habitat for migratory birds (including raptors and waterfowl).</p>
<p>What information or studies were accessed and considered early on the biological, aesthetic, cultural, and socioeconomic attributes of the region sufficiently to allow an accurate assessment of the environmental impacts of the wind-energy Project, and to distinguish among the potential sites considered during the site selection process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full details of the records reviews conducted as part of the <i>NHA/EIS</i> and <i>Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment</i> and associated addendums are provided in each report. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i> and the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>.
<p>What particular species, habitats, recreational areas, or cultural sites of special interest or concern have been identified that will be affected by the Project?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i> and associated Addendums. • Please refer to the <i>Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment</i> and associated addendum. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i> and the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>.
<p>What environmental mitigation measures will be taken and how will their effectiveness be measured?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Appendix B. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 4.0 and Appendix D. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.0 and Appendix F. • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i> and Addendums.
<p>What are the provincial, regional, and local legal requirements for such measures (e.g., habitat conservation plans)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan</i> (<i>NHA/EIS</i>, Appendix I) is a provincial requirement to measure the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures. • There are also provincial requirements for compensation under the <i>Endangered Species Act</i> which will be used to mitigate effects to Species at Risk (SAR), but these are not covered in the REA documents. Most mitigation measures are best management practices that are applied to projects, although they are not specific requirements from MOE or Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR).
<p>Are any listed Species at Risk identified from the proposed Project?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MNR does not allow for SAR to be discussed within the REA documents. They are dealt with through the Approvals and Permitting Requirements Document (APRD) process which is not publicly available. • If SAR or their habitats are found within the study area, a permit will be required from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR). This process occurs concurrently with the REA, and the permit application will be made public for a 30 day review and comment period during the MNR approval process.
<p>How, by whom, and at what intervals will the environmental impacts be evaluated once the Project is in operation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.0 and Appendix F: Summary of the Potential Environmental Effects and the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan during Operation. • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 5.6.2

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
What are the potential Project impact on birds and whether or not larger birds are more susceptible to being killed by turbines than smaller birds?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Appendix B. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 4.2.1 (Table 4-1) and Appendix D. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.2.1 (Table 5-1) and Appendix F. • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Sections 5.2.4, 5.3.7 and 5.4, 5.6.2.1, 5.6.2.2 and Appendix D.
Please provide a summary of the potential negative long-term environmental effects and cumulative negative effects of multiple similar wind farms close by and in a corridor from Port Franks to Tobermory, as a result of operation, use and retirement of your renewable energy generation facility (comment in the Draft PDR – February 2010).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under O. Reg. 359/09, the Noise Impact Assessment must consider the cumulative impact of all turbines within a 3km radius of the Project. • In reviewing the REA application, the MOE must also consider the cumulative impact of other existing and planned renewable energy Projects in the region. • The 23 turbines that currently exist within the General Project area are Capital Power’s Kingsbridge I Operation wind turbines.
Will trees be cut as a result of the development of the Project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Sections 5.2.1. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Section 2.7.3 and 3.5.3. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Sections 2.2.1 and 2.4.1.
Is there any evidence of the American Badger being found in any of the studies conducted to date?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of the American Badger has been found in the studies conducted for the proposed Project.
Potential for deer to avoid fields where turbines are located.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 2.2.4.1.
Would the identification of several species at risk in the Project area require any Federal involvement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Permitting for SAR is done through MNR in Ontario unless the project is proposed on Federal land. The Project is proposed on privately owned leased lands.
<p>Were studies on migratory birds considered in the site layout?</p> <p>Once birds are driven from an area, it is unlikely they will return.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Sections 2.2.4, 3.2.4.1, 5.3.3, and 5.3.7 and Appendix D. NHA references were provided which directed the community to information regarding migratory birds including the following information which is supported by: Section 2.2.4.1 of the NHA (Records review), and Section 3.2.4.1 (Site Investigation Results: Habitats of seasonal concentration areas of wildlife/ Waterfowl stopover and staging) : Through the work completed for the Natural Heritage Assessment an assessment of significant wildlife habitats for stopover and staging areas for both waterfowl and raptors was completed for lands where the Project is sited. The Project is sited primarily in actively managed agricultural fields and was not identified for significant wildlife habitat for migratory birds (including raptors and waterfowl).
What pre-construction studies for impact assessment and mitigation planning are required?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i> and associated Addendums.
What post-construction studies, with appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Appendix F: Summary of the Potential

