

### **3 Agency, Public and First Nation Consultation**

### 3. Agency, Public and First Nation Consultation

#### 3.1 Provincial and Federal Consultation Guidelines

The Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Electricity Projects prepared by the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch of the MOE recommends that a consultation plan include various elements such as

- identifying potentially affected stakeholders
- describing how the project may affect the environment
- providing appropriate notification to identified stakeholders as prescribed in the environmental screening process
- informing the public where, when and how they can be involved
- identifying public concerns and issues related to the project
- addressing public concerns and issues raised during the program
- documenting how public input is taken into account in the screening process and in the project planning and development (MOE, 2001).

The Guide offers additional recommendations regarding consultation with members of the public, stating the following:

“Public consultation should be commenced early in the screening process and continued throughout the process as necessary. The proponent is required to maintain a record and mailing list of all participants in the consultation process, a record of public concerns and issues and a record of how any concerns and issues have been addressed during the Screening or Environmental Review stages (MOE, 2001).”

In June 2007, MOE released the “Code of Practice – Consultation in Ontario’s Environmental Assessment Process”. The Code of Practice outlines the MOE’s expectations regarding appropriate consultation and provides information for the development and implementation of a consultation plan.

The Guideline on Assessing the Need for and Level of Public Participation in Screenings under CEAA states that “the public should have an opportunity to have a say in decisions that affect their lives through a meaningful public participation process”. For a public participation program to be meaningful, it should exhibit [specific elements]” (CEAA, 2006). These are listed as early notification, accessible information, shared knowledge, sensitivity to community values, reasonable timing, appropriate levels of participation, adaptive processes and transparent results.

The consultation program undertaken applied the above recommendations and requirements in engaging members of the public, agency stakeholders and First Nations during the environmental assessment of the Project.

### 3.2 Community Engagement and Stakeholder Consultations

Since first being awarded the rights to develop a hydroelectric facility at Bala Falls, SREL and its consultant have been engaged in a broad-based, multi-faceted and proactive effort to inform the community and potential stakeholders about the project, and, to solicit comments. Their efforts at community outreach to project neighbours, community groups, the broader Bala and Muskoka communities, other potential stakeholders (municipal, provincial and federal authorities), and, First Nations, have included

- the use of widely distributed local newspapers to post mandatory and open house notices
- the use of mail and special door-to-door delivery services to distribute project updates
- holding widely advertised Public Information Centres (PIC) (open houses)
- obtaining the support of local interest groups to distribute (via email) project update information to their widely dispersed members
- seeking out and responding to numerous opportunities to meet with individuals, community groups and their representatives
- the development of a comprehensive and regularly updated project website.

The following sections detail the efforts of SREL and its consultant to engage the community and potential stakeholders in what has become a phased consultation process that followed the publication of two Notices of Commencement of a Screening:

- Phase One consultations covered a period from the point March 2006 through July 2008. During this period, SREL built awareness of the Project through (a) Two Notices of Commencement (see Section 3.3.1), (b) solicitation of stakeholder comments, and (c) through studies and assessments during the latter portion of this Phase (January to June, 2008) to determine the feasibility of altering the original project's design and layout to address comments and concerns that had been raised.
- Phase Two consultations began with the announcement and release of a revised plan for the Bala Falls project in August 2008 and continued through to preparation of this Environmental Screening Report.
- Phase Three consultations are expected to commence with the 30-day public review of this Report and will continue through project construction and the operating life of the project.

### 3.3 Notice of Commencement of a Screening

Under the MOE Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Electricity Projects (March 2001), there are two mandatory public notifications that the proponent must circulate during the course of an Environmental Screening. These are a "Notice of Commencement of an Environmental Screening" and a "Notice of Completion of an Environmental Screening". Outlined below in this section are details regarding distribution of the Notice of Commencement.

#### 3.3.1 Newspaper Publication

Shortly after the award of the Applicant of Record status from MNR, giving SREL the right to pursue the environmental assessment and seek approvals for a hydroelectric generating station at Bala's North Dam, SREL's consultant published a Notice of Commencement in Bala area newspapers:

- Gravenhurst Banner: March 8, 2006 (circulation: 7,000)
- Bracebridge Examiner: March 8, 2006 (circulation: 7,000)
- Muskoka Today: March 9, 2006 (circulation: 12,500).

Due to administrative delays in initiating the screening process, SREL opted to post a second Notice of Commencement in Bala area newspapers with MNR's encouragement:

- Gravenhurst Banner: August 8, 2007 (circulation: 7,000)
- Bracebridge Examiner: August 8, 2007 (circulation: 7,000)
- Muskoka Today: August 9, 2007 (circulation: 12,500).

### **3.3.2 Additional Distribution to community Groups and Neighbours**

In addition to publishing the 2007 Notice of Commencement in local area newspapers, the Notice, along with a cover letter, was sent to the following nearby and adjacent landowner/occupants and interest groups:

#### ***Neighbouring Landowner/Occupants***

- Algonquin Power (owner/operator of Burgess Power Station)
- Bracebridge Generation Ltd.
- The Stone Church (formerly Burgess Memorial Church)
- Hydro One Networks Inc.
- Ontario Power Generation Inc. (including Evergreen Energy)
- Purk's Place Boat House and Marina.

#### ***Community Groups***

- Eastern Georgian Bay Stewardship Council
- Federation of Ontario Cottagers' Association
- Federation of Ontario Naturalists
- Georgian Bay Association
- Go Home Lake Cottage Owners Association
- Moon River Property Owners Association
- Muskoka Heritage Foundation
- Muskoka Lakes Association
- Muskoka Lakes Chamber of Commerce
- Muskoka Lakes Snow Trail Association
- Muskoka Ratepayers Association

- Muskoka River Water Management Plan Standing Advisory Committee
- Muskoka Watershed Council
- Township of Muskoka Lakes Ratepayers Association.

A copy of each of the 2006 and 2007 Notices of Commencement and corresponding Stakeholder Letter are included in Appendixes D1 and D2 respectively. A copy of the December 5, 2007 Stakeholder Letter is included in Appendix D3.

### 3.3.3 **Distribution to Federal, Provincial and Municipal Government Agencies**

SREL's consultant also distributed copies of the 2006 and 2007 Notices of Commencement to municipal, provincial and federal agencies.

**Table 3.1 List of Government Agencies**

<p><b>Federal Government</b> Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency Department of Fisheries and Oceans Environment Canada Indian and Northern Affairs Canada Natural Resources Canada Transport Canada Tony Clement, MP (Parry Sound-Muskoka)</p>
<p><b>Provincial Government</b> Ministry of Culture Ministry of Environment Ministry of Natural Resources Norm Miller, MPP (Parry Sound-Muskoka)</p>
<p><b>Municipal Governments</b> District Municipality of Muskoka Corporation of the Township of Muskoka Lakes Town of Bracebridge</p>

#### **First Nations**

SREL's consultant also distributed copies of the 2007 Notice of Commencement to the Wahta Mohawk First Nation and the Moose Deer Point First Nation.

