

WELLAND RIDGE ROAD SOLAR

SunEdison Canada

Welland Ridge Road – Solar Energy Project

Consultation Report



J u n e 2 5 , 2 0 1 2

Table of Contents

List of Appendices	ii
List of Tables	iii
1. Overview	1
1.1 Renewable Energy Approvals Legislative Requirements.....	1
1.2 The Consultation Process.....	1
2. Public Notices.....	2
2.1 Notice of Project Commencement and First Public Meeting	2
2.2 Notice of Second Public Meeting.....	2
2.3 Notice of Third Public Meeting.....	3
2.4 Notice of Fourth Public Meeting.....	3
2.5 Distribution of Documents for Review.....	4
3. Agency Consultation	4
3.1 MNR Review	4
3.2 MTC Review	5
3.3 Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA)	5
3.4 Ontario Ministry of Environment (MOE).....	5
3.5 Agency Comments and Concerns	5
4. Aboriginal Consultation.....	7
4.1 Director's List	7
4.2 Distribution of Notices and Reports	7
4.3 Additional Consultation Activities.....	9
4.3.1 Aboriginal Comments and Concerns	10
5. Municipal Consultation.....	12
5.1 Consultation Form.....	12
5.2 Consultation Summary.....	15
5.2.1 Municipal Comments and Concerns	16
6. Public Consultation.....	18
6.1 Summary of Comments	18
6.1.1 First Public Meeting, October 20, 2010	18
6.1.2 Second Public Meeting, December 19, 2011	18
6.1.3 Third Public Meeting, February 15, 2012	18
6.1.4 Fourth Public Meeting, May 14, 2012	18
6.1.5 Other Public Consultation	18
6.1.6 Public Comments and Concerns	19
7. Consideration of Public, Municipal and Aboriginal Input	43
7.1 Alterations to the Proposal to Engage in the Project	43
7.2 Alterations to the Required REA Reports	43

List of Appendices

Appendix F-A	Stakeholders List
Appendix F-B	Notices, Sample Letters, and Material from the First Public Meeting
Appendix F-C1	Notices, Sample Letters, and Material from the Second Public Meeting
Appendix F-C2	Notices, Sample Letters, and Material from the Third Public Meeting
Appendix F-C3	Notices, Sample Letters, and Material from the Fourth Public Meeting
Appendix F-D	Correspondence with the Public
Appendix F-E	Correspondence with Agencies
Appendix F-F	Correspondence with the Municipality
Appendix F-G	List of Aboriginal Communities from MOE
Appendix F-H	List of Aboriginal Communities from Hatch
Appendix F-I	Sample Letters to Aboriginal Communities
Appendix F-J	Subsequent Correspondence with Aboriginal Communities

List of Tables

Table 2-1	Publication of Public Notices.....	3
Table 3-1	Comments/Concerns from Agencies and Responses	5
Table 4-1	Distribution of First Public Meeting Notices	7
Table 4-2	Distribution of Second Public Meeting Notices and Reports	9
Table 4-3	Summary of Additional Consultation Activities with Aboriginal Communities.....	9
Table 4-4	Comments/Concerns from Aboriginal Groups/Communities and Responses.....	10
Table 5-1	Municipal Consultation Form Distribution	12
Table 5-2	Municipal Feedback	12
Table 5-3	Summary of Municipal Consultation	15
Table 5-4	Comment/Concerns from Municipalities and Responses	16
Table 6-1	Comments/Concerns from Public and Responses	20
Table 7-1	Alterations to the Proposal to Engage in the Project	43
Table 7-2	Alterations to the Required REA Reports	43

1. Overview

SunEdison is proposing a single Class 3 Solar Facility with a nameplate capacity of 10 MW (AC) in the City of Welland, Ontario. If approved, this facility will convert solar energy into electricity to be fed into the Welland Hydro-Electric System Corp. (WHESC) distribution grid. The defined project location covers approximately 38 hectares (ha) on Part of Lots 14 and 15, Concession 7, City of Welland (lower tier municipality) and Regional Municipality of Niagara (upper tier municipality). The project has received a 20-year Feed-in-Tariff contract from the Ontario Power Authority to sell the generated electricity to the Ontario electricity grid. As such, the project is anticipated to operate until at least 2033, at which time it may continue to generate electricity or the site may be decommissioned and the land returned to its former agricultural use.

1.1 Renewable Energy Approvals Legislative Requirements

Ontario Regulation (O.Reg.) 359/08—*Renewable Energy Approvals under Part V.0.1 of the Act*, (herein referred to as the REA Regulation) made under the *Environmental Protection Act* identifies the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) requirements for renewable energy projects in Ontario. The REA Regulation has since been amended by O.Reg. 521/10, which came into effect as of January 1, 2011. As per Section 4 of the amended REA Regulation, ground mounted solar facilities with a name plate capacity greater than 12 kilowatts (kW) are classified as Class 3 solar facilities and do require an REA.

Consultation is a requirement of the REA process as stipulated by Sections 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 of the REA Regulation. In addition, the Ministry of Environment (MOE) has prepared draft guidelines called “*Technical Bulletin Five-Guidance for Preparing the Consultation Report*” (MOE, 2010) outlining the Ministry’s expectations and guidelines for appropriate consultation, including the development of a Consultation Report as part of the REA application package. This Consultation Report has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the REA Regulations and the MOE technical bulletin.

The MOE released in the spring of 2011 draft guidelines for Aboriginal Consultation called “*Draft Aboriginal Consultation Guide for Preparing a Renewable Energy Approval (REA) Application*”. These draft guidelines were used as a reference for meeting Aboriginal consultation requirements.

1.2 The Consultation Process

Pursuant to O.Reg. 359/09, consultation conducted for the Project has included adjacent landowners, government agencies (e.g. MOE, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA), local municipalities, Aboriginal communities, and the public. The objectives of the consultation process have been to identify issues and potential concerns, obtain information about the Project Location, and to identify potential impacts associated with the Project. As well, the consultation process has been used to identify specific stakeholders as a means to establish open and meaningful dialogue between the Proponent and the stakeholders.

Local Road Boards, Local Service Boards, and Local Planning boards are not present in the Project area. Therefore, no consultation is possible with these bodies for the Project.

The following report sections provide:

- An outline and description of all consultation activities held for this Project for the public, government agencies (including municipalities), and Aboriginal communities;
- A summary of comments from public, government agencies, and Aboriginal communities; and
- A summary of how these comments were incorporated into the REA process.

2. Public Notices

Under O.Reg. 359/09, Part 4, Section 15, “A person who proposes to engage in a renewable energy project shall distribute:

- (a) notice of the proposal to engage in the project; and
- (b) notices of the location and time of at least two public meetings to be held for the purpose of conducting consultation in respect of the project. “

Two public meetings were held, in accordance with O.Reg. 359/09, Part 4, Section 15, in the City of Welland, Ontario. Notices were initially published thirty (30) days and at least thirty-one (32) days in advance of the first and second public meetings, respectively, in local newspapers distributed to neighbouring communities of the Project. An additional two public meetings were held in the City of Welland, Ontario and notice was provided in advance of these meetings. The notification process and publications are detailed in the rest of this section of the report, Section 2.

2.1 Notice of Project Commencement and First Public Meeting

The Welland Ridge Road - Solar Energy Project Renewable Energy Approval process began in 2010 with A Notice of Project and First Public Meeting published in The Welland Tribune on September 21, 2010 and again on September 28, 2010, as detailed in Table 2-1, below. The Initial Public Meeting was held on October 20, 2010 at Cooks Mills Hall, 630 Lyons Creek Road, Welland, Ontario.

Notices were made available on the Proponent's website (www.axiopower.ca) and a total of 107 letters were mailed by IBI Group on September 17, 2010 to the identified landowners within 500 metres (m) of the Project Location (note that a full list of landowners has not been provided to respect privacy). Additional mailings were completed to agencies (for Stakeholder's List refer to Appendix F-A). Copies of the notice were sent to the Clerk at the City of Welland, the Manger of Development Planning & Real Estate for the City of Welland, the Clerk at Niagara Region, the MNR District Manager (Niagara District), and the Director of Approvals (MOE). The notice contained information on the Project Location, the proposed size of the project, the Proponent, the process and a key map of the original Project Area. A copy of the Draft Project Description Report was made available at this meeting and a copy was posted on the Proponent's previous website (www.axiopower.ca).

A copy of the First Public Meeting notices, list of attendees and the display boards presented at the open houses are included in Appendix F-B. Further details of the open houses are included in Section 5 of this report.

2.2 Notice of Second Public Meeting

The Notice of Second Public Meeting was published in the local newspaper, as detailed in Table 2-1, below, and a total of 102 letters were mailed on October 17, 2011 to the identified landowners within 500 metres (m) of the Project Location (note that a full list of landowners has not been provided to respect privacy), and those individuals who provided their mailing address during the first public meeting. Additional mailings were completed to agencies (for Stakeholder's List refer to Appendix F-A). Copies of the notice were sent to the Clerk at the City of Welland, the Manger of Development Planning & Real Estate for the City of Welland, the Clerk at Niagara Region, the MNR District Manager (Guelph District), the Director of Approvals (MOE) and District Manager (MOE), and the Watershed Planner at NPCA. Notices were also made available on the Proponent's updated website (www.sunedison.ca/Wellandridge).

In order to conform to the requirements of O.Reg. 359/09, the notice contained information on the Project Location, the proposed size of the Project, the Proponent, the process and a key map of the Project Area. Also included in this notice was the location, time and date of the Second Public Meeting and where the Draft Project REA Reports were available for public review (both hard copy and electronic versions),

dates of the review period and to whom and where comments could be forwarded. A copy of the notice, list of attendees and the display boards presented at the open house are included in Appendix F-C1.

2.3 Notice of Third Public Meeting

The Notice of Third Public Meeting was published in the local newspaper, as detailed in Table 2-1, below, and a total of 146 letters were mailed on February 2, 2012 to the identified landowners within 500 metres (m) of the Project Location (note that a full list of landowners has not been provided to respect privacy), those individuals who provided their mailing address during the first or second public meetings, and those who signed the petition that was given to the Proponent at the Second Public Meeting.

On February 2, 2012, a copy of the notice was sent to the stakeholder's list (refer to Appendix F-A for the list and Appendix F-C2 for copy of the letter) and also directly to the Program Support Officer (MOE). The notice contained information on the Project Location, the proposed size of the Project, the Proponent, the process and a key map of the Project Location. Also included in this notice was the location, time and date of the Third Public Meeting and to whom and where comments could be forwarded. A copy of the notice, list of attendees and the slides presented at the meeting are included in Appendix F-C2. The purpose of the Third Public Meeting was to conduct a formal sit-down presentation with a question and answer session that focused on the concerns raised in the petition. More information can be found in Section 5 of this report.

2.4 Notice of Fourth Public Meeting

The Notice of Fourth Public Meeting was published in the local newspaper, as detailed in Table 2-1, below, and letters were mailed on April 19, 2012 to the identified landowners within 500 metres (m) of the Project Location (note that a full list of landowners has not been provided to respect privacy), those individuals who provided their mailing address during the first, second or third public meetings, and those who signed the petition that was given to the Proponent at the Second Public Meeting. On February 2, 2012, a copy of the notice was sent to the stakeholder's list (refer to Appendix F-A for the list and Appendix F-C3 for copies of the letters) and also directly to the Program Support Officer (MOE).

The notice contained information on the Project Location, the proposed size of the Project, the Proponent, the process and a key map of the Project Location. Also included in this notice was the location, time and date of the Fourth Public Meeting and to whom and where comments could be forwarded. A copy of the notice, list of attendees and the slides presented at the meeting are included in Appendix F-C3. The purpose of the Fourth Public Meeting was to present new information obtained from field studies of natural features that were conducted on and adjacent to the Project Location, discuss some updates that were done to some of the previous study reports, provide updated information on the proposed visual mitigation and to provide an opportunity for people to ask questions. More information can be found in Section 5 of this report.