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
controls, are required to evaluate impacts, modify mitigation if needed, and improve future planning?	Environmental Effects and the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan during Operation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 5.6.2 and Appendix I (Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan for Wildlife).
The Kingsbridge II Wind Power Project Draft PDR contains a highly transparent 'Environmental Effects' section that describes the environmental factors, relevant to the development of this wind Project, very clearly and with great detail. This transparency is rare in most draft PDR. Conversely, the draft PDR is lacking in much of the information required by the 'Technical Bulletin One' Guidance for Preparing the PDR for as part of an application under O. Reg. 359/09.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> is an iterative document that is updated throughout the REA process. • Since June, 2010, the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> (included in the current draft REA reports) has been updated to reflect our knowledge of the Project, potential effects, results of consultation, etc. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> for the Project which has been updated based on the Project plans.
Concerned about impacts to the high ground water and to ecological features.	Temporary and permanent access and infrastructure roads will be constructed such that they mimic pre-construction surface flow regimes. The implementation of best management practices will also help to reduce disruption to ground and surface water flows, and potential indirect Project impacts to ecological features. Note that a monitoring program will be conducted for three years post construction to assess any impact of the Project to significant ecological functions of adjacent features, including assessment of amphibian habitats (vernal pools) and amphibian population diversity and densities. Should there be changes to water inputs to significant features that result in impacts to these populations contingency measures have been developed that would be implemented.
Would like to see fish locations added to the detailed map within the Draft Water Assessment and Water Body Report.	At this time, the Water Assessment and Water Body Report are final reports, but K2 Wind agreed to provide further information regarding the fish locations. Much of the information requested is part of the permitting package that will be provided to the Conservation Authority. The permitting information can be made available, as appropriate.
Would like to see more detail provided about the locations identified as sensitive and high risk as this would help to focus mitigation that might be required at these sites.	At this time, the Water Assessment and Water Body Report are final reports, but K2 Wind agreed to provide further information. Much of the information requested is part of the permitting package that will be provided to the Conservation Authority. The permitting information can be made available as appropriate.
Commented that there was a lack of soil information for nine of the wetland areas.	Wetland communities were classified using Ecological Land Classification (ELC) and formally delineated using Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES) methodology, supplemented by existing Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) data. Wetlands were delineated using imagery interpretation and, where necessary, were field verified. In accordance with OWES, wetland delineations for the Project were determined through analyses of the hydrologic and ecological wetland indicators present, with hydric soil indicators used in cases where hydrologic and ecologic indicators are inconclusive.

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
<p>Interested in knowing how much of the study area was not accessible to be able to better understand the magnitude of the accessibility issue.</p>	<p>With respect to major Project components, such as turbines and access roads, all areas contained within the Project footprint were accessible and site investigations were conducted within these areas.</p> <p>Where the 120 m zone (of investigation) extended beyond participating property boundaries and permission was not granted to access adjacent properties, or where it was not deemed reasonable to complete a site investigation for other reasons (e.g., unsafe conditions), an alternative site investigation was completed.</p> <p>The properties where site investigations and alternative site investigations were completed are identified on Figures 4.1 and 4.2 (Appendix A of the Natural Heritage Assessment that was provided to the HSM on July 27, 2012).</p>
<p>Would have liked to see an assessment of how much groundwater is being contributed to the wetlands and assessment of the changes and rare species growing in there.</p>	<p>The Project design is intended to prevent direct impacts and minimize indirect impacts to local wetlands. This will be achieved through implementation of best management practices for road construction, setbacks from wetlands, and the placement of culverts to maintain surface water flows. Based on the shallow nature of the Project impacts, it is anticipated that wetland groundwater flow will not be impacted. K2 Wind has also committed to pre and post construction amphibian monitoring at sensitive areas within the Project's zone of investigation. This monitoring will help to determine if indirect Project impacts are occurring and whether further mitigation or adaptive management is required.</p>
<p>Would have liked to see the comment in section 5.3.7 regarding wildlife passage carried through as a recommendation in Section 5.4.</p>	<p>References to culverts as wildlife movement corridors is included in Section 5.4 of the NHA/EIS within the discussion of mitigation measures for features that were identified as movement corridors for amphibians and the commitment is made within these sections for a culvert. As noted within the Report: "Should the amphibian corridor between Features 33 and 35 be identified as significant, a wildlife friendly culvert will be constructed under the access road to allow safe movement of amphibians between features."</p> <p>References were noted in Sections 5.4.10.4; 5.4.11.4; and 5.4.28.4 (for features including 12, 13, 33, 35).</p>
<p>Potential for compaction of soils near wetlands.</p>	<p>The Project access roads are designed to prevent significant compaction of the underlying sub soils. Top soil is stripped for road construction and a geotextile fabric is placed on top of the subsoil, which enables rain water to reach the subsoil for drainage. A granular road base is placed on top of the geotextile fabric in multiple layers where each layer is compacted to ensure a hard base. This hard base distributes the load of vehicles and concrete trucks, turbine component delivery trucks and the crane, which helps to minimize subsoil compaction. Any subsoil compaction from the road construction and use by construction vehicles would extend only a short distance into the underlying subsoil if at all. As a result, there should be limited to no impact on groundwater flows from one side of the road to the other. In areas where surface water drainage issues are anticipated, culverts will be installed below the granular road base to ensure drainage across the roadway.</p> <p>Note that a monitoring program to assess any changes to hydrologic conditions will be conducted that</p>