## 3.4 **Phase One Consultations (March 2006 – June 2008)**

Following the distribution of Notices of Commencement in March, 2006 and early August, 2007, numerous other consultations occurred during Phase One as outlined below.

### 3.4.1 **Public Information Centre (PIC) 1 (August 29, 2007)**

Stakeholders and the public were notified of the August 29, 2007 Public Information Centre (PIC) organized by SREL's consultant by the following means:

***Newspaper Advertisements***

- the Gravenhurst Banner August 15, 2007 (circulation: 7,000)
- the Bracebridge Examiner August 15, 2007 (circulation: 7,000)
- Muskoka Today August 22, 2007 (circulation: 12,500).

Letters including a copy of the newspaper advertisement were mailed to a number of parties in order to coincide with newspaper publication. Recipients of mailed notices included

- adjacent and nearby property owners and occupants
- municipal, provincial and federal agencies (see Table 3.1)
- Wahta Mohawk First Nation.

See Appendix D4 for a copy of the notice and letter.

**3.4.1.1 *Structure and Organization***

The PIC was held at the Bala Community Centre, Maple Street, Bala, Ontario between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. Attendees were invited to peruse the poster display, with representatives of SREL and its project development team being available to answer questions. They were encouraged to complete an exit questionnaire before leaving. The display included text and depictions of

- information on SREL and its project partner (Bracebridge Generation)
- background on the Environmental Screening process including a preliminary timetable for public/regulatory review and approvals
- a description of the project
- Contact information for SREL and its environmental consultant contact information, including means for staying informed of Project developments.

Copies of the display panels and comment sheet are included in Appendix D5.

**3.4.1.2 *Findings***

A total of 140 people signed in at the PIC. Of these, 97 completed and submitted comment sheets.

The most frequently cited issues raised were concerns regarding the aesthetic impact the facility might have on the surrounding landscape (59) followed by the impact of the facility on water level fluctuations/flow (39). Other concerns included potential impacts on the local economy during construction, and interference with access to and recreational uses of the project site. Table 3.2 summarizes the issues raised by people who attended PIC 1.

**Table 3.2 Issues Raised by the Public and Proposed Resolution, 2007 PIC**

Issue	No. of Respondents Raising the Issue	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
Aesthetics/Signage	59	5.3.6 and 6.3.5
Water Level Fluctuation/Flows	39	6.2.2.
Flooding	2	6.2.2.
Negative Effects to the Environment	5	5 and 6
Fish and Fish Habitat (Including the newly constructed Pickerel spawning bed)	12	5.2.8 and 6.2.5
Tourism/Economic Impacts	18	5.3. 7; 5.3.9; 6.3.6 and 6.3.7.
Change/Loss of Recreational Use	14	5.3.7.2 and 6.3.6
Loss of Access by the Public	14	5.3.1 and 6.3.1 and Figures 5.4 and 6.5
Negative Effects to the Mill Stream	2	5.3.10
Relocation of the Lions Club Life Ring	1	1.2
Negative Effects to Property Values	5	6.3.6.3.
Safety	9	5.3.2; 5.3.3; and 6.3.2.
Noise Level Increase	11	6.3.4 and Appendix C1
Negative Effects to the Sewage Treatment Plant	1	6.2.4
Disruption to the Community During Construction	5	5.3.4; Figure 5.1
Project is Not Viable/ Cost Effective	8	1.4
Public Consultation Process/Method	10	3

### 3.4.2 Community Groups and Neighbours Outreach

In addition to the widely advertised August 29<sup>th</sup> PIC, SREL sought out and responded to numerous opportunities to forge open lines of communications with community groups, nearby and adjacent landowners and occupants in an effort to foster better understanding of the proposed project and to solicit questions and concerns.

A meeting was held with the members of the Moon River Property Owners Association at its Annual General Meeting (September 1, 2007), and SREL began discussions with nearby and adjacent landowner/occupants, including

- Purk's Place Boat House and Marina
- The Stone Church (formerly Burgess Memorial Church)
- Ontario Power Generation Inc.
- Hydro One Networks Inc

- Algonquin Power
- Township of Muskoka Lakes
- District of Muskoka.

Through the Phase One Consultations and community outreach efforts, it was clear the community had a number of concerns about the proposed project. Concerns included the following:

- Impacts of the proposed station design and layout on
  - ◆ traditional access to the North Dam's waterfall (Sections 5.3.1, 6.3.1 and 6.3.6.1)
  - ◆ the current natural beauty of the site (Section 5.3.6 and 6.3.5)
- The potential impacts of altering the seasonal flows over Bala's North and South dams on:
  - ◆ local fish habitats (Sections 5.2.7, 5.2.8 and 6.2.5)
  - ◆ cottagers' access to their docks (Section 6.3.6.2)
  - ◆ the aesthetics of the waterfalls (Section 6.3.5)
- The potential impacts of construction on
  - ◆ the seasonal local economy (Victoria Day – Cranberry Festival) (Sections 5.3.8 and 5.3.9)
  - ◆ use of an important snowmobile route that crosses through the proposed construction site on Bala Falls Road (Section 5.3.7.2).

In the case of the two most immediate neighbours, Purk's Place Boat House & Marina and The Stone Church, these owner/occupants also expressed concern about the impacts construction and construction-related activities on the integrity of their respective buildings and their access to them (Sections 5.3.8 and 6.3.1).

Appendix D6 provides a summary of the comments received through the Phase One Consultations with members of the public as well as industry/stakeholder groups.

### **3.4.3 Regulatory Agencies Consultation**

#### **3.4.3.1 Municipal: Township of Muskoka Lakes & District of Muskoka**

For the most part, the Township and District voiced the same concerns expressed by their respective constituents for the potential short- and long-term impacts this project on the local environment. Numerous meetings and discussions were held with municipal officials (staff and elected) to discuss these concerns and explain project details, as they developed.

The Township and District encouraged SREL to devise a design and layout that was more in keeping with a vision the Township of Muskoka Lakes had for the development of this site and its surrounding area based on public meetings held in 2002. (See Appendix D7 for drawing of Bala Strategic Plan, May 2002 provided by the Township of Muskoka Lakes.)

On March 16, 2006, John A. Cosgrove, CAO – Treasurer of the Corporation of the Township of Muskoka Lakes contacted SREL to forward comments from the Office of the Mayor (dated January 12, 2005) which would represent the comments of the township. The mayor included a council resolution (# PC-7-5/01/05) with these comments dated January 5, 2005.

On September 26, 2007 SREL sent a letter to the Muskoka District Solicitor as a follow-up to a telephone conversation to propose a meeting to discuss alternative plans for the Project in response to public concern for Layout Alternative 1, presented at the PIC. On November 16, 2007 SREL met with the Muskoka District Solicitor and the District Director of Roads and Waste Management to discuss the use of District lands for the Project.