Table 2-1 Publication of Public Notices

Notice	Date Published	Location of Notice	Days Prior to Public Meeting
First Public Meeting (Held October 20, 2010 at Cooks Mills Hall, 630 Lyons Creek Road)	September 21, 2010	The Tribune	30
	September 28, 2010	The Tribune	23
Second Public Meeting (Held December 19, 2011 at Cooks Mills Hall, 630 Lyons Creek Road)	October 17, 2011	The Tribune	64
	November 18, 2011	The Tribune	32
Third Public Meeting (Held February 15, 2012 at the Welland Civic Square)	February 8, 2012	The Tribune	8

Notice	Date Published	Location of Notice	Days Prior to Public Meeting
Fourth Public Meeting (Held May 14, 2012 at the Welland Civic Square)	April 19, 2012	The Tribune	26

2.5 Distribution of Documents for Review

Prior to the second public meeting (held December 19, 2011) the Draft Renewable Energy Approval documents for consultation were made available for public review for at least 60 days, as required by O.Reg. 359/09. These reports were made available on the proponent's website (www.sunedison.ca/wellandridge) on October 18, 2011, and were also made available for review at the offices of the City of Welland and Niagara Region on that same date, 64 days prior to the second public meeting.

All project components are proposed to be located within the City of Welland.

3. Agency Consultation

3.1 MNR Review

On December 23, 2010 the following documents were submitted by Hatch to the MNR for review to ensure compliance with the Natural Heritage requirements of O.Reg. 359/09:

- *Natural Heritage Assessment, Records Review Report, Welland Ridge Road Solar Energy Project*
- *Natural Heritage Assessment, Site Investigation Report, Welland Ridge Road Solar Energy Project*
- *Natural Heritage Assessment, Evaluation of Significance Report, Welland Ridge Road Solar Energy Project*
- *Natural Heritage Assessment, Environmental Impact Study Report, Welland Ridge Road Solar Energy Project*

The MNR replied on March 16, 2011 with comments regarding the reports and indicated that the reports did not meet the requirements as outlined within REA. Based on this, Hatch re-submitted modified reports to the MNR on July 15, 2011 and again on October 7, 2011. Confirmation that the revised reports met the requirements as outlined within the REA was issued by the MNR on October 12, 2011.

On April 11, 2011 Hatch emailed the MNR with a request for Natural Heritage information for the Project. On October 21, 2011, October 25, 2011, and October 27, 2011 Hatch sent several letters to the MNR regarding letters sent by concerned parties to the MNR raising a number of potential concerns regarding the proposed project. On November 29, 2011 Hatch sent a letter to the MNR with a project update regarding a change in technology. On March 16, 2012 Hatch emailed an addendum to the Natural Heritage Assessment reports to the MNR. MNR provided an addendum to their October 12, 2011 Letter of Confirmation on April 4, 2012.

Hatch submitted the APRD, which is not a REA requirement, to the MNR on April 12, 2011 and again on December 7, 2011.

On September 17, 2010 and October 17, 2011, the MNR was informed of the first two respective Public Meetings. They also received notification of the third and fourth Public Meetings on February 2, 2012 and April 16, 2012, respectively.

Copies of the correspondence and the MNR's letter of confirmations can be found in Appendix F-E.

3.2 MTC Review

The “Stage 1&2 Archaeological Assessment of Welland Ridge Road, Part of Lots 14 and 15, Concession 7, City of Welland, Regional Municipality of Niagara, Ontario” report was received by the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC) for review on November 28, 2011. An addendum was received on January 3, 2012. The MTC issued a Letter of Acceptance on January 11, 2012 agreeing with the findings of the report and expressing that the report complied with the Ontario Heritage Act’s licensing requirements. The Letter of Acceptance and the MTC’s Comment Letter are included in Appendix F-E.

3.3 Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA)

NPCA staff were consulted throughout the REA process to keep them apprised of the project activities and seek feedback on any NPCA concerns with the proposed project.

On August 26, 2010 Hatch called and emailed NPCA to introduce the project and request information about the project area. On October 7, 2010 NPCA replied by email, noting that the only area under NPCA’s authority is Strawn Road Wetland.

Email correspondence on November 25-30, 2010 between the Proponent, Hatch, IBI Group, and NPCA documents discussion surrounding the tree cutting by-law.

On April 26, 2011 the Proponent contacted NPCA requesting confirmation about the requirements for a permit to remove trees on the Project Location. On April 27, 2011 NPCA replied stating that the hedgerows can be removed without a permit, but the woodlands and provincially significant wetland (PSW) cannot be cleared and buffers are required. A copy of all correspondence with the NPCA is included in Appendix F-E.

3.4 Ontario Ministry of Environment (MOE)

The MOE was provided with a draft of the PDR and a list of Aboriginal communities to consult with was requested on June 16, 2010. The list was provided by the MOE to Hatch on November 12, 2010. On September 17, 2010, October 17, 2011, February 7, 2012, and April 16, 2012 the MOE was informed of the first, second, third and fourth Public Meetings, respectively. On February 24, 2012 the MOE was contacted by the Proponent notifying them that the issuance of the MTC Letter of Confirmation took much longer than expected, and therefore it was not made publicly available at least 60-days prior to the final public meeting.

On April 15, 2011 Hatch requested information about the water bodies present on and within 120m of the project location.

On-going email dialogue between Hatch, the Proponent, and MOE is documented. A copy of all correspondence with the MOE is included in Appendix F-E.

3.5 Agency Comments and Concerns

Agency comments and concerns are included in Table 3-1, which also indicates how the Project and/or supporting documents were modified to meet the agency comments/concerns. All correspondence with the following agencies is included in Appendix F-E.

Table 3-1 Comments/Concerns from Agencies and Responses

Agency	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Ontario Ministry of the Environment	The Ministry of Environment sent a letter on November 4, 2011 with a list of requirements for the Noise Study Report.	Hatch replied to the MOE on November 11, 2011 explaining how the Noise Study Report already meets the list of requirements.

Agency	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	The MOE has communicated by phone and email that the MTC letter of confirmation was not made publicly available at least 60-days prior to the final public meeting.	The Proponent continues to have on-going dialogue concerning this issue so as to work with the Ministry to find an appropriate solution. Two additional public meetings were held to address this (third and fourth meetings).
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources	<p>On March 16, 2011 the Ministry of Natural Resources requested further clarification for a number of items in Hatch's Natural Heritage Reports including the delineation of natural features.</p> <p>The MNR also suggested that surrounding land owners be contacted to request permission to access the property for the Natural Heritage Site Investigation.</p> <p>On March 16, 2011 the MNR requested an APRD and a Petroleum Resources Engineer's Report, as the Project Location may be within 75m of several petroleum resources operations (wells).</p> <p>The Petroleum Resources Engineer's Report is acceptable. (November 15, 2011)</p> <p>On March 20, 2012 the MNR acknowledged receipt of the APRD.</p> <p>In an email on March 20, 2012 the MNR stated they do not have any concerns regarding the change in technology from fixed to trackers.</p>	<p>Hatch revised the Natural Heritage documents to satisfy MNR's requests, and resubmitted theses revised reports to MNR for review.</p> <p>On May 6, 2011 Hatch mailed letters to the applicable landowners requesting permission to access the property for the Natural Heritage Site Investigation.</p> <p>The Proponent prepared and submitted both reports.</p> <p>No response required</p> <p>No response required</p> <p>No response required</p>
Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture	The archaeological assessment report for the project complies with the Ontario Heritage Act's licensing requirement is accepted into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeology Reports.	No response required
Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority	<p>The hedgerow features on the property that may need to be removed are not considered woodlands under the tree-cutting bylaw, and so there are no issues with their removal.</p> <p>Development is not permitted within 30 m of Strawn Road Wetland.</p> <p>In an email on February 29, 2012, the NHPCA said the Lyons Creek East Monitored Natural Recovery</p>	<p>No response required</p> <p>A proper setback from Strawn Road Wetland will be maintained.</p> <p>The Protocol documents will be reviewed and followed.</p>

Agency	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	Administrative Controls Protocol must be followed for development and site alteration activities in or near upper Lyons Creek East.	

4. Aboriginal Consultation

Aboriginal consultation has been undertaken by both Hatch and Patricia Stirbys on behalf of SunEdison in order to meet the requirements of the REA process. These activities are detailed in the proceeding sections.

4.1 Director's List

On June 16, 2010, a copy of the Draft Project Description Report was submitted to the Director of Approvals in order to receive the List of Aboriginal Communities to Consult. A response was received from the MOE on November 12, 2010 and identified the following Aboriginal groups to consult:

1. Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation - may have constitutionally protected treaty or aboriginal rights which may be impacted by the project;
2. Six Nations of the Grand River - may have constitutionally protected treaty or aboriginal rights which may be impacted by the project;
3. Haudenosaunee Confederacy Council - may have constitutionally protected treaty or aboriginal rights which may be impacted by the project;
4. Niagara Métis Council - may be interested in any negative effects of the project; and
5. Métis Nation of Ontario - may be interested in any negative effects of the project.

4.2 Distribution of Notices and Reports

The Proponent/Hatch initiated consultations prior to receiving the list from the MOE. Table 4-1 and 4-2 below identify the notices and documents sent to each First Nation's group for the regulated first and second Public Meetings. Responses were received from the Métis Nation of Ontario, Six Nations of the Grand River, and Chippewas of the Thames First Nation.

Notification letters were also sent to the Aboriginal Groups which identified the Third and Fourth Public Meetings on February 2, 2012 and April 16, 2012, respectively. These are not outlined in the table since there is no requirement for the number of days prior to the meeting that these notices must be distributed by.

Table 4-1 Distribution of First Public Meeting Notices

Group	First Public Meeting Notice	# Days Prior to First Public Meeting
Six Nations of the Grand River	September 17, 2010	34
Haudenosaunee Confederacy Council	September 17, 2010	34
Mississaugas of the Credit	September 17, 2010	34
Niagara Region Métis Council	September 17, 2010	34
Grand River Community Métis Council	September 17, 2010	34

Oneida Nation of the Thames	September 17, 2010	34
Chippewas of the Thames First Nation	September 17, 2010	34
Munsee-Delaware Nation	September 17, 2010	34
Great Lakes Métis Council	September 17, 2010	34
Delaware Nation (Moravian of the Thames)	September 17, 2010	34
Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation	September 17, 2010	34
Alderville First Nation	September 17, 2010	34
Hiawatha First Nation	September 17, 2010	34
Curve Lake First Nation	September 17, 2010	34
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation	September 17, 2010	34
Kawartha Nishnawbe	September 17, 2010	34
Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte	September 17, 2010	34
Northumberland Métis Council	September 17, 2010	34
Métis Nation of Ontario	September 17, 2010	34
Wapiti Métis Council	September 17, 2010	34
Oshawa and Durham Region Métis Council	September 17, 2010	34
Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation	September 17, 2010	34
Chippewas of Rama First Nation	September 17, 2010	34
Moon River Métis Council	September 17, 2010	34
Toronto – York Métis Council	September 17, 2010	34
Credit River Métis Council	September 17, 2010	34
Hamilton-Wentworth Métis Council	September 17, 2010	34
Wahta Mohawk	September 17, 2010	34
Georgian Bay Métis Council	September 17, 2010	34
Beausoleil First Nation	September 17, 2010	34

Table 4-2 Distribution of Second Public Meeting Notices and Reports

Group	Second Public Meeting Notice	# Days Prior to Second Public Meeting	Draft REA Documents	# Days Prior to Second Public Meeting
Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation	October 17, 2011	64	October 17, 2011	64
Six Nations of the Grand River	October 17, 2011	64	October 17, 2011	64
Haudenosaunee Confederacy Council	October 17, 2011	64	October 17, 2011	64
Niagara Métis Council	October 17, 2011	64	October 17, 2011	64
Métis Nation of Ontario	October 17, 2011	64	October 17, 2011	64
Métis Nation of Québec	October 17, 2011	64	October 17, 2011	64

4.3 Additional Consultation Activities

Additional consultation with Aboriginal groups took place throughout the REA process and is detailed below. One key to the consultation was asking the Aboriginal Groups whether they had any questions or concerns with the location of the project or any other matter. This goes to the treaty issue and in future conversations and emails with aboriginal communities, it was specifically asked whether they had any concerns relating to any impacts on their aboriginal or treaty rights.