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	includes visual inspections of culverts to ensure that they are not clogged and to look for evidence of significant pooling or drying. The monitoring program includes contingency measures that would be implemented should the monitoring program indicate significant changes to the hydrologic conditions.
Cumulative Effects	
How will cumulative effects of the Project on the environment be assessed, and what will be included in that assessment (i.e., the effects only of other wind-energy installations, or of all other electricity generators, or of all other anthropogenic impacts on the area)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) is required to consider aggregate impact of proposed renewable energy facilities in an area.
Have the spatial and temporal scales of the cumulative-effects assessment been specified? Provide detail?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response provided in correspondence dated June 17, 2011: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cumulative effects that we assess are in essence considered in each of the technical reports. Within the <i>NHA</i> the Project is assessed for potential impacts on species, their habitat, and migration. The <i>Cultural Heritage Report</i> (Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment and Addendum) provides an assessment of the impacts of the Project to Heritage properties and landscapes. With respect to the human population, the noise report provides a cumulative effects assessment of the sound from the proposed Project, taking into account other wind projects (proposed or in service within 3 km).
The REA process is deficient in addressing long-term effects. HSM is very interested in the cumulative effects anticipated for this Project with relation to the 20 years of the Project and/or with relation to compounded cumulative effects due to the high volume of wind projects throughout the territory. Is there any information on these topics that will be gathered during the REA process? This PDR (June 2010) states that there are already 23 turbines within the study area for the Project (Acciona's Ripley Wind Power Project). Will this change or affect any of the research done by Capital Power when completing their final REA?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under O. Reg. 359/09, the Noise Impact Assessment must consider the cumulative impact of all turbines within a 3km radius of the Project. In reviewing the REA application, the MOE must also consider the cumulative impact of other existing and planned renewable energy Projects in the region. The 23 turbines that currently exist within the General Project area are Capital Power's Kingsbridge I Operation wind turbines.
Safety	
Interest in the potential for "ice throw".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.8.2.
How will the Project affect recreational use of the area (e.g., snowmobiling and the liability of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project is being proposed on privately owned leased lands with the landowner working with K2 Wind on the placement of the turbine and access roads on their property. Recreational impacts such as snowmobiling are not expected since the towers will be placed on privately owned property with access roads to the

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
someone hitting a turbine pillar)?	turbines clearly marked.
REA Process	
<p>What regional planning documents were used during the early planning stage of the Project to address major areas of concern in the Project region and what were the tradeoffs identified and considered?</p>	<p>The Project Team reviewed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huron County Official Plan and the Huron County Online Interactive Mapping (http://gis.huroncounty.ca) – accessed October 2010. • Huron County. 2005. Summary of the Draft Aggregate Resource Strategy Report. http://www.huroncounty.ca/plandev/downloads/ExecutiveSummary.pdf. • Huron County. 2006. Aggregate Resource Inventory Plan for the Municipality of Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh: Unconstrained, Constrained, and Sterilized Aggregate Resources. http://www.huroncounty.ca/plandev/downloads/aggmmaps/ACW_resources.pdf • Township of Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh. 2003. Official Plan. Available on-line at: http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/stdprodconsume/groups/lr/@ene/@resources/documents/resource/std01_079308.pdf. • Regarding Landfill sites in ACW: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual Monitoring Data Update Report completed by R.J. Burnside & Associates Ltd. - Annual Operations and Monitoring completed by R.J. Burnside & Associated Ltd. • The <i>NHA/EIS</i> utilized numerous documents and databases that are regional in nature such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural Heritage Information Centre (NHIC) database. Natural Areas and Species records search. OMNR, Peterborough. http://www.OMNR.gov.on.ca/OMNR/nhic/nhic.html (OMNR, 2010b). - OMNR Land Information Ontario (LIO) digital mapping of natural features, provincial parks and conservation reserves (OMNR, 2010c). - OMNR Renewable Energy Atlas - Bat hibernacula mapping (OMNR, 2010d). - Huron County Official Plan (2010). Amendment No. 3 to the County of Huron Official Plan. 5-Year Review. - Huron County Online Interactive Mapping (http://gis.huroncounty.ca) – accessed October 2010. - Important Bird Areas database (Bird Studies Canada and BirdLife International, http://iba.audubon.org/iba/siteSearch.do. Accessed October 2010). - Ontario Partners in Flight – Ontario Landbird Conservation Plan: Lower Great Lakes/St. Lawrence Plain North American Bird Conservation Region 13 (2008). - Atlas of the Breeding Birds of Ontario (Cadman et al. 2007). - Ontario Herpetofaunal Atlas (Oldham and Weller, 2000). - Atlas of the Mammals of Ontario (Dobbyn, 1994).
Interest in funding to support participation in the REA process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital Power and HSM completed an REA Participation Agreement in June 2011.
What are the key gaps identified in information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information obtained during the Records Review is confirmed or added to during site investigations.