See Appendix D8 for a summary of the meetings and correspondence with the Township and District during Phase One Consultations.

#### 3.4.3.2 *Provincial Agency Consultations*

SREL and its environmental consultant corresponded with provincial agencies to determine their interests/concerns with respect to this project.

The following summarizes the concerns raised by particular provincial authorities through the Phase One Consultations.

##### ***Ministry of Natural Resources***

Consultation with the MNR revealed the following to be key concerns during Phase One Consultations. The relevant section of this ESR where these issues have been addressed is also provided:

- Reproductive success and recruitment of various fish species (Sections 5.2.7, 5.2.8 and 6.2.5)
- Negative effects to fish populations, riparian and littoral habitat (Sections 5.2.7, 5.2.8 and 6.2.5)
- Impacts to walleye and pike spawning (Sections 5.2.7, 5.2.8 and 6.2.5)
- Exposure of incubating lake trout eggs and fry (Sections 5.2.7, 5.2.8 and 6.2.5)
- Negative impacts to species at risk (Sections 5.2.11 and 6.2.7)
- Vulnerability of flora to changing flows and levels (Section 6.2.6)
- Impacts to the Lower Moon River Conservation Reserve, and Moon River Conservation Reserve (Section 9)
- Negative impacts to boating and recreational and commercial navigation (Sections 5.3.7, 5.3.8, and 6.3.6)
- Negative effects to vehicle and pedestrian traffic (Sections 5.3.4 and 6.3.3)
- Potential impacts to north shore residents and shoreline structures as a result of higher flows through the North Dam and that generated by the Project (Section 6.3.6.3)
- Significance of the North Bala Dam as a visual attractant and component of tourism (Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5)

- Impacts to residents' shoreline use and enjoyment due to high and low water events (Sections 6.3.6.2 and 6.3.6.3)
- Negative effects to Go Home Lake water levels (Section 6.2.2)
- Creation of a potential safety hazard due to increased flows and velocities (Section 6.3.2)
- Negative impacts to adjacent municipal and private property (Sections 6.3.6.3 and 9)
- Potential impacts to Wahta First Nation Reserve (Sections 5.3.13 and 6.3.9)
- Impacts to the generating stations belonging to OPG and Algonquin Power (Sections 5.3.10 and 6.3.8.1).

***Ministry of the Environment***

During the environmental assessment process, the MOE requested the following issues be considered. The relevant sections of the ESR where these have been addressed are noted:

- Consultation with Aboriginal communities (Section 3.5.7)
- Noise impacts (Sections 5.3.5 and 6.3.4)
- Spill containment and waste fluids (Sections 5.2.6.2, 6.5 and 8.6)
- Sewage and water services (Sections 5.1.9 and 5.1.10)
- Surface water quality (Sections 5.2.6 and 6.2.4)
- Excavated material (Section 5.1.4)
- Near shore construction and dredging (Section 5.1)
- Blasting (Section 5.1.4)
- Dust (Sections 5.2.3 and 6.2.1)
- C of A Air (Section 11)
- Waste disposal (Section 5.1.10)
- Decommissioning (Section 6.6)
- Emerald Ash Borer infestation (Section 5.2.9).

See Appendix D9 for a summary of the discussions and correspondence with provincial authorities during Phase One Consultations.

**3.4.3.3 *Federal Agency Consultations***

As the environmental screening also needs to satisfy federal requirements, SREL and its environmental consultant contacted appropriate federal agencies in order to determine their interests/concerns with respect to this project. See Appendix D10 for a summary of the discussions and correspondence with federal authorities.

The following summarizes the concerns raised by federal agencies through Phase One Consultations.

***Transport Canada***

The concerns expressed by TC during Phase One Consultations in their response to the Notice of Commencement dated September 18, 2007 included the following:

- North Bala dam requirement for approval pursuant to the NWPA (Section 11)
- Proposed location of booms or other structures (Figure 1.2)
- Potential impact of project on existing navigational uses (Sections 5.3.7, 5.3.8, and 6.3.6).

***Department of Fisheries and Oceans***

During Phase One Consultations DFO noted their interest in having the following areas of potential impact addressed:

- downstream fish habitat (Sections 5.2.8 and 6.2.5)
- fish spawning areas (Sections 5.2.8 and 6.2.5)
- potential fisheries impacts (Sections 5.2.7, 5.2.8 and 6.2.5)
- river flows during the operation of the hydroelectric generating station. (Sections 6.2.2 and 9).

***Indian and Northern Affairs Canada***

In response to the Notice of Commencement INAC requested that the proponent make efforts to identify and notify all potentially interested First Nation communities (see Sections 3.3.4, 3.4.4 and 3.5.7).

**3.4.4 *First Nations***

Neither the Wahta Mohawk First Nation or Moose Deer Point First Nation responded to the initial contacts during the Phase One Consultations. However, follow up was carried out during Phase Two consultations (see Section 3.5.7).

**3.4.5 *Project Website Launched (November 2007)***

A project website [www.balafalls.ca](http://www.balafalls.ca) was developed and launched by SREL as a means of providing the public with the latest information concerning project developments. The site included

- A description of the project (as envisioned at that point in time)
- Bala's History
- Frequently Asked Questions
- Who We Are
- Our Commitment to the Community
- The Approvals Process
- Notices and Links (including PIC display material)
- Contact Us.

To ensure all potential stakeholders were aware of this new website, SREL undertook a broad-based community outreach effort to notify the community of this newly established website. This included

- mailing 1500 letters to all those with “P0C 1A0” postal code (Bala and surrounding area)
- mailing 80 letters to those who provided contact information at the 2007 PIC
- mailing approximately 25 letters to all municipal, provincial and federal government agencies.

In an effort to reach Bala’s business and seasonal residents, SREL obtained the support and cooperation of the Moon River Property Owners Association, the Muskoka Lakes Association and Muskoka Lakes Chamber of Commerce to electronically distribute a copy of the above-mentioned letter to their respective members (approximately 3500). A copy of the letter can be found in Appendix D11.

In addition to providing a general project update and summary, these letters identified a toll free number for people to contact SREL to get answers to their questions.

### **3.5 Phase Two Consultations (July 2008 – ESR Release)**

Phase Two Consultations comprised three overlapping efforts to build community-awareness for SREL’s “new plan” for its Bala Falls project, a dramatically revised design. The Plan, while working with the engineering and environmental site constraints, responded to most of the community’s concerns.

Phase Two Consultations began with a focussed and concerted effort to engage neighbours with SREL’s new plan, followed by a series of ever-widening communications and public forums to present and solicit the community’s comments.

These community outreach initiatives are described in the following sections. A summary of Consultation with Public and Stakeholders is provided in Appendix D12.