Table 4-3 Summary of Additional Consultation Activities with Aboriginal Communities

Aboriginal Community/Group	Details of Additional Consultation
Métis Nation of Ontario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 8, 2010: The Métis Nation of Ontario sent an email requesting a description of how the Solar Energy Project will affect the Métis way of life, answers to specific questions, and information about the Project. • January 21, 2011: Hatch sent a letter replying to each of the concerns. • March 11, 2011: Email sent to Hatch by the Métis Nation of Ontario requesting an in-person meeting to discuss their possible involvement and learn more about the project. • March 18, 2011: Email reply sent to the Métis Nation of Ontario by the Proponent indicating that they welcome the opportunity to meet and discuss the current Projects. • June 5, 2011: Meeting held between the Proponent and the Métis Nation of Ontario in Ottawa, Ontario, to discuss the project and how the Proponent and the Métis Nation of Ontario could work together. The Métis Nation of Ontario expressed interest in shadowing the archaeology studies and the Proponent offered to arrange for that to happen.
Six Nations of the Grand River	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 28 and June 30, 2011: The Proponent and the Six Nations of the Grand River communicated by phone and by email. • October 17, 2011: The Proponent met with Six Nations of the Grand River

Aboriginal Community/Group	Details of Additional Consultation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 21, 2011: The Proponent sent Six Nations of the Grand River a follow up email with several attachments of requested information.
Haudenosaunee Confederacy Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 7, 2012: The Haudenosaunee Development Institute wrote a letter to Hatch acknowledging receipt of the letter dated October 17, 2011 and requesting that the Proponent submit an Application for Engagement.
Haudenosaunee Development Institute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 11, 2012: The Haudenosaunee Development Institute (HDI) (Six Nations of the Grand River Territory) wrote a letter to SunEdison regarding SunEdison's approach with the REA process and that it will impair, interfere and encroach upon Haudenosaunee harvesting rights protected by the 1701 Treaty. As well, they raised the failure of SunEdison to provide an application to HDI.

4.3.1 Aboriginal Comments and Concerns

The Proponent supports the use of traditional Aboriginal knowledge and through this consultation process aims to provide a method to incorporate this knowledge and to address any comments or concerns about the Project from the Aboriginal perspective. Comments and concerns are contained below for each community or organization, along with any responses that were required to effectively address the concern and/or incorporate this knowledge into the Project design.

The comments and concerns received, along with the responses, are provided in Table 4-4. This additional correspondence with Aboriginal communities is included in Appendix F-J.

Table 4-4 Comments/Concerns from Aboriginal Groups/Communities and Responses

Aboriginal Community/Group	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Métis Nation of Ontario	<p>How will the Project affect water quality (i.e. fish habits, drinkability, impacts downstream, pollution, groundwater, and monitoring)?</p> <p>How will the Project affect wildlife (i.e. flora and fauna populations, endangered species, harvesting, biodiversity initiatives, and monitoring)?</p> <p>Who and how have the aboriginal people in Ontario been consulted?</p>	<p>There are no creeks, streams or lakes within 120 m of the Project boundary and, therefore, there are no expected impacts to fish or water quality and there is no expectation that there will be monitoring requirements associated with these issues.</p> <p>The Natural Heritage Assessment documents have information about wildlife. No species of conservation concern were identified during the site investigations. Wildlife species that have adapted to an agricultural landscape, such as white-tailed deer, Wild Turkey and Ring-necked Pheasant, are all common species in the area. The proposed Project poses no conservation threat to these species, or others.</p> <p>The aboriginal communities consulted are listed in the enclosed letter. (MOE list)</p>

11

Note that no response, comments or concerns were received from any other Aboriginal communities or groups listed in Table 4-4.

5. Municipal Consultation

SunEdison Canada is actively engaging in consultation with the local municipality of The City of Welland. A "Renewable Energy Approval Consultation Form: municipalities, local authorities" (MOE) form was distributed (details provided in Section 4.1 below) to the Clerks of The City of Welland and the Region of Niagara more than 60 days prior to the Second public meeting, in accordance with the original un-amended O. Reg. 359/09.

The previous municipal consultation form was forwarded to the Clerks on November 12, 2010. The letter of October 17, 2011 and follow-up email of October 18, 2011 requested that the previous municipal consultation form be discarded and the new form be completed and sent back to Hatch.

5.1 Consultation Form

A "Renewable Energy Approval Consultation Form: municipalities, local authorities" (MOE) form was distributed to the Clerk of The City of Welland and the Clerk of the Region of Niagara, as noted in the table below. Included with the consultation forms were two copies of the Draft Renewable Energy Approval Documents for Consultation. Email correspondence was exchanged between the Clerks and Hatch and they indicated that the municipal consultation form would be completed. Copies of the consultation letters and emails are included in Appendix F-E.

Table 5-1 Municipal Consultation Form Distribution

Recipient of Consultation Form	Date of receipt of Form	# Days Prior to Second Public Meeting	Documents	Date of Receipt of Documents	# Days Prior to Second Public Meeting
Christine Minto , City Clerk, City of Welland	October 18, 2011	63	Draft REA Documents	October 18, 2011	63
Kevin Bain , Regional Clerk, Region of Niagara	October 18, 2011	63	Draft REA Documents	October 18, 2011	63

A completed Municipal Consultation Form was received from the City of Welland on March 21, 2012. A completed Municipal Consultation Form was received from the Region of Niagara on January 26, 2012. A copy of the Municipal Consultation Forms is included in Appendix F-F. A summary of issues raised and how they were addressed is found below.

Table 5-2 Municipal Feedback

Comments Received	Response
Niagara Region Municipal Consultation Form	
The Project is outside the urban services area. Municipal services and water exist on Ridge Road west of CNR Tracks.	No response required

Comments Received	Response
<p>Can access the project from the local road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction access recommended from Highway #140 and Ridge Road. The Traffic Management Plan recognizes benefits of using Highway #140 vs. Doan's Ridge Road. <p>If Doan's Ridge Road to be used by heavy vehicles Niagara Region is to be advised.</p> <p>Not adjacent to any Regional facilities.</p> <p>Policy 7.A.3 states that new development, including infrastructure, should be designed to maintain or enhance the natural features and functions of a site. The proponent shall be required to prepare an Environmental Impact Study (EIS). Adjacent lands to an Environmental Conservation Area are those lands within 50 meters. An EIS is not required, however, for uses authorized under an Environmental Assessment process carried out in accordance with Provincial or Federal legislation.</p>	<p>No response required</p> <p>As according to the Traffic Management Plan, Highway #140 and Ridge Road will be used for construction.</p> <p>No response required</p> <p>The Solar Energy Project has been designed to abide by Policy 7.A.3 as much as possible. A detailed Environmental Impact Study has been prepared.</p>
City of Welland Municipal Consultation Form	
<p>The Project is located outside of the Urban Boundary Area.</p> <p>No municipal services are available.</p> <p>Detailed plans are required showing locations of access roads.</p> <p>Road Occupancy Permit required for construction.</p> <p>Information required on site lighting.</p> <p>Access from Ridge Road is preferred.</p> <p>Review of roadway conditions required to establish current surface conditions within the proposed access routes.</p> <p>There are open ditches that would require culverts to be installed, if there are any new entrances proposed. If new entrances are required the City's Public Works Division shall install the culverts at the developer's cost.</p> <p>If there are extensive changes to the existing grading we would require an overall lot grading plan to show their proposed direction of rain water.</p> <p>The switch house qualifies as a building over 10 square meters in area, and therefore requires a building permit prior to installation. A Renewable Energy Approval from the Minister is required prior to issuance of a building permit for the switch house.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City requires a Fire Safety Plan (FSP) for this site. The plan shall conform to Section 2.8.2. of the 	<p>No response required</p> <p>No response required</p> <p>Detailed plans will be made available to the City once they are completed.</p> <p>All required permits will be obtained.</p> <p>Information on site lighting will be provided.</p> <p>Access from Ridge Road will be utilized.</p> <p>A Road Condition Survey will be completed in conjunction with the City's requirements.</p> <p>The Proponent will collaborate with the City's Public Works Division regarding culverts.</p> <p>A detailed grading plan will be provided to the City once it is completed.</p> <p>All required permits will be obtained.</p> <p>The Proponent will collaborate with the City while preparing the details of the emergency management procedures/safety protocols and</p>

14

5.2 Consultation Summary

Table 5-3 Summary of Municipal Consultation

Municipality & Consultation Date	Discussion Summary
<i>City of Welland</i>	
July 26, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponent and Hatch met with the City of Welland in order to introduce the Project and discuss any preliminary concerns.
September 17, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch sent the Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project and Public Meeting, and two hard copies of the Project Description Report to both the Clerk and the Manger of Development Planning & Real Estate of The City of Welland. The letters can be found in Appendix F-E.
November 12, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch emailed The City of Welland the Municipal Consultation Form, requesting it be filled out once all of the project reports were submitted. This email can be found in Appendix F-F.
June 28, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponent sent the City of Welland an email with an update on project progress. This email is included in Appendix F-E.
October 17, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch mailed the Notice of Second Public Meeting to the City of Welland with two copies of the project reports, requesting that they be made available for public review. The letters are included in Appendix F-E.
October 18, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch emailed the City of Welland an updated Municipal Consultation Form listing the reports that had been submitted. The email is included in Appendix F-E.
March 1, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch emailed the City of Welland requesting that the Municipal Consultation Form be completed. The City of Welland replied saying the Municipal Consultation Form would be ready shortly.
<i>Niagara Region</i>	
September 17, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch sent the Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project and Public Meeting, and two hard copies of the Project Description Report to the Clerk of the Niagara Region. The letter can be found in Appendix F-E.
November 12, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch emailed The Region of Niagara the Municipal Consultation Form, requesting it be filled out once all of the project reports were submitted. This email can be found in Appendix F-E. The completed Municipal Consultation Form is included in Appendix F-F.
October 17, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch mailed the Notice of Second Public Meeting to the Clerk of the Region of Niagara with two copies of the project reports, requesting that they be made available for public review. The letters are included in Appendix F-E.
October 18, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch emailed the Region of Niagara an updated Municipal Consultation Form listing the reports that had been submitted. The email is included in Appendix F-F.
January 26, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Region of Niagara mailed the completed Municipal Consultation Form to Hatch.

5.2.1 Municipal Comments and Concerns

Municipal comments and concerns are included in Table 5-4, which also indicates how the Project and/or supporting documents were modified to meet the municipal comments/concerns. All correspondence with the following Municipality is included in Appendix F-E.

Table 5-4 Comment/Concerns from Municipalities and Responses

Municipality	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
City of Welland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Three previous developments in the area may influence public opinion about a proposed solar farm (odour issues with Universal Resource Recovery's composting facility, Welland Tube of Canada's heat treatment gas pipeline facility, and P&W Trucking's industrial catch basin waste treatment facility at 580 Ridge Road). ▪ Another issue affecting the area is the closure of the local elementary school. ▪ Visual impacts will likely be the main issue, and it should be determined through public consultation whether the public prefers a coniferous or deciduous buffer, though the City recommends a deciduous buffer. ▪ An entrance permit will be needed from the City. ▪ The Niagara Region (administered by the NPCA), not the City, has a tree cutting bylaw. ▪ Requested that a 500m notification radius be used. ▪ Suggested that public notices be advertised in the Welland Tribune and Niagara This Week ▪ Suggested that the Cook's Mills Hall be considered for the PICs. ▪ Question regarding the site being on Class 3 soils. ▪ Concerns about the aquifer in the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No response required. ▪ No response required. ▪ The Proponent has consulted with the public about visual buffer preferences, and they prefer red cedar. A landscaping plan is in progress. ▪ The Proponent will obtain all required permits. ▪ The Proponent contacted the NPCA who confirmed that the tree cutting bylaw will not affect the tree removal required for the project. ▪ For the First and Second Public Meetings all landowners within 500m were notified. ▪ Public notices were advertised in the Welland Tribune. ▪ Cook's Mills Hall was used for the first two PICs. ▪ 70 MW of solar power was made available by the OPA in this region for Class 3 soils. ▪ The Proponent performed research about potential effects on the aquifer and concluded that it is extremely unlikely that any negative effects occur. To address continuing concerns, the Proponent has committed to conducting a groundwater monitoring plan.