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
that was or is being addressed with further research to guide the operation of an approved Project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For further information, please see the <i>NHA/EIS</i> and <i>Water Assessment</i> and <i>Water Body Reports</i> and addendums for natural features. Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Appendix F: Summary of the Potential Environmental Effects and the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan during Operation.
What steps in the review process explicitly address the cumulative impacts of wind energy Projects over space and time; that is, by reviewing each new project in the context of other existing and planned Projects in the region?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under O. Reg. 359/09, the Noise Impact Assessment must consider the cumulative impact of all turbines within a 3km radius of the Project. In reviewing the REA application, the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) must also consider the cumulative impact of other existing and planned renewable energy Projects in the region.
REA process following final Project Open House.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project Team will continue to consult with interested communities following the final Open House for the Project. As per the requirements outlined in the REA process, K2 Wind will submit the REA application to the MOE for review and determination of 'completeness'. The MOE will then place the application on the Environmental Registry (EBR) for a period of 30 days for public review and comment. Following the 30 day review, the MOE will take approximately 6 months for technical review of the Project and comments received, before making a decision to approve or reject the Project.
Please provide a full description of "regulated activities (construction, installation, use, operation, changing and retiring) that will be engaged in as part of the Project".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>. Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>. Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>. Please refer to the Draft <i>Decommissioning Plan Report</i>.
A greater degree of detail in regard to the Project timing and schedule needs to be included in the PDR.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> is an iterative document that is updated throughout the REA process and is not meant to include full details of the Project. Since June, 2010, the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> (included in the current Draft REA Reports) has been updated to reflect our knowledge of the Project, potential effects, results of consultation, etc. An outline of the schedule is provided in the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> which has been updated based on the Project plans. The Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i> provides a more detailed overview of the schedule. Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Section 4.2. Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 3.0 (Table 3-1).
Information regarding 'wastes' is absent from this PDR [June 2010] and although air and noise emissions are mentioned in the Environmental Effects section no mitigative measures are addressed. Please provide.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> is an iterative document that is updated throughout the REA process and is not meant to include full details of the Project. Since June 2010, the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> (included in the current Draft REA Reports) has been updated to reflect our knowledge of the Project, potential effects, results of consultation, etc. Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> which has been updated based on the Project plans. Additionally, further detail is provided in the <i>Draft Design and Operations Report</i>.

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Section 4.3.1, 4.3.4 and 4.3.5 and Appendix B. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i> Section 4.5.
<p>Further detail and justification of water taking activities is necessary and required in a final PDR. Please provide.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> is an iterative document that is updated throughout the REA process and is not meant to include full details of the Project. • Since June, 2010, the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> (included in the current draft REA reports) has been updated to reflect our knowledge of the Project, potential effects, results of consultation, etc. Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> which has been updated based on the Project plans. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Section 4.3.7. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i> Section 4.5.3. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 2.6.4. • The Draft <i>Hydrogeological Assessment in Support of Renewable Energy Approval Application for Short-Term, Non-Recurring Water Taking</i> (September 2012) was provided on October 12, 2012.
<p>Assessment of potential Project impacts is not possible without first having the documents to assess.</p> <p>It is very important that HSM has time to review the draft reports and submit comments that will be considered in the final versions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project Team has been consulting with HSM with regards to Project updates and has provided the Draft REA Reports for review and comment as per the requirements of the REA process. • The Project Team has been consulting with HSM with regards to the timing of the release of the Draft REA Reports and their continued participation in the review of the Draft REA Reports for the Project.
<p>Request for a point form list of the changes made to the Draft PDR issued in June 2010.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final <i>Project Description Report</i> will contain significantly more detail than the initial draft version of the <i>Project Description Report</i> published in June 2010 and will capture changes to the Project design and include information about the Project Partnership. Some of the key changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An updated schedule; - Turbine technology change from Vestas to Siemens; - Greater detail about Project components and activities; and - Additional detailed information about environmental effects and mitigation. • Given the significant changes to the document, it is not possible to summarize the changes in a point form list.
<p>Project Infrastructure Siting</p>	
<p>What studies were required for pre-site selection?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The General Project Area has undergone several years of Natural Heritage and Cultural Heritage/Archaeological review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vegetation/Vascular Plants - Woodlands - Wetlands