#### **3.5.1 SREL’s New Plan for Bala Falls (July/August 2008)**

After several months of reviewing public and stakeholder comments, and, assessing the feasibility of various siting and design options raised in the Phase One Consultation, SREL undertook a series of meetings and discussions with the community and community representatives to present a “new plan” that responded to the concerns raised in the community-wide Phase One Consultations. Specifically, the “new plan” entailed

- preserving traditional access to the North Dam’s waterfall by moving the powerhouse complex more than 35 m from its previous locations abutting the shoreline of the North Dam’s waterfall
- minimizing the visual impacts of the power station complex by burying most of the equipment and facilities below grade, and proposing an extensive landscape plan to restore the site and surrounding area in a manner sensitive to the area’s rugged landscape and municipal visions for this area

- reconfiguring the projected water use profile of the facility to better balance the aesthetic needs for flows over the Bala's North Dam and the protection of fish habitat and aesthetics at Bala's South Dam
- revising the project construction approach to reduce the disturbance to the local economy and the off-season traffic flows
- proposing a local advisory committee, comprising neighbours and community representatives, to work with SREL in finalizing a suitable landscape plan to guide restoration of the site, post construction.

### 3.5.1.1 *Meeting with Community Representatives (August 9, 2008)*

Before launching a community-wide notice of SREL's "new plan" for Bala Falls, SREL held a meeting with a small group of community representatives to solicit reactions to the new proposed plan. The meeting included a Township of Muskoka Lakes representative, four Moon River Property Owners Association representatives and a Bala resident. Two representatives from the Bala Bay – Lake Muskoka area and a Township of Muskoka Lakes staff person were also invited but were unable to attend. The meeting also included discussion and review of the material proposed for the second, upcoming PIC.

There was general support for the efforts SREL had taken to respond to community concerns about the design and layout previously proposed. Specifically, the plan to move the project more than 35 m from the base of the North Dam's waterfall, and, to reduce the profile of the powerhouse structure to minimize the visual impacts of the proposed facility, were positively received. Nevertheless, the rationale for developing such a scenic site was questioned. Other questions and concerns raised pertained to

- the location of the safety booms (Figure 1.2)
- the added risks the new intake location might pose to those jumping off the CPR bridge (Section 6.3.2)
- the implications the new design had for the continued operations of Purk's Boat House and Marina (Section 5.3.8)
- the extent of excavation that would be required to build the facility's intake and powerhouse. (Section 5.1.2).

### 3.5.2 **Community-Wide Fact Sheet**

SREL prepared a fact sheet explaining the new, revised project design and distributed it (August 5, 2008), by special door-to-door delivery services, to approximately 900 residence in the area immediately surrounding Bala's falls. This fact sheet highlighted the measures SREL was proposing to address the community's concerns about the preliminary design presented at PIC 1. Under the new plan

- the powerhouse would be moved more than 35 m away from the edge of the north dam's waterfall in order to preserve the traditional use and access to the waterfall
- a significant portion of the station structures would be buried below grade to minimize impacts to the site and surrounding area's visual aesthetics

- the proposed construction schedule was reorganized to minimize/avoid traffic disturbances during the summer tourist season
- extensive landscaping would be undertaken to preserve the site's traditional character and scenic beauty.

A map illustrating the area where the fact sheet was distributed and a copy of the fact sheet are included as Appendix D13.

### **3.5.3 Public Information Centre 2 (August 13, 2008)**

#### **3.5.3.1 Notice**

Stakeholders and the public were notified of the August 13, 2008 Public Information Centre (PIC 2) by the following means.

##### **Advertisement**

- the Gravenhurst Banner August 6 & 13, 2008 (circulation: 7,000)
- the Bracebridge Examiner August 6 & 13, 2008 (circulation: 7,000)
- Muskoka Today August 22, 2008 (circulation: 12,500)
- Muskoka Sun August 22, 2008 (circulation 15,000)
- The Muskokan August 22, 2008 (circulation 24,000).

Letters including a copy of the newspaper advertisement were mailed on or about August 14, 2008 to

- adjacent and nearby property owners and occupants
- Wahta Mohawk and Moose Deer Point First Nations
- municipal, provincial and federal agencies (see Table 3.1).

Appendix D14 contains copies of the newspaper notices as well as the letters of notification.

#### **3.5.3.2 Structure and Organization**

The PIC was held at the Bala Community Centre, Maple Street, Bala, Ontario between 4:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. The PIC was organized with display boards and representatives from SREL and its project development team were available to answer questions. Attendees were invited to peruse the materials, and they were encouraged to complete an exit questionnaire before leaving. The display included

- information on SREL and its project partner
- background on the Environmental Screening process including a preliminary timetable for public/regulatory review and approvals

- a description of the project (including graphics that showed the predicted water level changes in relation to the MRWMP)
- Contact information for SREL and its environmental consultant, including means for staying informed of Project developments.

A copy of the display panels, comment sheet and a tabulation of comment sheet responses are included in Appendix D15.

### 3.5.3.3 Findings

A total of 159 people signed in at the PIC. Of these, 77 completed and submitted comment sheets.

Table 3.3 summarizes the issues raised by people who attended PIC 2.

**Table 3.3 Issues Raised by the Public and Proposed Resolution, 2008 PIC**

Issue	No. of Respondents Raising the Issue	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
Water Level Fluctuation/Flows	4	6.2.2
Flooding	1	6.2.2
Fish and Fish Habitat (Including the newly constructed Pickerel spawning bed)	2	5.2.8 and 6.2.5
Tourism/Economic Impacts	3	5.3.7 and 6.3.6. 5.3.9 and 6.3.7
Aesthetics/Preference for Natural Rehabilitation Following Construction	13	5.3.6 and 6.3.5; Figure 6.6
Public Consultation Process/Methods	7	Section 3
Change/Loss of Recreational Use	4	5.3.7.2 and 6.3.6
Traffic Disruption within the Community During Construction	3	5.3.4; Figure 5.1
Safety/ Concern for those Jumping from CPR Bridge	3	5.3.2; 5.3.3; 6.3.2
Impacts to Purk's Place	3	5.3.8 and 6.3.1
View of the Powerhouse from the Water	3	6.3.5.3
Revenue Sharing with/ Compensation for the Community of Bala	2	Figure 6.6
Noise Impacts	2	6.3.4; Appendix C1 – Acoustic Assessment Report.
Project is Not Viable/Cost Effective	1	1.4
Impact to Cranberry Festival	1	5.3.7 and 6.3.6
First Nation Consultation	1	3.7
Wheelchair Accessibility	1	6.3.1
Information on the Transmission Line	1	1.2.3
Availability of the Environmental Screening Report for Public Review	1	3.1.2
Snowmobile Traffic	1	5.3.7.2

Issue	No. of Respondents Raising the Issue	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
Intake/Tailrace Boom Information	1	6.3.1
Negative Effects to Heritage Buildings (Purk's Place and Burgess Memorial Church)	1	5.3.12

While some people remained fundamentally opposed to any power development at Bala's North Dam, there was appreciation for SREL's effort to respond to previously expressed concerns by proposing to move the site away from the north dam's waterfall and substantially burying the facility. Nevertheless, there was concern regarding the artist's rendering that depicted a substantial "sunset deck" overtop of the powerhouse which was out of step with the community's desire to preserve the site's "undeveloped" character. (See revised artist's rendering in Appendix D15.)