Municipality	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Niagara Region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns about de-icing and snow clearance, the usage of manually uncovering ice and snow, and the IRAP snow study. ▪ Concern about mitigating noise through berming. ▪ Request for a modified format for the Second Public Meeting where the audience has the opportunity to ask questions as a group. ▪ No comments received. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ During the winter, Project access roads will be ploughed to maintain access of personnel to Project facilities within the site. Under most winter conditions, snow on the modules is expected to either melt off due to the module heating in response to solar radiation or simply fall off as a result of the tracker motion. Under some conditions, manual snow removal may be performed by maintenance personnel who will clear the snow using a brush attached to a long pole. ▪ Berms will be considered as a means of mitigating noise from the Project. ▪ The Proponent conducted a third public meeting of the requested format on February 15, 2012. ▪ No response required.

6. Public Consultation

6.1 Summary of Comments

The summary presents all types of comments received but does not contain each instance where there were multiple comments. Refer to the comment sheets in Appendix F to see the original comments. Responses and references are included to demonstrate whether and how the comments were considered and/or addressed in the final REA submission.

6.1.1 First Public Meeting, October 20, 2010

Sixty-nine (69) people attended and signed the sign-in sheet of the First Public Meeting on October 20, 2010. Generally, comments were both positive and negative, with enquiries about noise, safety and security, wildlife, site selection, socio-economic, and visual impacts. Eleven (11) comment sheets were obtained from the First Public Meeting. The Proponent wrote letters to the stakeholders who attended the First Public Meeting and responded to the comment sheets.

6.1.2 Second Public Meeting, December 19, 2011

Forty-one (41) people signed the sign-in sheet at the Second Public Meeting. Generally, comments were negative with many enquiries about noise, impact on aquifer, site selection, socio-economic, and visual impacts. The attendees requested a third public meeting in a more formal presentation format with a group question and answer period. During the meeting the Proponent was presented with a petition signed by the community members. Two (2) comment sheets were obtained from the Second Public Meeting. The Proponent wrote letters to the stakeholders who attended the Second Public Meeting and responded to the comment sheets.

6.1.3 Third Public Meeting, February 15, 2012

At the request of the public, a third public meeting was held with the purpose of addressing the concerns raised in the petition. Forty-eight (48) people signed the sign-in sheet. Generally, comments were positive and negative. Eight (8) comment sheets were obtained from the Third Public Meeting, two of which expressed support for the project and four expressed several concerns (e.g. noise, groundwater quality, flooding, reflectivity, aesthetics, etc.). The Proponent wrote thank-you letters to the stakeholders who attended the Third Public Meeting and responded to the comment sheets.

6.1.4 Fourth Public Meeting, May 14, 2012

Based on discussions with the MOE, it was determined that a fourth public meeting was required to provide the public with an opportunity to review the Letter of Confirmation provided from the MNR (initially provided October 12, 2011 and re-confirmed on April 4, 2012) and the Letter of Acceptance from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS – formerly MTC). The letter of acceptance was provided on January 11, 2012 (following the second meeting but prior to the third meeting). Stage 3 Archaeology investigations will be conducted starting in May 2012 and a report submitted to MTCS. In addition, due to issues raised by the public regarding visual impacts, the fourth public meeting was used as an opportunity to review proposed visual mitigation measures (including visual simulations).

Seventeen (17) comment sheets were received from the fourth public meeting and responses were mailed out to respond to each comment sheet. These response letters were forwarded to the person that completed the comment sheet and are provided in Appendix F-D.

6.1.5 Other Public Consultation

The public was encouraged to communicate any comments or concerns to the Proponent and Hatch outside of public meetings by email, phone, mail, or in-person meetings. Copies of all correspondence are in Appendix F.

On May 6, 2011 Hatch mailed letters to many of the surrounding land owners requesting permission to access the property for the purposes of the Natural Heritage Site Investigation. Eight (8) letters were sent;

there were four positive replies and four negative replies. On February 23, 2012 the same landowners were contacted by mail again to request permission to access the property.

On December 19, 2011 Hatch and the Proponent received a petition letter signed by seventy-seven (77) individuals, outlining their specific comments and concerns with respect to the proposed solar development.

6.1.6 Public Comments and Concerns

The comments and/or concerns that were obtained from the public (e.g. comment sheets and/or emails) during the Project consultation process, along with the Project response and/or resulting actions taken to address each concern are provided in Table 6-1. Where applicable, the Proponent response also provides reference to where more detail could be found in the Project documents prepared under the REA Process. Additionally, any changes to the Project documents and/or to the Project made in response to public comments/concerns are included in Table 6-1. All additional correspondence with the public is included in Appendix F.

Table 6-1 Comments/Concerns from Public and Responses

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Noise	<p>Will there be noise or steady humming in the area of the Project? A comment sheet at PIC 4 raised concern over the noise that will be generated and that the noise study was not accurate since the panels will generate noise.</p> <p>What will be the overall noise levels from the Project? Provide project details (Certificate of Approval) and approval for noise levels.</p>	<p>The Proponent responded by letter outlining how no noise impacts to humans or wildlife are expected to occur from the low levels of Project noise that may ensue. A noise impact study was completed on behalf of the Proponent to ensure that the Project fully complies with all applicable noise regulations. Residents near the project site will not experience more than 45 decibels (dB) from 7am to 7 pm, and 40 dB from 7pm to 7am. The panels will not emit any noise since they are securely mounted and bracketed in place. A condition of REA will likely be completion of an acoustic audit which is undertaken once the project is operational.</p> <p>A Noise Study Report was prepared and posted on the Proponent's website prior to the final public meeting.</p>
	<p>On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident asked, <i>"How do you know if it's more than 40 or 45 dB, do we get noise indicators for free so we can monitor the noise around the site?"</i></p>	<p>SunEdison's compliance to the MOE's sound criterion will be mandated in the conditions prescribed by MOE in the Renewable Energy Approval. This will typically require that SunEdison retain an independent consultant to take sound measures of the equipment during its operation to demonstrate compliance and submit these measures in an Acoustic Audit Report to MOE. For example, from other projects where a REA has been issued by MOE, the condition states: <i>"The Company shall carry out an Acoustic Audit in accordance with the procedures set out in Publication NPC-103, and shall submit to the District Manager and the Director an Acoustic Audit Report prepared by an Independent Acoustical Consultant in accordance with the requirements of Publication NPC-233, no later than three (3) months after the commencement of the operation of the Facility or three (3) months after the date of this Approval."</i></p>
	<p>On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident said, <i>"I would also like to have the two converter, transformer stations on the 575 Ridge Road property moved up to align with the ones across the road on 505 Ridge Road to get rid of the adverse effects on my property indicated as PR01. I do not want my property polluted with your noise."</i></p>	<p>Application of the MOE criteria (e.g., 40 dbA) is based on the sound emissions not exceeding the guideline criteria at the PORs (e.g. existing buildings or proposed building locations on vacant lands) relative to the Project, not the property line. In regards to the property east of Strawn Road identified in the Noise Study Report as POR1, these lands are vacant and there is only minor encroachment of the simulated 45 dbA noise</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
		contour onto the property. Therefore, there is no need to move the locations of the inverter/transformer buildings.
	On the petition the local residents stated they would like berms surrounding the proposed site to shield from noise.	The construction of berms around the perimeter of the Project Location could compromise drainage at the site. However, SunEdison will examine the feasibility of berms in certain locations and situations.
Visual	<p>In a letter on January 6, 2011 residents stated that light pollution will be an issue to both wildlife and humans if the solar farm has lights on through the night.</p> <p>A local resident mentioned in a comment sheet that the project should be hidden from view. At PIC 4 a comment sheet questioned how the view will be improved?</p> <p>A resident asked in a comment sheet, "Will there be a reflection that affects residents and drivers?"</p>	<p>Hatch responded by letter on November 22, 2011, stating that there will be a light at the substation and in each inverter house. However, no lights are to be left on when these buildings are empty and, therefore, the facility will not emit light during the night time hours.</p> <p>In collaboration with the local residents, visually appealing fencing and native species of hedges, trees and other vegetative buffers will be planted along the perimeter of the solar farm to reduce visibility of the solar panels to neighbours in the area. Visual simulations (including mitigation measures) were provided at the 4th Public Meeting.</p> <p>Solar photovoltaic (PV) modules are specifically engineered to absorb light, rather than reflect it, as reflected light results in the loss of energy output. However, a Reflectivity Study has been conducted. The study concluded that a minor reflection is possible under very specific conditions near sunset and sunrise if the panels were undergoing maintenance. The conditions would only exist for 10 to 15 minutes and surrounding vegetation would mitigate the impact.</p>
Safety and Security	<p>A resident asked in a comment sheet, "What levels of EMF will be present at the closest homes to the project?"</p> <p>In a letter to the MNR on February 2, 2012, a representative of the Cooks Mills Community Development Group stated, "An unknown amount of stray voltage in the area will be created by this solar project...we feel this is a severe risk to the safety of the people in the area from both rusting of the pipeline to a possible explosion."</p>	The Project's low voltage lines will be underground and EMF will not be an issue because the proximity of the wires to each other mitigates EMF. Voltages and currents would be no greater than in a commercial area with underground distribution. Distance mitigates and reduces EMF. You get more EMF from a hairdryer 6" from your head drying your hair than you do from power lines. Stray voltage is primarily caused by rural distribution, i.e., where there are consumers on the line and they are connected in single phase (line to neutral) configuration. The proposed electrical line crossing the existing gas pipeline along Strawn Road will be a three phase collection circuit without consumers connected to it (no line to neutral connections) and therefore it is very unlikely to cause any stray voltage. Further, underground