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Valleylands - Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat - Species of Conservation and Concern - Areas of Natural and Scientific interest - Waterway and Fish habitat - Archaeology - Heritage Properties and Cultural Heritage Areas of Interest
Number of turbines and size of surrounding gravel area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Sections 1.1, 3.1 and 3.2.
Due to the very high volume of turbines (100 to 150) do you foresee a problem meeting the setbacks required by the noise matrix?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Appendix A – Site Plan and Appendix D, <i>Noise Assessment Report</i>.
The June 2010 PDR talks about ‘airport management’ needing to review the site layout to make certain there are no conflicts with the airport operations. Is there an official license or approval that is granted in this case? Are there any other approval requirements not listed in the draft PDR?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> is an iterative document that is updated throughout the REA process. • Since June, 2010, the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> (included in the current Draft REA Reports) has been updated to reflect our knowledge of the Project, potential effects, results of consultation, etc. • No adverse effects are anticipated to aeronautical activities at the Goderich Municipal Airport during operation of the facility based on consultations with NAV Canada and the Goderich Airport Manager (Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.6.3). Turbine lighting must conform to Transport Canada standards for turbine lighting.
More definitive information is required in regard to the nameplate of each turbine, number of turbines and total nameplate capacity. When will the total number of turbines for this Project be determined? Why has a number not yet been finalized?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> is an iterative document that is updated throughout the REA process. • Since June, 2010, the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> (included in the current draft REA reports) has been updated to reflect our knowledge of the Project, potential effects, results of consultation, etc. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i> which has been updated based on the Project plans. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Section 1.1. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Wind Turbine Specifications Report</i>.
Please provide a legal description of the privately owned parcels of land that are proposed for the Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Section 2.6.
Has it been determined whether the Project is located within all the required setback distances described by O. Reg. 359/09?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 2.2 and Appendix A: Site Plan. • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>.
Potential for in-fill to occur, adding turbines to the Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not possible under the REA process as the Project currently has a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) for approximately 270 MW of renewable energy for the province of Ontario.
Sound	
Have pre-construction noise surveys been	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the current provincial regulations for siting wind projects pre-construction noise surveys are not a

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
conducted to determine the background noise levels?	requirement. The Ontario noise guidelines that were used for this Project were designed to take typical rural noise levels into account. When designing the Project, we did not take into account any naturally occurring masking effects of foliage or terrain, and modeled as if all turbines were simultaneously upwind of all receptors. Additionally, we were required to assume that the turbines were producing their maximum warranted noise output.
What technical assessments of the operational noise levels were conducted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Appendix D, Noise Assessment Report.
Please provide acoustic emissions data, including the sound power level and frequency spectrum, in terms of octave-band sound power levels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Section 3.2. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Appendix D, <i>Noise Assessment Report</i>.
What additional information exists in regard to the noise produced by this Project other than what is found in the Environmental Effects section of the PDR?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Appendix D, <i>Noise Assessment Report</i>.
Can you demonstrate that the Project, as designed, will not exceed the maximum 40-decibel noise level?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Appendix D, <i>Noise Assessment Report</i>.
How can HSM be sure that noise levels will be acceptable if it is possible that the output of the turbines can be adjusted?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turbines are factory adjusted as per MOE requirements and cannot be adjusted by the wind farm operator.
Visual	
Has the Project planning involved professional assessment of potential visual impacts, using established techniques such as recommended in some countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project is meeting all required regulatory requirements for the proposed Project and a visual assessment is not required under the REA. • Based on questions and comments we have received regarding the proposed switchyard design, the Project is preparing visual simulations based on our Project plans and would be happy to share these with your community.
How are the public and the local Aboriginal communities been involved in evaluating the potential aesthetic and visual impacts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of the REA process, information about the Project, including the Project location and area of investigation, size and model of turbine and Project layout have been communicated to community members. • A Project e-mail address, website, phone number and local Project office and Project contact person were established to contact the Project Team regarding the Project plans. • K2 Wind considered all questions and concerns received from the community when designing the proposed Project.

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since commencing the REA process for the Project, the Proponent has held meetings with Aboriginal communities, landowners, and community members, as well as Open Houses in March 2010, May 2011, July 2012, and October 2012. A Question and Answer Session was also held in September 2012. Information regarding these public sessions were provided to HSM. • In addition, to date, five Project Update Community Newsletters have been made available to provide additional information about the Project, the Project team and the Project plans.
<p>What process is in place to consult with the public and local Aboriginals when Project planning considers upgrades to the facilities altering aesthetics – i.e. larger turbines, etc.?</p> <p>What process is in place to consult with the public and local Aboriginal communities related to the metering and grounding facility that has a major impact on aesthetics?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K2 Wind's consultation process is being used for this Project and any other Project we engage in. This includes communicating our Project plans and design to various community members. • K2 Wind is proposing a wind development up to approximately 270 MW. As part of the REA process, K2 Wind has communicated the size and model of turbine, as well as the proposed turbine layout. The final plans for the Project, including detailed design elements will be submitted to the MOE as part of the final REA application. • If significant Project changes were to be made to the Project plans, we would be required to work with the MOE on determining if any additional consultation activities were required under the REA process. As always, the Project Team will continue to update Aboriginal communities about Project plans.
Other Comments	
<p>What is the established process to resolve complaints from the operation of the turbines?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Emergency Response and Communications Plan in the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 7.0.
<p>Is there a process in place to address complaints of shadow flicker and does the operator use the best software programs to minimize any flicker? If so, describe.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Emergency Response and Communications Plan in the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 7.0. • Once operating, if the Operations Manager was to receive a complaint including concerns regarding shadow flicker, they would investigate the concern. The REA regulated 550m turbine setback distance from residences helps to minimize shadow flicker since residences would be located outside the typical blade shadow.
<p>What were the studies and measures used to assess the possibility of radio, television, and radar interference?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.6.2.
<p>How will the Project plan to communicate with the community once the Project is built (e.g., if the wind farm was upgraded, buildings constructed beneath turbines for storage of power, installation of larger turbines).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Emergency Response and Communications Plan in the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 7.0. • Ongoing consultations with HSM will continue throughout the Project life, as appropriate.
<p>What are the Project's plans for refurbishing the turbines (i.e. 20 years from now)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Decommissioning Plan Report</i>.