#### 3.5.4 **Additional Project Information (October 2008)**

In an effort to correct misconceptions about the proposed development, SREL distributed a fact sheet containing a list of questions and answers. This two-sided 8 x 14" factsheet was distributed, by special door-to-door delivery services, on October 11, 2008, to approximately 900 residents in the surrounding of Bala's falls.

SREL also had the Q&A fact sheet published in the local area newspapers (see Table 3.4) in order to reach Bala's wider community.

**Table 3.4 Newspaper Q&A Fact Sheet**

Newspaper	Date of Insertion	Circulation (approximate)
Muskoka Weekender	Friday, Oct.10, 2008	26,000
Bracebridge Examiner	Wednesday, Oct.15, 2008	7,000
Gravenhurst Banner	Wednesday, Oct. 15, 2008	7,000
Muskoka Sun	Thursday, Oct 16, 2008	15,000
Muskoka Today	Thursday, Oct. 16, 2008	12,500

For a copy of the Question & Answer Fact Sheet, see Appendix D16.

#### 3.5.5 **Follow-Up Meetings/Discussions with Neighbours & Community Groups (July 2008 to February 2009)**

In an effort similar to that undertaken in follow-up to PIC 1, SREL also engaged neighbours and other stakeholders to explain the details of its revised plan for the proposed North Bala development, to solicit comments and reactions to it, and, to assess whether and to what extent the design and features of the "new" facility could practicably be altered to address any remaining concerns.

The following describes the nature and scope of discussions with the project's neighbours and community groups.

### 3.5.5.1 Neighbours

#### ***Purk's Place Boat House and Marina (PPBH&M)***

After an initial meeting in Phase One on May 7, 2008 SREL held another meeting with PPBH&M on August 13, 2008 prior to the PIC 2, concerning the potential short- and long-term impacts SREL's proposed facility would have on the continued operation of this business. SREL also discussed with PPBH&M possible compensation for the construction period and options for relocating the dock.

It was clear to SREL that given the proposed location of the power station's intake, the requirement for a construction laydown area, and the likely placement of a safety boom upstream of the proposed facility that sustaining this business would require the relocation of PPBH&M's boat docks. Possible relocation of the docks to Crown land at Diver's Point was discussed. However, a review by MNR of the safety and liability issues associated with the placement of a dock at this point led to the dismissal of this relocation option.

See Appendix D17 for a summary of consultation with the owner of PPBH&M during Phase Two Consultations).

The owner of PPBH&M and SREL will need to negotiate mutually acceptable mitigation and/or compensation for any negative effects to this business as a result of the Project.

#### ***The Stone Church (formerly Burgess Memorial Church) Owner/Occupant***

A number of meetings and phone conversations were held with the owners of the Stone Church (see Appendix D18).

While the owners understood the reasons for moving the project's proposed location away from the North Dam's waterfall, they were concerned about the loss of available parking to support a business they were planning at the Stone Church. Also, the owners were concerned about the broad effects of the planned flow reductions at Bala's South Dam on the fish habitat in this dam's tailrace and on the general character and ambience they currently enjoyed from their property abutting the South Dam's outfall. Also, now that the project site is closer to their property (a designated heritage site), they are concerned about the potential impacts of construction activities, i.e., noise and vibration, on the integrity of their century-old building (see Section 5.3.12.1).

In follow-up to the questions and concerns raised by The Stone Church owners, SREL committed to determining what measures were, or could be adopted to mitigate effects to this century-old building by construction activities, and, that the character of the South Dam's waterfall, including its associated fish habitat, would be protected, to the extent possible. A commitment was made to do a condition survey of The Stone Church, before any construction activities commenced and to provide designated parking for its customers. This was detailed in a memorandum to the church's owners on September 17, 2008.

#### ***Algonquin Power***

Algonquin Power has received all letters and notices apprising the company of project developments. In accordance with its water rights, Algonquin Power is satisfied that SREL's proposed operating regime for its Bala Falls project will not compromise Algonquin Power's Burgess Falls operations.

***Ontario Power Generation Inc. (OPG)***

OPG are power station operators downstream of the proposed development site. Under the MRWMP, existing operators must be in agreement with the operations of new proposed plants. From the project's conception, SREL recognized the importance of coordinating its proposed facility's operations with the water rights and requirements of OPG's Ragged Rapids and Big Eddy hydroelectric facilities located downstream. To this end, extensive discussions were held with OPG to discuss the implications of the proposed facility on water levels and flows from the plant and along the Bala Reach. As the plant will be operated as a run-of-river plant within the flow requirements of the MRWMP, no adverse impact is anticipated to OPG's operations.

Please see Section 9 for plant operational details and its relation to the MRWMP. See Appendix D12 for a summary of consultation with stakeholders during Phase Two Consultations.

***Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI)***

HONI has received all letters and notices apprising the company of project developments. Through the requirement to obtain a Connection Impact Agreement, SREL has confirmed that HONI's nearby distribution system is capable of receiving the proposed facility's electricity production. HONI's final approval for the interconnection will be required before the facility can go into service.

***Canadian Pacific Rail***

After initial phone conversations with CP Rail, SREL met with CP Rail real estate and structural representatives on August 4, 2009. It was noted that SREL was discussing mitigation and compensation for the loss of navigational rights directly with CP Rail's tenant Purk's Place. Concerns expressed with respect to increased scour around the rail bridge abutments and pier from the increased flow through the north channel during the operations phase of the Project. It was agreed that CP Rail would conduct an underwater survey of the structure to determine if upgrades would be necessary. SREL indicated that it would like to be present during the survey. In addition, CP Rail expressed concern that there would be reduced access to its structure with the relocation of the boom. Future maintenance, however, should be able to be coordinated with the Project operators to try and schedule during low flow periods. Safety procedures required for future maintenance should not be significantly different than those utilized currently with the existing boom location. Finally, CP Rail requested that the Contractor incorporate standard specifications for blasting work near rail structures. SREL agreed to enforce this request.

### 3.5.5.2 Community Groups

***Moon River Property Owners Association (MRPOA)***

Discussions with and presentations to the MRPOA have proven extremely useful in helping SREL understand its members' concerns. Numerous meetings and discussions were held with its members and its executive (Appendix D12 provides a record of consultation with stakeholders during Phase Two Consultations).