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>Another resident expressed concern about stray energy that may cause their animals to become sick and die.</p> <p>In a letter to the MNR on February 2, 2012, a representative of the Cooks Mills Community Development Group stated, "Stray voltage will counteract the effects of cathodic protection system of the gas pipeline."</p> <p>In an email on May 28, 2011 a resident expressed concern about the danger from increased lightning strikes when storm clouds are present due to larger than normal positive/negative power attractions from the project.</p> <p>On a comment sheet from the Second Public Meeting a local resident asked for further explanation about the section in the Design and Operations Report about the emergency response plan for spills.</p> <p>A comment sheet from PIC 4 raised an issue of potential fire and off-site impacts from a fire.</p>	<p>utilities, such as gas, power, water and sewer, frequently cross one another underground. When services cross they are engineered to meet all applicable and appropriate regulations and codes.</p> <p>Cathodic protection is impressed direct current (DC), that is, current that does not reverse polarity. In order to "neutralize" or reverse the cathodic protection, it would have to be DC. The current in the solar collection system crossing Strawn Road will be alternating current (AC). So, even if there was stray voltage due to the collection system, it would not adversely affect the gas pipeline's corrosion protection.</p> <p>There is no increased or decreased potential for lightning strikes due to the presence of the solar farm. In any event, the facility is designed with appropriate grounding, and if a lightning strike were to occur, the energy would go to ground.</p> <p>As discussed in the Design and Operations Report (Hatch, 2011), oil leaks and improper handling are examples of potential scenarios (i.e., resulting from an accident or equipment malfunction) that if occurred could necessitate some form of emergency response. Such scenarios, including the possibility of fire, are considered to have a low probability of occurrence and are acknowledged in the report for the purpose of developing an Emergency Response and Communications Plan and should not be construed as something that will occur or is expected to occur under normal circumstances.</p>
	<p>On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident asked, <i>"What will you do for me when my health goes downhill because of your electric plant all around me? What guarantee do you give as to my health and safety from this solar site?"</i></p>	<p>During construction, fencing and signage will be installed along the mutual property lines to prevent any unauthorized access onto neighbouring properties by construction vehicles that might pose a safety risk. The construction will be conducted in accordance with all appropriate health and safety regulations and the Contractor will be required to prepare and follow an emergency response plan that will include protocols in response to an emergency and for contacting emergency response services such as fire and ambulance services. For equipment deliveries, the Contractor will be required to strictly adhere to a designated road route and speed limits for vehicles. Extra caution will be maintained along Ridge Road and Strawn Road</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
		<p>near the project site entrance and a flag person will be used to safely direct vehicles into and out of the site.</p> <p>During project operation, SunEdison will continue to operate the facility in accordance with applicable health and safety regulations, and will have an emergency response plan that will include protocols to notify our adjacent neighbours as well as emergency response services in the unlikely event of an emergency. Overall, the project operation will not negatively impact your personal health since there are no toxic air emissions or effluent discharges from a solar facility.</p>
Water: Surface, Ground, Stormwater	On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident expressed concern about the removal of drainage ditches causing flooding.	<p>The subject of storm water runoff from the Project location has been assessed in detail in the Storm Water Management Report (McIntosh Perry, 2011), on-line at: http://www.sunedison.ca/wellandridge/.</p> <p>The study used hydrologic calculations to estimate the quantity of runoff from the Project location for both the existing (pre-construction land use) and the proposed solar facility. Based on the findings, the study recommended that storm water quantity controls be implemented as part of the Project Site Grading and Drainage Plan to mitigate the potential for adverse off-site effects such as erosion or nuisance flooding. This mitigation would consist of small concrete weirs constructed in the drainage swales to provide temporary, onsite storage of storm water runoff and peak flow attenuation to control the post-development peak flows to pre-construction levels for all rainfall events up to and including the 100-year return period. On this basis, the specific civil engineering details associated with the storm water management mitigation measures as well as the specific grading, drainage (e.g. grassed swales, culverts) and sediment and erosion control measures (e.g., rip rap erosion protection) will be designed and included in the construction plans for the Project.</p>
	In a letter written on January 6, 2011 local residents asked questions such as: Will water be used on-site? If yes, where will the water be provided from and will there be any impact of water supply lines on local	As summarized in Section 3.14 of the Design and Operations report, it is expected that water from rain or snow will be the primary method of cleaning the panels. If additional cleaning is required, then SunEdison will contact local suppliers to provide

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>homeowners? For example, will water supply lines run through private property? Will there be a cost to homeowners?</p> <p>In letters on November 29, 2010 and January 6, 2011 and at PIC 4 residents expressed concern that runoff from the solar farm will be toxic due to the deposition of deteriorated solar panel components over time and the suspected use of chemical laden cleaning solutions.</p> <p>In letters written on January 6, 2011 and January 11, 2011 local residents expressed concerns about potential impacts from oil or gasoline during construction or the operation of the facility.</p> <p>In a letter on November 29, 2010 a resident asked, "Will the project require the construction of extraction wells as a water source?" If so there is a concern that high water demand for the project could cause groundwater dewatering.</p> <p>The resident also asked, "What will be the impact on local wells and groundwater aquifers?"</p> <p>In a letter on November 29, 2010 a resident requested guaranteed groundwater monitoring.</p>	<p>potable water in tankers from off-site sources for this purpose. This method of cleaning has proven to be effective at other successful solar facilities. If the cleaning of dust, bird droppings, etc., off the panels proves to be occasionally troublesome, then SunEdison can arrange to use a mobile power washer to assist in the cleaning. Solutions will not be used to add in the cleaning. The poly crystalline solar panels are in a solid state, inert, and do not release liquids or leach contaminants. If required, the panels will be cleaned with only municipal water from the City of Welland.</p> <p>Although considered to be a low risk, there is a possibility that spills from vehicles/power equipment operating on site, such as fuel or hydraulic oils, or spills of concrete materials from concrete trucks, could occur during the construction process. To reduce the risk of a spill during construction and to minimize the potential impact if a spill was to occur, spill prevention, mitigation and response measures will be implemented.</p> <p>The Proponent and Hatch responded by letter that there are no plans to construct extraction or dewatering wells on the property for the purpose of using groundwater from the underlying aquifer for wash water or any other purpose. Hence, there are no expected impacts to domestic water well users in the area.</p> <p>A Groundwater Monitoring Plan Report was prepared and posted on the Proponent's website prior to the final public meeting. The Proponent will conduct water well quality sampling before and during construction (if complaints arise) in participating landowners' wells.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>Comments received as part of a petition sent to the Proponent/Hatch (on December 19, 2011) and raised again at PIC 4. The petition states that the undersigned want the water on the proposed site, the shallow aquifer unharmed and left as clear and clean as it is now. Any damage to this unique, vulnerable aquifer will stop all progress and all development on this project will stop.</p> <p>Several individuals sent emails and letters expressing concerns about the aquifer.</p>	<p>With respect to aquifers, the Regulations do not prescribe specific setbacks from aquifers or groundwater recharge areas. The Regulations do prescribe a 120 m setback from seepage areas (i.e., a water body feature) that are defined as a site of emergence of groundwater where the water table is present at the ground surface, including a spring. Based on the Water Body Records Review (Hatch, 2011) and Water Body Site Investigation Report (Hatch, 2011), no seepage areas were identified within 120 m of the Project location. As presented at the 3rd public meeting, SunEdison and their Consultant (Hatch Ltd.) are aware that the City of Welland Official Plan does illustrate vulnerable groundwater areas that include <i>Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas</i> and <i>Highly Vulnerable Aquifers</i> in proximity to the Project. As shown on the attached figure, the Project location is situated more than 120 m away from these features and neither of these features are defined as waterbodies in the Regulation.</p> <p>SunEdison believes that the potential for groundwater or well water contamination from the solar farm development and its subsequent construction, operation and maintenance and finally decommissioning is negligible (extremely remote). However, in the extremely unlikely event of the solar farm development somehow contributing to ground or well water contamination, SunEdison is committed to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supply bottled water or water cooler for drinking (potable uses) 2. Supply portable water supply for household use (non-potable) – storage tank 3. Fill dug well (if present) with trucked potable water 4. Perform ongoing tests until the domestic well water is within acceptable levels, or similar to preconstruction quality 5. Retain licensed driller to assess well and determine if deepening or other options are available 6. If there is a demonstrated long-term effect, provide a suitable domestic water treatment system (for example with UV disinfection, RO, and/or other appropriate filtration)

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident asked if Mr. Bennett's presentation about the aquifer was over ruling the MOE's standpoint that it should be protected.</p> <p>On February 16, 2012 a local resident sent a letter to Hatch, MOE, McIntosh Perry, and the Proponent expressing specific concerns about the Groundwater Monitoring Report.</p> <p>In a letter written on February 9, 2012 a resident stated that the Project reports state that the aquifer lies 1 m below the ground surface.</p> <p>An aquifer being water is three-dimensional and moving therefore it is impossible to state that there is water at a specific depth and will not be affected by construction activities (i.e. driven piles).</p>	<p>7. Evaluate modifications to the solar farm construction process which potentially caused groundwater issues.</p> <p>SunEdison will continue to exercise a high standard of care, responsibility and due diligence to protect the environment. Accordingly, as discussed at the meeting, SunEdison will incorporate a well water sampling program for nearby participating well owners with inclusion of a (bottled water) contingency plan. This plan has been prepared at the request of MOE, based on meeting discussions between SunEdison and MOE staff. This requirement is not unique to the Welland Ridge Project and in fact, MOE has requested this be done for all REA proponents of solar energy projects.</p> <p>The MOE's 1978 order to restrict the spreading of digested sewage sludge is not being "over-ruled" by SunEdison's proposed Welland Ridge Project – it still stands -- the spreading of sewage sludge is not permitted. Furthermore, development has not been stopped or prevented due to the MOE's 1978 decision and is still permissible in the area for homes, barns, roads, industrial complexes and in the case of the Welland Ridge Project, solar farms.</p> <p>McIntosh Perry replied by letter on February 23, 2012 addressing each concern and the Final revised version of the report is posted on the SunEdison website.</p> <p>Upon review of McIntosh Perry's Groundwater Monitoring Report (2011), paragraph 2, page 7, which stated, "<i>Borehole data indicate that groundwater levels in the area range from 1.0 to 5.8 m below the ground surface but exceeded 6.6 m in some holes (Inspec-Sol, 2011)</i>" was indeed erroneous and has since been corrected in the final version of the report to state, "<i>The groundwater level is reported to be ranging in depth from 4.0 m to 5.0 m below the ground surface (Inspec-Sol, 2012)</i>". The updated version of this report is available on-line at: http://www.sunedison.ca/wellandridge/.</p> <p>We agree that the depth of the water table can vary seasonally.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>In a letter written on February 9, 2012 a resident stated concern that the ground water monitoring plan does not include tests for E. coli.</p> <p>In an email written on March 2, 2012 a local resident requested that testing for Sulphur and PCBs be included in the Ground Water Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>In a letter to the MNR on February 2, 2012, a representative of the Cooks Mills Community Development Group asked, "What is being done to locate the gas wells on the project properties?"</p> <p>In a letter to the MNR on February 2, 2012, a representative of the Cooks Mills Community Development Group asked, "How were the gas wells plugged?"</p>	<p>These are all factors that will have to be assessed by the design engineer and the construction contractor based on additional geotechnical investigations.</p> <p>The presence of E. coli in water is a strong indication of recent sewage or animal waste contamination. Should e-coli be found to occur in groundwater obtained from a water well, then it is usually indicative of animal waste on the property, or from a neighbouring property, entering the underlying aquifer through a poorly constructed well (i.e., usually through a poorly sealed borehole annulus). It would not be associated with a solar facility as there would be no livestock on this property. However, if it will provide assurance to a resident to have their water well tested for e-coli as part of the groundwater monitoring program, then SunEdison would be pleased to add this parameter to the program.</p> <p>If it will provide assurance to a resident to have their water well tested for PCBs and sulphur as part of the groundwater monitoring program, then SunEdison would be pleased to add these parameters to the program.</p> <p>The identification of the gas wells on and in proximity to the subject property were identified through completion of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) as part of SunEdison's due diligence. The Phase I ESA identified two (2) Ontario oil and gas wells (The Consumers Gas Company) within 250 m of the subject property, and two (2) gas wells located on the subject property. The location of the gas wells were identified on Figure 2.1 (attached) as GW1 and GW3. Figure 2.1 was included in Hatch's Project Description, Construction Plan, Design and Operations, and Decommissioning Plan reports. Specific information regarding how and when the two gas wells (GW1 and GW3) were plugged was provided in a Petroleum Engineer's Report (and a supplementary email) prepared by McIntosh Perry, which was submitted to the MNR c/o the Petroleum Operations Section (POS) in September 2011. MNR accepted the Engineer's Report in November 2011. (Refer to Appendix G for abandonment procedures for the two gas wells as abstracted from the Engineer's Report.)</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>In a letter to the MNR on February 2, 2012, a representative of the Cooks Mills Community Development Group asked, "What happens if the gas wells are hit?"</p> <p>In a letter to the MNR on February 2, 2012, a representative of the Cooks Mills Community Development Group asked, "What is being done by the Proponent to address the minimum setback on a gas well that is plugged? Is it not a 70 m setback on a plugged well?"</p> <p>On a comment sheet from the Second Public Meeting a local resident asked, "The bodies of water chart does not show aquifers. Why?"</p> <p>A local resident sent an email on January 31, 2012 informing the Proponent that the foundations for the installed test panels had failed due to high winds and a high water table. He also mentioned that this could be an issue for the solar farm.</p>	<p>In the unlikely event that a foundation support was installed in the exact same location as the plugged well, no impact (i.e., release of gas) would be expected given that the upper 45 m length of each well has been plugged with concrete.</p> <p>Pursuant to MNR's Approvals and Permitting Requirements Document (APRD) for Renewable Energy Projects, renewable energy project applicants wishing to develop within 75 m of a petroleum resource operation must provide an Engineer's Report demonstrating that there are no adverse effects created by the development. As noted above, an Engineer's Report was prepared for the Project to address this requirement. MNR accepted the Engineer's Report in November 2011.</p> <p>As defined in the Renewable Energy Approval Regulation, it is only a requirement to assess water body features such as a lake, permanent and intermittent watercourses, or groundwater seepage areas on and within 120 m of the Project Location. Water body features do not include grassed waterways, temporary channels for surface drainage, roadside ditches, or dugout ponds. As indicated on the open house display panel for waterbodies, there are no waterbodies on or within 120 m of the project location.</p> <p>On February 2, 2012 the Proponent replied by email, stating that the test site was intended to be a temporary structure, and regrettably, the installer did not do a good job. The test site will either be fixed or decommissioned. As for the solar farm on a larger scale, it will have engineered foundations, based on detailed geotechnical investigations, pole or pier "pull tests", and detailed engineering calculations. The comments received to date have been very helpful and we will be sure to bring the water table issues, soil structure, and composition to the attention of the project's geotechnical, civil, and structural engineers.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Terrestrial, Soil	In a letter on November 29, 2010 and December 8, 2010 a resident and the Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society (PALS), respectively, expressed concern that the Project site has Class 1 and 2 soils.	Stantec Consulting confirmed that based on June 2009 mapping produced by the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, the soils of both of the land holdings (i.e., Project site) are Class 3.
	In a letter written on February 9, 2012 a resident asked, "How deep are the steel piles going to be driven in the ground?"	The reason why some specific project details, such as the below ground support structures, are not precisely known at this time is because the detailed follow-up geotechnical field studies and engineering design of the supports has not yet been completed. It is quite common and acceptable for the detailed engineering and design to be started in the later stages of the REA process or even after a proponent has received a REA. The foundation system to be used at the Welland Ridge site will be designed based on the specific soil and water table conditions at the site using detailed engineering analysis. Currently, SunEdison's projects use steel pipe, typically embedded 3 meters into the ground. Although the foundation system for the Welland Project has not yet been completed at this time, a similar arrangement is expected.
Wetland and Vegetation	<p>What is the impact of the Project on local wetlands?</p> <p>On December 8, 2010 PALS requested that no facilities be built on the Lyons Creek wetland and that a proper buffer should be applied to protect drip line of trees.</p> <p>In a letter on November 8, 2010 a resident expressed concern that the Project site overlaps with the Strawn Road Wetland, which is part of the provincial Black Creek Wetland Complex. Also concern regarding proximity to: Lyons Creek Wetland Complex (2km N); Forks Road Northeast Slough Forest (1 km S); Stelco Wetland Complex (1 km E); McKenny Road Wetland Complex (West).</p>	The Proponent responded by letter, indicating that they recognize the importance of the Lyons Creek Provincially Significant Wetland and that the two woodlands on or adjacent the Project meet MNR's criteria for significance. During site investigations, no specific species of conservation concern were observed, though the property may provide habitat for some species of conservation concern. The solar arrays will observe a 75m setback from the adjacent woodlands to the northeast and a 120 m setback from the more sensitive Strawn Road Wetland to the south. The project decided not to acquire the lands in Lot 13 Conc. 7 as part of the project site, leaving a movement corridor between the Strawn Road Wetland and the woodland adjacent to the northeast corner of the site. The results of the natural heritage assessment of the site will be documented and made available to the Public, at least 60 days before the final public meeting.