Comments Received from Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) and Consideration by Project Team

Comment	Project Response
Interest in information about Project decommissioning.	
Concern about turbine maintenance and turbines not functioning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3.
Describe the energy sources used to generate wind powered electricity, not the energy generated by the proposed wind Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Section 3.1.
How will the new partnership with Pattern Renewable Holdings Canada and Samsung Renewable Energy affect a long-term relationship between the Project and HSM?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnership will have no effect on any long term relationship between K2 Wind and HSM with the exception that it will now be the board of directors of the partnership who will make decisions related to long-term agreements.
Concern that HSM is absent as a data source in the records report search for background information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project Team has been in consultation with HSM since early 2010 regarding the Project and has provided ongoing updates with regards to Project plans and activities. During that time requests were made for any information the HSM community would have that may be relevant in preparing Project reports. During an initial meeting on April 7, 2010, the Project Team indicated that it would be beneficial to Project planning to receive any information the HSM may have regarding heritage lands or any information they may have regarding the Project location area. The Project Team asked HSM for any information they may have on any impacts the proposed Project may have on their traditional or heritage lands. In addition, since commencing communications regarding the Project, requests were made to provide, in writing, any information available that, in the HSM community's opinion, should be considered in the preparation of the reports listed in Table 1, and in particular, any information the community may have about any adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights and any proposed measures for mitigating those adverse impacts (as per O. Reg. 359/09 S. 17(1) (4)).

Comments Received from Métis Nation of Ontario / Great Lakes Métis Council (MNO) and Consideration by the Project Team

Comment	Project Response
Aboriginal or Treaty Rights	
Potential adverse impacts on Aboriginal or treaty rights.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of the REA process (Ontario Regulation 359/09), the Project Team is in the process of engaging Aboriginal communities to identify potential impacts to their treaty and/or Aboriginal interests. Specifically, subsection 17.1.4 of the Regulation, requires that we seek information, in writing, from communities that should be considered in the preparation of the reports listed in <i>Table 1</i>, and particularly adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights and any measures for mitigating those adverse impacts. Future discussions and the nature of those discussions, with Aboriginal communities potentially impacted by the Project will be based largely on the information we receive from the communities and the results of the environmental and cultural heritage studies which is currently on-going. Project updates and information were sent to Aboriginal communities as the planning progressed for the Project. Please see the Draft REA Reports for additional information regarding the Project.
Archaeology	
Interested in archaeological findings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the <i>Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Reports</i>.
Classification of post-contact archaeological findings.	
Participation in Stage 3 archaeological studies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing archaeological updates have been provided to the MNO community for the Project.
Navigable waterways of 300 years ago (may be creeks now) are sensitive areas that were likely used in the past.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment was noted by Project Team and information was provided to the environmental and archaeological consultants for the Project.
Environment	
Consultation prior to the completion of environmental studies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MNO community was provided with updates regarding the Project including general Project updates, proposed Project timelines and an update on the Project partnership. MNO participated in a site visit for the Project on September 9, 2011 prior to the release of the Draft REA Report completion.
Bird mortality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the Draft <i>Project Description Report</i>, Appendix B. Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 4.0. Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.2. Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Sections 5.2.4.3 and 5.4, Appendix D, and Appendix I.
Impact of turbines on ability of raptors to hunt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 5.2.4.3 and 5.4, Appendix D, and Appendix I.

Comments Received from Métis Nation of Ontario / Great Lakes Métis Council (MNO) and Consideration by the Project Team