In various meetings and discussions with the MRPOA and its representatives, concerns were expressed about

- the project's potential short- and long-term impacts, i.e., traffic and economic disruption to the local economy during construction (Sections 5 and 6)

- the project's potential impacts on the traditional character, access and public safety of the area surrounding the North Dam's waterfall (Sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.6, 6.3.1, 6.3.2 and 6.3.5)
- the timing and extent of the required road closures during construction (Section 5.3.4)
- construction and road closure impacts on the snowmobile trail that follows the Bala Falls Road to Muskoka Road 169 (Section 5.3.7.2)
- whether the operating regime of the proposed power stations would improve or exacerbate the water level fluctuations and flooding being experienced by downstream cottagers (Section 6.3.6.2).

***Muskoka Lakes Association (MLA)***

The MLA has been part of SREL's communications outreach program from the outset of this project's development. The MLA has been provided with notices of public meetings and project development updates throughout the course of this project's public consultations and community outreach program.

Through meetings with MLA's executive on January 12, 2009 and June 12, 2009, SREL answered a broad range of questions assembled from its members. Minutes from these meetings were posted on MLA's website for the public.

***Bala Falls Community Association (BFCA)/Save the Bala Falls (SBF)***

These two community-based groups have expressed concern with development at Bala's North Dam. Topics and concerns raised (on associated websites and in public pronouncements) include

- concern about the visual impacts associated with
  - ◆ the view looking upstream from Bala Reach (Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5)
  - ◆ the placement of safety booms upstream and downstream of facility (Figure 1.2)
  - ◆ the unsightliness of security fences and safety signage. (Section 5.3.6)
- willingness to consider power development around Bala's South dam, however propose that all profits go to the local community (Section 3.5.6.1)
- disruption to traffic, tourism, recreation and the environment. (Sections 5.3.4, 5.3.7 5.2 and 6.2).

A meeting with representatives from these groups, and a concerned neighbour was held on May 27, 2009 to discuss their idea of moving the project to the South Dam, as well as other safety and aesthetic concerns.

***Muskoka Lakes Chamber of Commerce (MLCC)***

SREL recognizes the seasonal nature of Bala's economy and engaged the MLCC early in the consultation process.

SREL met with the MLCC's executive (October 6, 2008) in order to explain the project and to address their questions and concerns. The MLCC's primary concerns were with the potential short- and long-term impacts the proposed facility might have on Bala's heavily tourism-dependent economy.

Specifically, the MLCC raised questions about the construction period, the associated road closures and dust that might be associated with this work, and, the impacts this work would have on Bala's tourism-dependent local economy (see Sections 5.2.3, 5.3.4 and 5.3.9).

### **3.5.6 Agency Consultation**

#### **3.5.6.1 Meetings/Discussions with Municipal Authorities**

##### ***Township of Muskoka Lakes/District of Muskoka***

From the project's inception, SREL has sought out and responded to numerous requests to meet with municipal officials (staff and elected). (See Appendix D19 for a summary of correspondence with the Township during Phase Two Consultations.)

While both the Township and the District expressed significant concerns with the design and layout proposed by SREL in the Phase One Consultations, both levels of government support in principle the "new plan" that relocated the facility more than 35 m from the edge of the North Dam's waterfall.

The following section provides a brief summary of the key consultation with the Township and District during 2008.

##### ***Corporation of the Township of Muskoka Lakes:***

In spring 2008 *in-camera* meetings were held with Mayor Susan Pryke and council members. Layout Alternative 1 was discussed and input from the municipality was incorporated into Layout Alternative 2 (see Section 1.5 for Layout Alternative details).

On July 8, 2008 The Township of Muskoka Lakes carried a resolution (C-29-08/07/08) stating "in principle" that the District Municipality of Muskoka consider the use of District owned lands. On October 21, 2008 the Township of Muskoka Lakes carried an additional resolution (Resolution Number: C-14-21/10/08) that the consideration of the heritage value of the Bala Falls and effect to Bala's economy, in particular snowmobile travel be included in the environmental assessment process (see Sections 2.2.6.2, 5.3.9, 5.3.7.2 and 6.3.7). Details regarding these resolutions are provided in Section 2.2.3 and copies have been included in Appendix C5.

A subsequent resolution passed by the Township requested a heritage study be completed by SREL as part of the environmental screening process. (A copy of the Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment of the Bala Falls is included as Appendix C8.)

##### ***District of Muskoka***

The District Municipality of Muskoka carried a motion to agree "in principle" with the proposal by SREL to construct the project on property owned by the District on August 13, 2008. This agreement is subject to the following two conditions; "successful completion of the Environmental Screening process; and a satisfactory agreement with the District Municipality of Muskoka regarding the use of District owned lands".

SREL presented an outline of the project and answered questions from councillors during an open District Council Meeting on October 14, 2008.

A second motion was carried by Council on October 14, 2008. It stated that after having had the opportunity to visit the site and receive a presentation from SREL, the District of Muskoka would consider the use of District lands as an alternative to the previously selected Crown land site.

Details regarding these motions are provided in Section 2.2.3 and a copy of each motion is included in Appendix C6.

Prior to the 2008 PIC, SREL sent an invitation to the Muskoka District Solicitor along with details regarding the intended use of District lands, and the extent of public notification activities to be undertaken (letter dated: July 21, 2008).

SREL conducted site tours for District Council members on October 14, 2008 to review the proposed project plans *in situ*. Numerous questions and queries seeking clarification of the proposed project's design and operating characteristics were addressed.

SREL made a presentation to the District Municipality of Muskoka on October 14, 2008. The following topics were discussed at that time:

- Project Overview
- Renewable Energy Benefits
- Two Siting Options
- Project Timing
- Avoiding/Mitigating Impacts.

A copy of the material presented during this meeting is included as Appendix D20.

#### ***Development at South Bala Dam instead of North Bala Dam***

The question as to why SREL had not proposed a hydro development at the South Bala Dam instead of at the North Bala Dam was initially raised by some members of the public and subsequently by some members of the DMM council.

The following section outlines the various factors considered in relation to development in the south channel and shows why this was not pursued further by SREL.

#### ***Applicant of Record (AR) Award***

Firstly, the MNR in its competitive site release process invited bids to take advantage of opportunities for the development of hydroelectric generation at the North Bala Dam (MNR – Dam-RFP-01-05). In response, SREL submitted its proposal to develop the named available site, the North Bala Dam. In a letter dated August 5, 2005, the MNR, Parry Sound office notified SREL that it had been named Applicant of Record for the North Bala Dam site. On August 31, 2005, MNR published a public notice on the internet using its extranet [https://extranet.mnr.gov.on.ca/waterpower/rfp\\_dams.html](https://extranet.mnr.gov.on.ca/waterpower/rfp_dams.html). This notice clearly indicated that the AR had been identified for the retrofitting of the North Bala Dam for hydroelectric generation. A copy of this notice is in Appendix A1. These various documents verify that the North Dam was the one offered for development. It is based on this fact that SREL proposed the development at the North Bala Dam.

Despite the fact that the South Dam was not made available for development, SREL responded to public queries by undertaking a high-level examination of the suggested development at the South Bala Dam.