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>Concern about vegetation clearing and loss of trees that are hundreds of years old.</p> <p>In a letter on January 6, 2011 local residents expressed concern that the native groundcover proposed to go beneath the solar panels is not "native" because historically the land was either forest or agricultural crops.</p> <p>In the petition local residents stated, "We strongly oppose the building of a new wetland on the proposed site and the proposed location of this solar project. We oppose the destruction of the two small wetlands, wetland 1 and wetland 2. We want these two wetlands to remain as they are. They should not be filled in, drained or bulldozed over but built around and left with sufficient space to let them thrive as they have so far without this proposed project.</p> <p>In a letter written on January 11, 2011 a local resident expressed concern about using pesticides to spray weeds.</p>	<p>The Proponent responded by letter, stating that vegetative clearing will be kept to an absolute minimum and native ground cover will be planted beneath the solar panels. The Proponent we will work with the MNR and NPCA to ensure that the development is constructed in a responsible and compliant manner.</p> <p>There are no old-growth trees (i.e., greater than 100 yrs old) identified on the Project Location. The trees that would be removed are associated with Woodland 2 and are considered mid-aged to mature, not old-growth.</p> <p>In a letter on November 22, 2011 Hatch responded stating that "native" means species from the local area, and is not related to the historical vegetation on the land.</p> <p>At the Third Public Meeting the Proponent discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions were previously held with MNR regarding the possibility of constructing a new wetland between the south part of the Project Location and the Strawn Road Wetland, if approval was given to infill Wetlands 1 & 2 • However, the following was instead agreed to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wetland 2 is not significant, however this wetland will remain outside the Project Location and is not required to be infilled ○ As Wetland 1 is not significant, this wetland will be infilled • Consequently, no new wetland will be constructed <p>The Proponent has no plans to use pesticides and, in fact, was banned from using them when the Province of Ontario banned the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes effective April 22, 2009.</p>
Construction	A local resident expressed concern about dust production during construction.	Some dust may occur during construction and appropriate suppression methods such as the use of water on access roads and providing covers on soil stockpiles, if required. Construction may also be phased to limit the amount of time soils are exposed. Finally, certain types of work will be limited during