Comment	Project Response
High transmission line impacts to birth rates in cattle.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following information was provided in Project correspondence to MNO dated November 14, 2011: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Safety is a top priority for the K2 Wind and is extended to our employees, contractors and neighbours. In our view, it is the relevant government regulatory authorities' responsibility to establish public policy and regulations that protect public health and safety, and the environment, and our role is to comply with these regulations. - K2 Wind is proposing to build the wind generator collector system at 34.5 kilovolts (kV), which is a commonly used distribution level voltage throughout rural Ontario and other jurisdictions. We are also proposing to primarily bury the entire collector system. Our proposed installations are governed by the Ontario Electrical Safety Code and would meet all applicable regulations and standard industry practices. We therefore do not anticipate any impact on livestock from the collector system. - With regards to your questions concerning electric and magnetic fields (EMF), K2 Wind's position is consistent with the consensus of large health organizations, such as Health Canada, the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Radiation Protection Committee and the World Health Organization, which have reviewed the literature related to electric and magnetic fields (EMF) and possible adverse health effects. - We are following all current applicable regulations regarding the Project, including the turbine and switchyard designs and operations. For additional information, we have attached information from Health Canada regarding EMF. - Specifically with regards to wind operations, at present we are unaware of any scientific research that has been conducted on possible impacts on farm animal health from wind turbines. We would note that there are thousands of turbines operating across Europe, Australia, the United States and Canada; this issue does not appear to have surfaced around these existing facilities, some of which have been in operation for decades.
Groundwater	
Interest in possible impacts of renewable energy projects on waterways, watercourse setbacks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>Water Bodies Report</i>, Section 4.0. • Please refer to the <i>Water Assessment Report</i>, Section 4.0. • Please refer to the <i>Addendum to the Water Assessment Report</i>.
Assessment of aquatic habitat.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>Water Assessment Report</i>, the <i>Water Bodies Report</i> and the <i>Addendum to the Water Assessment Report</i>.
Waterways and cold water fisheries; impacts on trout and spawning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>Water Assessment Report</i>, Section 3.0, Table 3-2, <i>Water Bodies Report</i>, Section 4.0 and Table 4-1. • Please refer to the <i>Water Bodies Report</i>, Section 4.0. • Please refer to Sections 4.0 and 5.0 of Appendix B of the <i>Addendum to the Water Assessment Report</i>.
Health / Safety	
Potential health effects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about the relationship between wind turbines and possible health effects was provided in written correspondence to the community, including Project update newsletters, information on the Project website

Comments Received from Métis Nation of Ontario / Great Lakes Métis Council (MNO) and Consideration by the Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<p>and through Open house display boards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All turbines associated with the K2 Wind Power Project meet the minimum setback distance of 550 m from a noise receptor. • The K2 Wind Power Project is being proposed north of Goderich in the Township of Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh. Please refer to the <i>Project Description Report</i>, Section 2.2 for the Project Location. • All turbines associated with the Project meet the minimum setback distance of 550 m from a noise receptor. • Safety is a top priority for the K2 Wind and is extended to our employees, contractors and neighbours. In our view, it is the relevant government regulatory authorities' responsibility to establish public policy and regulations that protect public health and safety, and the environment, and our role is to comply with these regulations. • 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)). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Audible / Inaudible Noise</u>: 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "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." - In fact, a recent review of the scientific literature, conducted by a group of independent medical and scientific experts stated that there is "no evidence for a set of health effects, from exposure to wind turbines that could be characterized as a 'Wind Turbine Syndrome.'" (The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection and Public Health, 2012). - <u>Shadow flicker</u>: 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). - <u>EMF</u>: Health Canada (2010) has stated: "You do not need to take action regarding daily exposures to electric and magnetic fields at extremely low frequencies. 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. - Scientists and medical experts around the world continue to publish research in this area. In fact, Health

Comments Received from Métis Nation of Ontario / Great Lakes Métis Council (MNO) and Consideration by the Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<p>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. Capital Power has engaged recognized environmental health experts to assist us in assessing the science and to helping the company stay informed on this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.8.
How many litres of oil do the turbines contain?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to Appendix A of the Draft <i>Wind Turbine Specifications Report</i>.
Do the turbine units have fire suppression capabilities within them?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no fire suppression capabilities within the turbine units. Should a fire begin in a turbine, the safest approach is to monitor the situation and allow the fire to self-extinguish. An Emergency Response Plan will be developed in consultation with the Municipality.
Emergency Response.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to Section 7.0 of the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>.
Employment / Contract Opportunities	
<p>Work placement opportunities for Métis students.</p> <p>Potential procurement opportunities as a result of the Project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K2 Wind will continue to update MNO with Project updates and timelines, including Project contracting and construction timelines. Other discussions related to Aboriginal employment opportunities fall outside the scope of this REA process, but would continue to be the subject of discussion with MNO as the Project progresses. • The Project would create significant economic stimulus and employment opportunities while it is being constructed and would provide longer term employment opportunities once the Project was in operation. Where possible, local hiring would be maximized during Project operations, providing work for qualified tradespersons and labourers. Trades that could be required and provided locally include pipefitters, electricians, ironworkers, millwrights and carpenters. • Operations of the Project would also result in indirect and induced employment, the majority of which is anticipated to be filled by local businesses. Indirect employment is considered jobs and income in other businesses/industries in the community that would supply inputs to the Project and Project employees. Induced employment would include jobs and income changes occurring in other businesses/industries in the community from spending activities of directly and indirectly employed individuals. • Discussions related to potential employment opportunities will continue to be the subject of discussions with MNO as the Project progresses <p>General Information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.5.8. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 4.5.7.
Number of jobs the Project will create.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.5.8. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although still in the planning stages, it is anticipated that once in operation, up to approximately 18 to 24 full-time jobs would be created in Ontario as a result of the Project.