It was found that a hydroelectric project at the South Dam would need to be constructed in one of three ways:

- **Design A**

The first design option would be to integrate the intake and powerhouse into the north end of the existing south dam. Such a design could be accommodated on Crown land in the area. However, this design was found to be not feasible due to the following three major issues:

1. This option would require the intake/powerhouse to be integrated into as many as three of the existing dam sluices. During construction, these sluices would not be available for water passage. Therefore, the dam's flood protection capability would be considerably reduced, increasing the potential for upstream flooding. Bala Bay properties would be at risk with the additional danger of all three Bala dams being overtopped in the event of extreme flood conditions. A diversion channel would be required to be placed somewhere on the island in order to reduce the risk. There is no immediately suitable location at present for such a diversion channel. SREL considers such a flooding/overtopping risk during construction as being unacceptably high.
2. If flow during construction were to be very low, allowing the completion of the plant, the long-term operation would pose water passage problems. While operating, the plant would replace the three removed sluices as a passage for flood waters. However, there may be occurrences requiring the shutdown of the plant including closure of the intake. During such a plant shutdown, the flood capacity of the Bala dams would again be reduced significantly, increasing the risk of flooding of Bala Bay (as well as the rest of Lake Muskoka) in an extreme weather event. In order to counter this risk, the remaining sluices in the North and/or South Dam would have to be expanded by in-stream blasting in order to improve the flow capacity. The cost of doing this would be prohibitive to a project of this size. The time required to undertake this expansion work also extend the construction period.
3. The existing South Bala dam is almost 100 years old. It is anticipated that extensive structural upgrades would be required for the South Bala dam to be able to accommodate any project involving integration. It is possible that the entire dam would likely require replacement. The cost of such an undertaking would be prohibitive to a project of the size proposed, rendering it non-viable. The construction period would also be lengthened considerably

- **Design B**

The second design option could be considered as an alternative to attempting structural changes to the existing old dam and/or reducing its existing flood capacity. This design would involve the construction of an intake in the vicinity of Diver's Point upstream of the South Dam along with a conveyance structure such as a tunnel or penstock to carry plant flows to a powerhouse. The powerhouse could, theoretically, be constructed anywhere downstream of the South Dam. Discharged flows would be released either into the south channel or directly into the

downstream Moon River. The available Crown land upstream of the South Bala dam would be able to accommodate the intake for this design.

The main issues with this option are as follows.

1. The water upstream of the South Dam is shallow and considerable rock excavation extending some distance upstream would be required in order to minimize head losses.
  2. The presence of an intake at Diver's Point would require a much larger boom than is currently situated at the South Dam as approach the intake itself would need protected by the boom. No further recreational use of this area would be possible with this option.
  3. The powerhouse would need to be constructed downstream of the dam. The Crown land upstream of the bridge is not large enough to accommodate a powerhouse. Extensive upgrades to the existing dam abutments and extensive in-stream blasting to allow the construction of a powerhouse and the utilization of the full hydraulic head of the site would be required. The land downstream of the bridge is privately owned on highway land. Therefore, the powerhouse would still need to be constructed east of the highway. The most likely site would be just south of the proposed North Bala location. The same aesthetic issues regarding the view of the powerhouse from Moon River would be present with this option. However, since there is not a natural valley at the south end of the island, it would be much more difficult to bury. The amount of rock would also increase the amount of blasting that would be required.
  4. The conveyance structure (pipe or tunnel) would need to go under a live rail line and two roads (Bala Falls Road and Highway 169). Therefore, in addition to the same road closure issues associated with the North Bala option, there would be the potential impact on a live railway line.
  5. This option would still require visible structures to both Bala Bay and the Moon River as well as excessively more disruption to roads and railways. The costs associated with this option would be significantly higher and the aesthetic issues would be comparable to the proposed North Bala option. In fact, the potential impacts to two roads plus a rail line as opposed to just the one road for the North Bala project actually renders this option more problematic in addition to being more expensive.
- **Design C**

The third option (raised by a member of the public) proposed the use of kinetic, or river, turbines. These small turbines require minimal infrastructure and very little head to operate, depending on just the flow at the point of placement for generation. By virtue of their design, these turbines cannot utilize head and are therefore severely limited in the generation capacity. However, since power generated from a turbine is a function of both flow and head, by significantly reducing the head by putting it downstream of the dam, the power produced would be significantly reduced. It is estimated that these river turbines would produce 100 kW to 400 kW as opposed to the current project size of 4 MW, representing a reduction of at least 90%. This is significantly different from the 4000- to 5000-kW plant proposal through which led to SREL's selection as Applicant of Record.

### 3.5.6.2 *Meetings/Discussions with Provincial Agencies*

Dialogue was maintained with various provincial ministries during the course of the environmental screening. These included the Ministry of the Environment (MOE), Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR). The majority of discussions ensued between SREL and the MNR, as the MNR has responsibility for site release and Crown land disposition in addition to being the owner of the two Bala dams. The following section summarizes the concerns raised by MNR through the Phase Two Consultations. Please see Appendix D21 for a summary of correspondence with provincial agencies during this phase.

#### ***Ministry of Natural Resources***

In a meeting with MNR and OPG on September 16, 2008, SREL was provided information regarding the current management of the river system requiring the coordination of MNR and OPG. Main issues discussed at this meeting and through subsequent dialogue with MNR included

- requirement for SREL to ensure that the MRWMP high flow trigger for the Bala Reach was not exceeded by plant operation
- requirement to ensure that Go Home Lake levels were not changed from the historical existing expected conditions
- requirement that additional operation of the Go Home dam by MNR did not result from the operations of the proposed project
- requirement that the plant operate so as to maintain Lake Muskoka levels within a Best Management band within the normal operating zone (NOZ) described in the MRWMP.

The MRWMP is addressed in Section 9.

### 3.5.6.3 *Meetings/Discussions with Federal Agencies*

Dialogue was maintained with appropriate federal agencies throughout the environmental screening process. The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) coordinated the federal agencies' involvement in the process. Transport Canada and Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) were identified as the lead federal agencies. The following summarizes the concerns raised by these agencies through the Phase Two Consultations. Please see Appendix D22 for a summary of correspondence with federal agencies during this phase.

#### ***Transport Canada***

Transport Canada participated in a number of conference calls and following review of project information provided, noted their concerns and/or requested consideration of the following items during the course of the environmental assessment:

- navigational safety issues within the areas upstream of the proposed plant intake (Sections 5.3.1 and 6.3.1)
- existing issues with Purk's Place facility that would limit safe water access (Section 5.3.8)
- rescue procedures or considerations for persons or vessels caught in the intake (Section 5.3.2)

- discussion within the ESR regarding the placement of upstream and downstream safety booms (Section 6.3.2)
- potential impact on use of island as a portage route past the Bala dams (Section 6.3.6.1)
- application of the Navigational Water Protection Act (NWP) to the project (Section 11).