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>A local resident expressed concern about traffic during construction.</p>	<p>excessively windy weather.</p> <p>In order to assess the best transportation routes to minimize potential inconvenience and road damage, the proponent has formulated a transportation plan with consultation from the City of Welland.</p> <p>A Traffic Impact Study (McIntosh Perry, 2011) has been prepared and is available on-line at http://www.sunedison.ca/wellandridge/.</p>
Wildlife	<p>In a letter on November 8, 2010 a resident expressed concern regarding potential habitat destruction and/or disruption of an environmentally sensitive area and wildlife sensitive area, and the Project impact on all wildlife in the area (including deer, coyote, bats, snapping turtles, wild turkeys, Canada geese, blue heron, etc.)</p> <p>Request for a 120 m setback from a wooded area located on a wide strip of land west of Strawn Road on Lot 15 Concession 7.</p> <p>A local resident wrote an email to the MNR on December 1, 2011 disputing the findings of Significant Natural Features in the Natural Heritage Assessment project reports. Other letters with similar concerns were also received.</p> <p>In letters written on December 12, 2011 and February 6, 2012 to the MNR, local residents asked why they did not receive a letter requesting permission to perform a physical site investigation, as their land has very important wildlife.</p>	<p>Hatch responded by letter, stating that the Project has carefully considered natural features on the property in the design and layout of the facility. The solar arrays will observe a 75 m setback from the adjacent woodlands to the northeast, and a 120 m setback from the more sensitive Strawn Road Wetland to the south. The Project decided not to acquire the lands in Lot 13 Conc. 7 as part of the project site, leaving a movement corridor between the Strawn Road Wetland and the woodland adjacent to the northeast corner of the site. The change from agricultural crops to native ground cover will benefit some species of wildlife.</p> <p>As permission to enter the property was not granted, an alternative site investigation was performed for these particular lands. A site meeting was held on December 20, 2011 with several neighbours and representatives from SunEdison Canada and the MNR Guelph District Office. A follow-up meeting was also held with MNR Guelph on January 17, 2012 to discuss the findings. As a result of these meetings it was agreed between MNR Guelph and SunEdison Canada that some additional field work will take place in Spring 2012 on selected lands east and south, within 120 m of the Project Location.</p> <p>For some surrounding lands the information obtained from a desktop review and visual observations made during a roadside survey were deemed appropriate by the MNR. Furthermore and in consideration of the proposed development and impacts to surrounding lands, the MNR agreed that visiting the site would not provide any further insight to what was already identified through the alternative site investigation.</p> <p>For other surrounding lands further site investigations were performed in Spring 2012 based on receiving landowner</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>In letters written on November 8, 2010 and January 6, 2011 residents asked "Will the noise levels impact wildlife in the area?"</p> <p>In a letter on November 8, 2010 a resident expressed concern regarding deer migration through the area, and the impact the Project will have on deer movement.</p> <p>A resident mentioned that the current proposal for a 6 foot fence will be inadequate to keep deer out of the property. Recommend height greater than 9 feet.</p> <p>Concern regarding the safety of deer (and other wildlife) if they enter the Project site.</p> <p>On December 8, 2010 PALS stated that the Lyons Creek Provincially Significant wetland has various bird species including the Sandhill Crane.</p> <p>On January 6, 2011 in a letter local residents asked the MNR, "Why was our area not noted as a wildlife corridor?"</p> <p>At PIC 4 concern was raised over completeness of wildlife studies undertaken and conclusions drawn based on the studies.</p>	<p>permission to access the property.</p> <p>Hatch responded by letter, and reiterated that based on the anticipated noise levels determined through the comprehensive noise study, no noise impacts are expected to occur to wildlife during operation of the project.</p> <p>The Proponent responded by letter, stating that the results of the natural heritage assessment of the site will be documented and made available to the Public, at least 60 days before the final (second) public meeting.</p> <p>The height of the perimeter fence was increased to 2.7 m high to ensure that deer will not be able to enter the Project site.</p> <p>The Proponent recognizes the importance of the Lyons Creek Provincially Significant Wetland and agrees that the protection of wetlands and woodlands is significant in preserving wildlife habitat.</p> <p>On November 22, 2011 Hatch replied to the MNR stating that the Natural Heritage Corridor that they identify on the City of Welland Official Plan is further than 120 m from the Project Location and accordingly it is outside the limits for consideration during the natural heritage assessment as described in the Renewable Energy Approvals (REA) process.</p> <p>The studies were conducted by a consulting company in accordance with MOE and MNR requirements (including detailed site investigations).</p>
	<p>On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident expressed concern about snapping turtles and frogs that will be adversely affected.</p>	<p>SunEdison is working with the MNR and developing a post construction research project to study amphibians and reptiles.</p> <p>At this point in time it is believed that the solar farm will create a net benefit in terms of habitat for amphibians and reptiles, given the prior use, intensive agriculture, plowing, seeding, fertilizing, harvesting, etc., has stopped. The open undisturbed fields, planted in native groundcover species, should provide additional</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
		habitat for amphibians and reptiles, which SunEdison and other agencies are interested in studying as this type of research has not been completed.
	<p>On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident mentioned that there is a muskrat lodge located on the project location that was not documented in the Site Investigation Report.</p> <p>On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident stated, <i>"The barbed wire on top has to be discarded as migratory and other birds in that area will be destroyed by this barbed wire as they fly through it."</i></p>	<p>Hatch's Biologist has reviewed your question and reaffirmed herein that during the site investigations completed in June 2010 and May – August, 2011 there were no muskrat lodges observed in the wetlands on the Project Location. Muskrats typically begin lodge construction in October and continue in November until ice formation and are designed to last only through the winter months. Muskrat will relocate depending on a number of circumstances including food supply, water fluctuations, etc. Hatch will conduct muskrat monitoring prior to construction to determine if this species is permanently residing on the Project Location. If this species is found to be present prior to construction, a licensed trapper will be hired to live-trap and relocate this species to a location that will provide suitable habitat conditions.</p> <p>The inclusion of three strands of barbed wire atop the proposed galvanized metal chain link fence is a requirement of the Ontario Electrical Safety Code (OESC) for which the Project design and construction must comply with. The OESC stipulates that chain link fence must extend to within 50 mm (2 inches) of the ground. Given this, it is expected that small mammals (e.g. rodents), snakes and frogs will still be able to pass under the fence unrestricted. The potential effects of the Project fence on larger wildlife and wildlife movement has been assessed in the Natural Heritage Assessment – Environmental Impact Study (Hatch, 2011), http://www.sunedison.ca/wellandridge/.</p>
Decommissioning	<p>In a letter on November 29, 2010 a resident asked "Will livestock be allowed on this land after decommissioning?"</p> <p>A resident asked in a comment sheet, "Upon decommissioning, how long will it be before the fields will bear crop that would be sustainable?"</p>	<p>If at the completion of the OPA contract the solar facility is decommissioned, it is the Proponent's intention to have the property returned immediately to a productive agricultural state if this is the preferred use of the future property owner.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>One resident asked in a comment sheet, "What will happen to the property if the project is started and not completed?"</p> <p>A resident expressed concern about waste and recycling on a comment sheet.</p>	<p>As part of the REA Environmental Approval the Proponent is required to prepare a decommissioning plan which describes how the equipment can be removed and the site fully rehabilitated to its original state. SunEdison respects the need to be a responsible long-term neighbour and maintain an efficient and tidy operation.</p> <p>All modules will be disconnected, removed from the racks, packaged and transported to a designated location for resale, recycling or disposal. If the modules are not to be reused in a different location, the glass and silicon will be reclaimed and the aluminum frames will be recycled. Any disposal or recycling will be done in accordance with local by-laws and requirements.</p>
Technical	<p>One resident asked in a comment sheet, "What about the reception of TV, radio, cell phones, and other electrical equipment? Can you prove to me that they will work in my home?"</p>	<p>The Welland Ridge solar farm will not have a negative impact or effect on local TV, radio, cell phone, or other electrical equipment. When an electric device that transmits (i.e., acts as an antenna) is in close proximity to another electric device, then the second device can be affected by interference from an electric field. As well as from antennas, fields can be emitted from products with poorly designed shielding and external wire termination techniques for high frequency components, or products that are unenclosed in a metallic cabinet. SunEdison believes that even if an inverter or a transformer were not properly installed or enclosed that the devices in a home, at a significant distance to the nearest inverter or transformer, would not be affected. This is because electric field falls away at a rate proportional to the inverse square of the distance from the source. This ensures that any interference that would exist right next to the source would dissipate fairly quickly as one moved away from the source.</p>
	<p>On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident asked why the technology was changed from a fixed tilt system to a tracking system.</p>	<p>The Project technology change from a fixed mount system to that of single axis trackers was a decision by SunEdison based on their experience that panels that track the sun's movement are more effective in terms of the energy that is harvested from the sun. Switching to a single axis tracker system, as opposed to a fixed tilt system, also lowers the vertical profile and overall height of the system, which helps to mitigate the visual impact, which is another benefit.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Agricultural	<p>On December 8, 2010 PALS stated that they are opposed to removal of protections for farm land and several local residents expressed concern about this use of farm land.</p> <p>At PIC 4 this was raised again that agricultural lands should not be used for the project. As well, this area is a quiet rural residential area and is being portrayed as industrial.</p>	<p>Hatch responded by letter stating that under the Province of Ontario's Green Energy and Green Economy Act, renewable energy generation is permissible on lands zoned rural, light industrial and, depending on the soil classification, lands zoned for agriculture.</p> <p>SunEdison is not changing the long-term zoning. The approximately 70-acres east of Strawn road will remain zoned for agricultural purposes. After the solar farm is decommissioned the owner of the land at that time will determine what they will do with the land, in compliance with the zoning, rules, and regulations at that time in the future. The approximately 48-acre parcel west of Strawn Road is currently light industrial so it has already been deemed appropriate to be used for non-agricultural purposes.</p>
Archaeological	<p>A local resident sent letters to MTC on December 3, 2010 and December 21, 2011 stating that there have been archaeological finds in the area of the project in the past and that the archaeologist who investigated the project lands lacked the proper procedures.</p> <p>Concern at 4th Public Meeting over the field conditions for the archaeological assessment.</p>	<p>On February 2, 2012 the Proponent sent a letter to MTCS explaining that the archaeologist is licensed by the Province of Ontario as a professional consultant archaeologist. The archaeological assessment was conducted in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act and has met all Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) standards and guidelines for consultant archaeologists.</p> <p>Licensed archaeologists followed MTCS protocols to conduct Stage 2 assessment.</p>
Socio- economic	<p>Various local residents expressed concern about property values.</p> <p>A local resident mentioned on a comment sheet concerns about the increase in hydro rates to Ontarians, the oversized benefit to solar developers, and concerns about what will happen when the government subsidies "dry up".</p> <p>A local resident mentioned on a comment sheet concerns that the project would create no permanent jobs and very little local labour will be employed.</p>	<p>We do not anticipate that having a solar photovoltaic (PV) project next to existing properties or that of neighbours will impact property values. Experience and studies with larger and more visible wind energy projects in Canada, the United States and Europe, show no impact. Currently we are not aware of an equivalent study available for solar energy facilities.</p> <p>Residents are free to voice any political question, comments, or concerns with their local MPP and/or the Premier.</p> <p>There will be extensive local job creation and procurement of supplies during the approximately 6-months of construction. Given SunEdison currently has (1) 9.1 MW solar farm in</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
		operation (FirstLight1), is constructing (1) 10 MW solar farm at Sandhurst, and has (6) other FIT contracts going through REA that will ultimately be constructed, there will be meaningful full time permanent jobs created in the area. In total, when or if all of these farms are constructed the estimate is for between 15 to 18 full time jobs.
Site Selection	Local residents mentioned that brownfields would be more appropriate for the solar farm.	It is the Proponent's preference to seek out marginal lands, such as brownfields, for solar development as not only is it making use of valuable land, but can be more cost effective. In locations where the Proponent was aware of the existence of these lands, these possibilities were explored. However, due to lack of landowner response or interest in selling, they were not secured
Policy	The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) properly protects large areas of Class One to Three soils such as the subject lands from industrial use encroachments.	Solar energy projects are not formally subject to the PPSs, however many of the PPS requirements have largely been incorporated into the Renewable Energy Approval requirements under O. Reg. 359/09.
Other	<p>A resident asked in a comment sheet, "Will there be a change in the ambient temperature due to the solar panel's waste energy that is not converted to electricity?"</p> <p>A resident asked in a comment sheet, "How might this project affect the ability of homeowners to connect their own microfit projects?"</p> <p>On a comment sheet a resident asked, "How much energy is consumed to produce solar panels?"</p> <p>On a comment sheet a resident asked, "Give examples of things that neighbours cannot do when a solar farm is next door."</p>	<p>On very warm sunny days, the protective tempered glass solar covering on the panels can become warm to the touch similar to other dark surfaces. However, the panels will not heat up excessively, nor will this heat result in a significant change (if any) to the local ambient air temperature in proximity to the Project Location. The atmosphere is considered an infinite heat sink and the solar farm cannot have an effect on temperature, considering there is air and ventilation all around the panels, and the rows are spaced approximately 10 meters apart.</p> <p>SunEdison has no knowledge of, or control of, the available capacity on the Local Distribution Companies (LDC's) feeders. Anyone interested in connecting a FIT or microFIT project must first apply for a contract with the OPA.</p> <p>The energy payback for solar panels, or the amount of time it takes a panel to generate enough energy to replace the energy it took to produce the panel, has been estimated to be approximately 1.5 years.</p> <p>A solar farm does not place any restrictions on adjacent residential landowners.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>On a comment sheet a resident asked, "Can I build a house next to this solar farm, and how close?"</p> <p>In an email on October 20, 2011 a concerned citizen asked about what needs to be met for the project to receive approval.</p> <p>In an email on October 20, 2011 a concerned citizen asked about what conditions would result in the project being turned down (by the MOE).</p> <p>In an email on October 20, 2011 a concerned citizen asked where O.Reg. 359/09 can be found.</p> <p>Attendees of the Second Public Meeting expressed that they would like a public meeting where there is a presentation and a group question/answer period.</p>	<p>The house would be subject to the minimum building setbacks as required by the municipal zoning and building codes.</p> <p>The applicant provides all of the required information for provincial ministry approvals. This includes an REA application form and supporting forms, diagrams, assessments and reports to the MOE. Once an application is made for an REA, a notice of a proposal is posted on the Environmental Registry by the MOE so the public can review and provide comments. After considering an application for the issue or renewal of an REA and all public comments are received through the Environmental Registry, the Ministry of the Environment Director may do either of the following: Issue, renew or amend an REA; or Refuse to issue, renew or amend an REA. The Director notifies the applicant of the decision and posts it on the Environmental Registry. If a decision is made to approve the application, the applicant must get any remaining approvals necessary before starting construction.</p> <p>SunEdison is not aware of, or privy to, the reasons why a proposed project may not be approved by the MOE and, therefore, citizens will have to contact the MOE to ask them directly. The Renewable Energy Facilitation Office (REFO) may be the appropriate point of contact as they are the Ontario government's one-window access for information about renewable energy.</p> <p>The link below will provide you with a copy of O.Reg. 359/09. http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/source/regs/english/2009/elaws_src_regs_r09359_e.htm</p> <p>A Third Public Meeting with a formal sit-down presentation and question and answer session was held on February 15, 2012 at the Welland Civic Square.</p>
	<p>In a letter written on February 9, 2012 to the Proponent and Hatch a local resident expressed concern that there was not enough notice prior to the Third Public Meeting, and no answers to the concerns raised in the Second Public Meeting were received.</p>	<p>The Proponent replied in a letter on March 16, 2012 stating that at the December 19, 2011 meeting the attendees were notified of the Third Public Meeting to take place at the end of January or early February. Letters were mailed on February 3, 2012, providing approximately 9 days advance notice. A newspaper notice was published one week in advance of the meeting. SunEdison did not promise to provide information in advance of</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
		the 3 rd meeting, since the purpose of the 3 rd meeting was to present this information back to the petitioners in the form of a detailed presentation and question and answer period.
	In a letter written on February 9, 2012 a resident made the following comment: <i>"This fly by the seat of your pants mentality with no regard for the environment, wildlife decreasing property value, noise, water contamination etc is totally abhorrent."</i>	SunEdison's approach to the Welland Project, as with all of our ongoing projects, is not by the seat of our pants, but rather one in which we have maintained a high standard of care and professionalism with respect to the City of Welland, local residents and the environment. SunEdison has endeavored to use the most qualified and experienced consulting firms to complete the REA planning and documentation, and will continue to use highly qualified engineering and competent construction firms to design and build the facility.
	In a letter written on February 9, 2012 a resident made the following comment: <i>"If the province was really committed to the environment we should by buying 100% renewable hydro electric power from Quebec that they have a surplus of in fact sell to the US."</i>	<p>The Ontario Power Authority (OPA) is responsible for power procurement in the Province of Ontario, including hydroelectric power from Quebec. The OPA is also responsible for developing the Long-Term Energy Plan (LTEP) (http://www.powerauthority.on.ca/the-plan), which includes what the "supply mix" will be in terms of the blend of power generation sources from nuclear, coal, hydroelectric, natural gas and renewable. The LTEP envisions about 20% or 10,700 MW of the Province's power coming from wind, solar and bioenergy, and about 9,000 MW being supplied by hydroelectric facilities in Ontario. Citizens may direct any questions or comments regarding the Ontario's LTEP and its supply mix to the OPA at http://www.powerauthority.on.ca/contact-us.</p> <p>The power system in Ontario, and indeed North America, is extremely complex in which, supply and demand are "balanced" minute by minute, hour by hour and day by day. In Ontario, this balancing and "dispatching" of power is controlled by the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) (http://www.ieso.ca/). The IESO tells which generators to turn off and on, and when. The IESO also controls power imports and exports. Citizens are free to direct any questions or comments regarding the power market to the IESO at http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/siteShared/contact.asp.</p> <p>SunEdison is participating in the Ontario power market, but SunEdison has no control over it. SunEdison is a relatively small market participant.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	In a letter written on February 9, 2012 a resident made the following comment: <i>"This particular project even running at peak capacity (unlikely to ever happen) only generates a fraction of one percent of the power needed to supply the Province of Ontario. In your own dictum this should read as not a significant source of power for residents of Welland or Ontario."</i>	A 10 MW solar farm is a reasonably sized distributed generator, meaning it connects locally to the distribution system. This is how the Feed in Tariff (FIT) Program in Ontario was designed for solar. Certainly, larger solar farms are possible, and in other jurisdictions they are being developed (e.g., 100, 200, 500 MW, or larger). Over the course of a year this 10 MW solar farm will produce enough power for between 1,200 to 2,000 homes, depending on their consumption, and this is a significant and positive contribution to (green) generation locally.
	In a letter written on February 9, 2012 a resident mentioned that the Feed in Tariff rates are going to drop.	The OPA closed the stakeholder comment solicitation portion of its scheduled 2-year review of the FIT Program in November. All renewable energy developers in the Province of Ontario are awaiting the results of this 2-year review and what the program will look like going forward. We fully expect that the rates that will be paid for solar going forward will decrease over time, given that the cost of solar continues to drop. Price and/or cost reductions are a direct result of increased volume and technological innovation. This is what is happening in other solar markets globally. The Ontario government has clearly stated its commitment to green energy and renewable in Ontario, and SunEdison is a developer committed to solar energy development and the Province of Ontario.
	On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident asked why her PIC 1 comment sheet questions were never answered.	The first public meeting was held on October 20, 2011. Jennifer Dawson sent brief thank you letters (dated November 11, 2010) to all persons, including you, who submitted comment sheets. The thank you letters indicated that we would provide individual letter responses to the comments/questions raised at a later date owing to the large number of comment sheets and response letters that had been received by us (and Hatch) for all of SunEdison's 9 projects. In addition to your comment sheet, you also sent a very detailed letter to Hatch on November 29, 2010 that contained numerous and similar questions to those posed on your comment sheet. During April 25 to May 1, 2011, Jennifer Dawson sent detailed response letters to all of the people who sent in comment sheets. Due to the number and detailed nature your questions in both your comment sheet and letter, Jennifer did not send you a letter at that time, but rather it was decided that Hatch would respond by letter. On May 4,