Comments Received from Métis Nation of Ontario / Great Lakes Métis Council (MNO) and Consideration by the Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is also expected up to approximately 350 person years of direct labour would be generated over the construction period for the Project. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 4.5.7.
Visual	
Tree removal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the NHA/EIS, Sections 5.2.1 and 5.3.3.
Size of Project footprint (number of acres of land used for the Project).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft Project Description Report, Section 2.2 for the Project area.
Effects of lightning on turbines.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lightning protection systems for wind turbines have developed significantly over the past decade and best practices have been incorporated into the industry standards to which all modern turbines must comply. This has led to a significant reduction in events where lightning causes structural damage. A review of available literature, conducted by the Chatham-Kent Public Health Unit (2008), revealed only four documented turbine failure issues in Ontario due to lightning strikes that required the turbine to be shut down for repair and no blade liberation. • The turbines are also equipped with sophisticated lightning protection. Lightning strikes are safely absorbed by lightning conductors and the lightning current is conducted via a spark gap and cables into the ground surrounding the foundation. • The Proponent and/or the Operation and Maintenance Contractor would aim to minimize accidents and malfunctions with proper training and education of staff operating the control system. In addition, the turbines would be equipped with lightning protection systems and located at least the minimum regulated setback distance from receptors. • Please refer to the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>, Section 5.8.
Property Values	
Property value impacts from wind turbines.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following information was provided in Project correspondence to MNO dated November 14, 2011: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Property values can be influenced by a tremendous range of factors. There are recent studies available which indicate that neither the view of the wind turbines nor the distance of the home to the project have any consistent, measurable or statistically significant effect on home sale prices. - Specific to wind turbines, a recent study by Canning Consultants Inc. and John Simmons Realty Services Ltd., <i>Wind Energy Study - Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario</i> (February 2010) looked at results of real estate values arising from wind farm development in Southwestern Ontario, more specifically along the north shore of Lake Erie. It concluded that 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 view shed of a wind turbine” and that “it was highly unlikely that any type of a causal relationship exists between wind farms and the market values of rural residential real estate.” - Additionally, a study by the Renewable Energy Policy Project <i>The Effect of Wind Development on Local</i>

Comments Received from Métis Nation of Ontario / Great Lakes Métis Council (MNO) and Consideration by the Project Team

Comment	Project Response
	<p><i>Property Values</i> (May 2003) looked at results of property value impacts of many wind farms across the United States. It concluded that there was “no evidence that property values decreased as a result of wind farms [...] for the great majority of projects the property values actually rose more quickly in the view shed than they did in the comparable community. Moreover, values increased faster in the view shed after the projects came online than they did before.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finally, another recent report released by the U.S. Department of Energy’s (DOE) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (December 2009) titled <i>The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: A Multi-Site Hedonic Analysis</i> found that 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 effect on home sales prices. - The Canadian Wind Energy Association (CanWEA) 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 (January 2010). - For more information on CanWEA, please visit www.canwea.ca and for the U.S. Department of Energy’s (DOE) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory please visit http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Property_Value_Study.pdf. - Copies of the above mentioned reports were provided in correspondence dated November 14, 2011.
Collector Lines and Transmission Line	
How will underground power lines be placed (e.g., directional drilling, trenching)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to Section 2.3 of the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i> and Section 3.4.2 of the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i>.
Sound	
Interest in learning more about sound modeling.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>Noise Assessment Report</i> contained within Appendix D of the Draft <i>Design and Operations Report</i> and Appendix A of the Draft <i>Wind Turbine Specifications Report</i>.
Other Comments	
Amount of concrete required for turbine bases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Draft <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 2.2.3 and Table 2-2.

Comments Received from Six Nations of the Grand River and Consideration by the Project Team

Comment	Project Response
Environment	
Information on monitoring – post construction bird and bat monitoring and the timelines for this monitoring and mitigation once in operation based on post monitoring results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 5.6 (Construction and Post-Construction Monitoring Plans), and Tables 5.1 and 5.2 in Appendix B. • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Appendix I (Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan for Wildlife).
Breeding bird mitigation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Section 5.3.3 (Vegetation Removal), Section 5.3.7 (Wildlife Mitigation), and Tables 5.1 and 5.2 in Appendix B. • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i>, Appendix I (Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan for Wildlife).
Species at risk mitigation – barn swallow, bobolink and meadowlark.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>NHA/EIS</i> Section 5.4 (Significant Natural Features), and Tables 5.1 and 5.2 in Appendix B.
Sound	
Noise monitoring at the site during operations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project would be required to operate according to the terms and conditions of the REA. • Routine facility maintenance to ensure infrastructure is operating properly and efficiently would be performed as required (Section 5.4.3 of the <i>Design and Operations Report</i>). • Adherence to Complaint Response Protocol (Section 7.0 of the <i>Design and Operations Report</i>).
Other	
How much concrete is in a tower base?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the <i>Construction Plan Report</i>, Section 2.2.3 and Table 2-2.