**Department of Fisheries and Oceans**

DFO expressed concern about existing habitat downstream of both dams and the potential impacts that may occur due to project activities, particularly during operation. Of particular concern was the potential loss of walleye spawning habitat (including some enhanced areas) on the north side downstream of the North Bala falls through reduced flow resulting from diversion.

Following extensive dialogue with DFO and conducting of field studies, operational procedures aimed at ensuring the provision of suitable spawning conditions within the identified areas were agreed upon by DFO and SREL. These procedures are detailed in Section 6.2.5.

**3.5.7 First Nations**

First Nations contacted during the environmental screening of the project were the Wahta Mohawk and Moose Deer Point First Nations. These First Nations were contacted to advise them of the project and to give them the opportunity to participate in the environmental screening process.

In follow-up to initial correspondence, SREL talked with Blaine Edward, Chief of the Wahta Mohawk’s. Although he expressed some concern regarding potential impacts of the project on the Moon River’s water levels and potential impacts on fish, he did not feel a meeting to discuss these matters further, was needed.

Further to initial correspondence sent to Moose Deer Point First Nation during the environmental screening process, HE contacted the First Nation on October 15, 2008. A representative of the Moose Deer Point First Nation Band Office confirmed that Chief Barron King had received the letter of August 7, 2008 and stated that Moose Deer Point “had no issues regarding the project”.

Appendix D23 provides a summary of the First Nations and related contacts. Copies of written correspondence and records of telephone conversations are also provided in Appendix D23.

**3.6 Summary of Consultation Findings (Issues) and Relevant Report Sections**

Table 3.5 represents a consolidation of stakeholder concerns (i.e., the public, interest groups (named), nearby/adjacent landowner/occupants, municipal, provincial, and federal agencies, and First Nations) by category, along with references to those sections of the ESR where those concerns are addressed.

**Table 3.5 Summary of Consultation Findings (Issues) and Relevant Report Sections**

Issue	Raised By	Relevant Report Section
Construction Zone/ Project Location and Tenure	Ministry of Environment Transport Canada Public/Stakeholders Communities in Bloom	Figures 1.1; 1.2; 2.11 and 5.4

Issue	Raised By	Relevant Report Section
Public Consultation Process	Public/Stakeholders	3
Hydroelectric Development at the South Dam	Public/Stakeholders District Municipality of Muskoka	3.5.6.1.3
Identification of/ Consultation with Potentially Interested First Nation Communities	Indian and Northern Affairs Canada Ministry of Environment Public/Stakeholders	3.5.7
Blasting, Rock Excavation and Disposal	Ministry of Environment Owners – The Stone Church Public/Stakeholders	5.1.4
Construction Schedule	Public/Stakeholders	5.1
Effects to Sewage and Water Services	Ministry of Environment Public/Stakeholders	5.1.9 and 5.1.10
Effects to Air Quality	Ministry of Environment	5.2.3 and 6.2.1
Impacts to Water Quality	District Municipality of Muskoka Ministry of the Environment	5.2.6 and 6.2.4
Protection of/Impacts to Fish and Fish Habitat	District Municipality of Muskoka Fisheries and Oceans Canada Ministry of Natural Resources Public/Stakeholders Purk's Place Owners – The Stone Church	5.2.7; 5.2.8 and 6.2.5
Emerald Ash Borer	Ministry of Environment	5.2.9
Effects to Vegetation	Ministry of Natural Resources Public/Stakeholders	5.2.9 and 6.2.6
Effects to Species at Risk	Ministry of Natural Resources	5.2.11 and 6.2.7
Change in Public Access	Public/Stakeholders Purk's Place The Stone Church Muskoka Lakes Ratepayers Association	5.3.1 and 6.3.1
Risk to Public Safety	Public/Stakeholders Ministry of Natural Resources	5.3.2 and 6.3.2
Effects to Local Traffic	District Municipality of Muskoka Public/Stakeholders Ministry of Natural Resources	5.3.4 and 6.3.3
Emergency Response During Construction	Public/Stakeholders	5.3.4.1
Effects Related to Noise Emissions	Ministry of Environment Public/Stakeholders	5.3.5 and 6.3.4

Issue	Raised By	Relevant Report Section
Change in Aesthetics	Township of Muskoka Lakes Public/Stakeholders Owners – The Stone Church Ministry of Natural Resources Public/Stakeholders Muskoka Lakes Association	5.3.6 and 6.3.5
Effects to Tourism	Purk's Place Owner - The Stone Church Ministry of Natural Resources Public/Stakeholders Muskoka Lakes Ratepayers Association	5.3.7 and 6.3.6
Change to/Loss of Recreational and Navigational Use	Public/Stakeholders Purk's Place Ministry of Natural Resources Transport Canada Muskoka Lakes Snow Trails Association	5.3.7 and 6.3.6
Effects to the Town Docks	Public/Stakeholders	5.3.7.2 and 6.3.6.1
Effects to Purk's Place Boat House and Marina	Public/Stakeholders Purk's Place	5.3.8
Effects to The Stone Church	Owners – The Stone Church	5.3.8 and 5.3.12
Effects to the Local Economy	Public/Stakeholders	5.3.8; 5.3.9 and 6.3.7
Employment during Construction	Public/Stakeholders	5.3.9
Effects to Mill Stream	Public/Stakeholders	5.3.10
Waste Disposal	Ministry of Environment	5.3.11
Effects to Heritage Buildings (Purk's Place and the Stone Church)	Public/Stakeholders	5.3.12
Impacts to Wahta First Nation Reserve	Ministry of Natural Resources Ministry of the Environment	5.3.13 and 6.3.9
Changes in Water Levels/Flows and Flooding	Township of Muskoka Lakes District Municipality of Muskoka Public/Stakeholders Ministry of Natural Resources Fisheries and Oceans Canada Muskoka Lakes Ratepayers Association Muskoka Lakes Association	6.2.2
Changes to the Operation of the South Dam	Public/Stakeholders	6.2.2
Accidental Spills	Ministry of Environment	6.2.4.3
Effects to the Existing Portage Trail	Purk's Place Transport Canada	6.3.6.1
Effects to Property Values/Shoreline Residents	Public/Stakeholders Ministry of Natural Resources	6.3.6.3

Issue	Raised By	Relevant Report Section
Decommissioning	Ministry of Environment	6.6
Proposed Operating Regime	Fisheries and Oceans Canada Ontario Power Generation Ministry of Natural Resources Public/Stakeholders	9
Requirement for a Certificate of Approval (Air)	Ministry of Environment	11
Approval under the NWPAA	Transport Canada	11
Effects to CP Rail Bridge Abutments and Pier	CP Rail	3.5.5.1 and 6.3.8.3

### 3.7 Notice of Completion

A "Notice of Completion" of the environmental screening process will be published to inform the general public that the screening report has been prepared and is available for public and agency review. The notice will state the length of the review period and describe the process by which written comments may be submitted for the proponent's consideration. The process by which elevation requests may be conducted will also be described.