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
		2011, Hatch sent a 6-page letter that grouped many questions by category and then provided a detailed response to each of your principle concerns.
	On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident asked why the Third Public Meeting was not held at the Cooks Mills Hall as requested by the stakeholders.	As stated in our February 2, 2012 invitation letter to you, given the large number of people that the invitation was sent to, this necessitated that the meeting venue be moved from the Cooks Mills Hall to a larger facility at the Community Room at Welland Civic Square which provided much larger seating capacity than the Cooks Mills Hall as well as audiovisual support for the presentation.
	On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident stated that nothing new was presented at the Third Public Meeting.	SunEdison disagrees that nothing new was presented in the presentation. In fact, a significant portion of the presentation (19 slides) was dedicated to answering the key member-petition concerns regarding groundwater flow conditions, potential effects to the nearby aquifer and the proposed well water sampling program. The presentation was made by Mr. Bruce Bennett of Hatch Ltd.
	On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident inquired about the qualifications of Mr. Miller (SunEdison) and Mr. Bennett (Hatch).	Mr. Miller is the Director of Development, SunEdison Canada. Prior to the acquisition of Axio Power by SunEdison in July 2011, Mr. Miller was Country Manager, Axio Power Canada Inc. Mr. Miller has been the Project Manager for the Welland Ridge Project since its inception in 2010. Mr. Miller is a licensed Professional Engineer and has a Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering and a Master's of Science degree in Environmental Engineering. Mr. Bennett is the Manager of the Niagara Falls Environmental Services Group, Hatch Ltd. Mr. Bennett is a licensed Geoscientist with a Master's of Science degree in Geology specializing in Hydrogeology. Both Mr. Miller and Mr. Bennett's roles and contact information have been fully disclosed and communicated to the public, and documented in the Project Description Report (Hatch, 2011), on-line at: http://www.sunedison.ca/wellandridge/ as required by the REA Regulations.
	On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident asked, <i>"Why is there a gate at each south end of the fence on both 505 and 575 Ridge Road parcels?"</i>	The locations of the proposed gates shown on SunEdison's site plan drawings at each south end of the fence are to allow access to the south side of the fence for maintenance personnel to conduct inspections, possible fence repairs and to maintain vegetative plantings placed along the south side of the fence for

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
		visual screening.
	On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident expressed concerns that the Third Public Meeting was not moderated well and that many people left with questions unanswered.	SunEdison used the services of a professional moderator for the meeting to provide a structured meeting format for the benefit of the presenters and the attendees. To maintain decorum and to respect the presenters, attendees were told that questions would be held until each presenter had completed their respective presentations. Attendees who were not comfortable with public speaking were allowed to submit written questions which were answered by SunEdison's panel of experts in attendance. For people that felt they did not have any opportunity to ask a question, or felt that their question was not answered in sufficient detail were encouraged to submit a comment sheet to obtain further answers. Of approximately 50 people that attended the meeting, only 4 signed comment sheets were received that posed follow-up questions, it did not appear that there were many people with questions left unanswered.
	On a PIC 3 comment sheet a local resident requested that funds be given to the community to conduct an independent review of the REA application.	The provision of funding to a community group or association to conduct an independent peer review is not a requirement under the current REA requirements as prescribed by Ontario Regulations 521/10 that amended O. Reg. 359/09. When the MOE finishes their technical review and issues the REA for the Project, they will post a notification of this on the EBR website at: www.ebr.gov.on.ca . At this time, any resident of Ontario may request a hearing by the Environmental Review Tribunal (ERT) within 15 days after the date that the REA Decision is posted on the EBR by providing written notice to the contacts identified in the EBR notification. Further information regarding the REA appeals process is provided in the document, A Guide to Appeals by Members of the Public regarding Renewable Energy Approvals under section 142.1 of the Environmental Protection Act (July 2010) available on-line at the Environmental Review Tribunal's website at: http://www.ert.gov.on.ca/english/guides/index.htm .
	In the petition the local residents stated, <i>"We most definitely want a \$25,000,000.00 liability bond taken out by both the owner of the land and the leaser of the land to protect</i>	At the Third Public Meeting the Proponent discussed the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SunEdison Canada has no plans to take out a Liability Bond for the Project

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<i>the stakeholders around this proposed site for compensation due to adverse health effects to both the people who live around the site, the surrounding farm animals, the attached natural environment of the area, and the devaluation of homes and properties.”</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liability bonds are not a REA or OPA FIT requirement • Private development on privately owned land does not require bonds • Decommissioning and the developer’s responsibility and commitment is outlined in the Decommissioning Report.
	PIC 4 comment sheet raised the issue of this being the wrong place, wrong setup (price is way too high) and it should be in your backyard.	The FIT program was put in place to procure green, clean renewable energy which has many social, economic and environmental benefits. The employment benefits have been discussed previously and the pricing issue can be reviewed on the OPA’s website (http://fit.powerauthority.on.ca/fit-program-pricing).

7. Consideration of Public, Municipal and Aboriginal Input

7.1 Alterations to the Proposal to Engage in the Project

After consultation with the public, landowners and the municipalities, there were no significant concerns with the Project Proposal which could not be resolved. Some minor details will be modified and these are detailed in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1 Alterations to the Proposal to Engage in the Project

Comment / Concern	Alteration to the Project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MNR suggested that surrounding land owners be contacted to request permission to access the property for the Natural Heritage Site Investigation. 	On May 6, 2011 Hatch mailed letters to the applicable landowners requesting permission to access the property for the Natural Heritage Site Investigation. The accuracy of the Site Investigation Report was improved based on the ability to physically investigate more of the surrounding properties.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MNR requested that the Non-Significant Wetland (Wetland 2 in the NHA) not be filled in. 	The project was changed to go around Wetland 2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City of Welland requested that the notification radius be increased to 500m. 	For the First and Second Public Meetings all landowners within 500m were notified.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City of Welland and the Region of Niagara suggested using Ridge Road for site access 	A Traffic Impact Study was completed and Ridge Road will be used for site access.

7.2 Alterations to the Required REA Reports

After consultation with the public, landowners and the municipalities, several changes were also made to the draft documents released for public review. The public input and the resulting commitments are detailed in Table 7-2.

Table 7-2 Alterations to the Required REA Reports

Comment / Concern	Alteration to the Reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual impact of the Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In collaboration with the local residents, visually appealing fencing and native species of hedges, trees and other vegetative buffers will be planted along the perimeter of the solar farm to reduce visibility of the solar panels to neighbours in the area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guaranteed groundwater monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Groundwater Monitoring Plan Report was prepared and posted on the Proponent's website prior to the final public meeting. The Proponent will conduct water well quality sampling before and during construction (if complaints arise) in participating landowners' wells. Based on requests, testing for E.coli, PCBs, and sulphur will be included.

Comment / Concern	Alteration to the Reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about harming the aquifer 	<p>SunEdison believes that the potential for groundwater or well water contamination from the solar farm development and its subsequent construction, operation and maintenance and finally decommissioning is negligible (extremely remote). However, in the extremely unlikely event of the solar farm development somehow contributing to ground or well water contamination, SunEdison is committed to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supply bottled water or water cooler for drinking (potable uses) 2. Supply portable water supply for household use (non-potable) – storage tank 3. Fill dug well (if present) with trucked potable water 4. Perform ongoing tests until the domestic well water is within acceptable levels, or similar to preconstruction quality 5. Retain licensed driller to assess well and determine if deepening or other options are available 6. If there is a demonstrated long-term effect, provide a suitable domestic water treatment system (for example with UV disinfection, RO, and/or other appropriate filtration) 7. Evaluate modifications to the solar farm construction process which potentially caused groundwater issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some mistakes were found in the Groundwater Monitoring Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Groundwater Monitoring Report was updated and posted on the website on February 21, 2012.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MNR requested a Petroleum Resources Engineer's Report, as the Project Location may be within 75m of several petroleum resources operations (wells). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponent prepared the report and it was accepted by the MNR.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some local residents disputed the findings of Significant Natural Features in the Natural Heritage Assessment project reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A site meeting was held on December 20, 2011 with several neighbours and representatives from SunEdison Canada and the MNR Guelph District Office. A follow-up meeting was also held with MNR Guelph on January 17, 2012 to discuss the findings. As a result of these meetings it was agreed between MNR Guelph and SunEdison Canada that some additional field work will take place in Spring 2012 on selected lands east and south, within 120 m of the Project Location.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A resident mentioned that the current proposal for a 6 foot fence will be inadequate to keep deer out of the property. Recommend height greater than 9 feet. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The height of the perimeter fence was increased to 2.7 m high to ensure that deer will not be able to enter the Project site.

Comment / Concern	Alteration to the Reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Concerns about snapping turtles and frogs that will be adversely affected	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ SunEdison is working with the MNR and developing a post construction research project to study amphibians and reptiles. At this point in time it is believed that the solar farm will create a net benefit in terms of habitat for amphibians and reptiles, given the prior use, intensive agriculture, plowing, seeding, fertilizing, harvesting, etc., has stopped. The open undisturbed fields, planted in native groundcover species, should provide additional habitat for amphibians and reptiles, which SunEdison and other agencies are interested in studying as this type of research has not been completed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Attendees of the Second Public Meeting expressed that they would like a public meeting where there is a presentation and a group question/answer period.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ A Third Public Meeting with a formal sit-down presentation and question and answer session was held on February 15, 2012 at the Welland Civic Centre.