

**D12 Summary of Consultation
with Public and Stakeholders
During Phase II**

Table D6
Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups – Phase 2 Consultation Period

Date	Industry/ Stakeholder Group	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
July 4, 2008	Ayesha Sabouba, Manager, Generation Connections, HONI	Written Correspondence	Provided 2 months notice of expiry of the Project's queue position and advised completion of the Connection Cost Recovery Agreement Application Form	N/A	N/A	N/A
August 31, 2008	Moon River Property Owner's Association (MRPOA)	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested that SREL make a presentation regarding project to members 	SREL agreed to make presentation at September 13, 2008 meeting	August 31, 2008	N/A
September 13, 2008	MRPOA	Meeting with members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SREL presented summary of Project and answered questions Why was Bala chosen? Snowmobile route would be restricted during construction Effects to businesses during construction 	SREL agreed to look into ways to satisfy snowmobile passage requirement. Business disruption would be minimal during construction and would bring additional business for workers during off season.	September 13, 2008	Section 1.1 Project Background; Tourism and Recreation: Section 5.3.7; and Local Businesses: 5.3.8
September 15 and 16, 2008	Muskoka Chamber of Commerce	Phone call from SREL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tried to clear up some misconceptions regarding blasting, construction impacts to highway 169, flows over the falls and impacts to Purk's Place 	Muskoka Chamber of Commerce agreed to arrange a meeting for SREL to present to the Chamber of Commerce board	September 15 & 16, 2008	Blasting: Section 5.1.4; Traffic: 5.3.4; Aesthetics: 6.3.5; and Local Businesses: 5.3.8
September 16, 2008	OPG	Meeting	HE presented the Project on behalf of SREL and	OPG requested clarification that the impact of the Project on	September 26, 2008	Water Management Plan

Table D6
Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups – Phase 2 Consultation Period

Date	Industry/ Stakeholder Group	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
			<p>discussed the integration of the Project into the Muskoka River Water Management Plan. SREL acknowledged that the final proposed operating plan should be submitted for review and comment by both MNR and OPG. SREL also stated its intention to submit an amendment to the existing WMP to include the North Bala GS, and to identify any high or low flow indicators or triggers.</p>	OPG facilities will be minimal.		– Section 9
September 16, 2008	OPG	Meeting	<p>HE presented the Project on behalf of SREL and discussed the integration of the Project into the Muskoka River Water Management Plan. SREL acknowledged that the final proposed operating plan should be submitted for review and comment by both MNR and OPG. SREL also stated its</p>	N/A	N/A	Water Management Plan – Section 9

Table D6
Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups – Phase 2 Consultation Period

Date	Industry/ Stakeholder Group	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
			intention to submit an amendment to the existing WMP to include the North Bala GS, and to identify any high or low flow indicators or triggers.			
September 25, 2008	MRPOA	Email	MRPOA sent SREL a copy of communications to members, including a summary of SREL's presentation on Sep 13 th	N/A	N/A	N/A
September 26, 2008	OPG	Email	OPG requested clarification that the impact of the Project on OPG facilities will be minimal.	ESR Section 9 – Water Management Plan will provide appropriate clarification	N/A	Water Management Plan – Section 9
October 5, 2008	Muskoka Lakes Snow Trail Association	Letter	Strong concern regarding travel by snowmobilers during the closure of Bala Falls Road which is part of Trail C102D.	SREL responded that they have been discussing possible solutions regarding the snowmobile trail with the municipality, and may participate with the construction of a permanent or floating bridge along the Lake Muskoka side of the rail bridge. If not, SREL is prepared to provide the MLSTA with a trail to accommodate travel along the existing route. SREL committed to consulting with the MLSTA	October 17, 2008 by email	Recreation – Section 5.3.7.2

Table D6
Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups – Phase 2 Consultation Period

Date	Industry/ Stakeholder Group	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
October 20, 2008	Muskoka Lakes Snow Trails Association	Email in response to October 17, 2008 reply from SREL	<i>Thank you...Our club can now proceed with the usual trail routing through town for this winter. In addition MLSTA asked to be added to the stakeholder mailing list and would like to discuss with SREL any decisions being made that will directly affect the group.</i>	regarding this corridor/path. <i>We will contact you next fall if not before to discuss the details of the routing for next winter.</i>	October 21, 2008	Recreation – Section 5.3.7.2
November 1, 2008	Muskoka Lakes Association (MLA)	Email from SREL	SREL responded to a MLA issued newsletter to its members re: project. Confirmed the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is privately funded, therefore, no cost to taxpayers • Project will be paid by OPA for power produced as per Standard Offer Project contract at 11.08 cents/kWh • Project will not reduce access to falls 	N/A	N/A	Section 5.3.1 – Effect on Local Use and Access; and 6.3.1. Local Access.
November 2, 2008	Muskoka Ratepayers Association	Email	Provided address of Environmental Chair	Stakeholder added to mailing list	November 2, 2008	N/A

Table D6
Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups – Phase 2 Consultation Period

Date	Industry/ Stakeholder Group	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
November 3, 2008	MLA	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Will there be a business economic assessment to determine fiscal prudence?</i> • <i>Who will be responsible for flooding properties if man-made error in operating</i> • <i>What is size of intake?</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A business economic assessment is not part of the ESR. • SREL's operator will be first contact. Contact MNR for info regarding responsibilities/liabilities. • Intake size not finalized until detail design, but will be designed to ensure fish aren't entrained 	November 3, 2008	N/A
November 25, 2008	Georgian Bay Association	Email	<i>Please note our new address and update your mail file.</i>	Stakeholder Mailing List was updated	November 25, 2008	N/A
December 4, 2008	MLA	Email from SREL	SREL respect the right of MLA to oppose the proposed project, however, SREL would like to clear up some of the misconceptions that MLA has circulated in its mailings in particular: -water levels will NOT be maintained up to 2' higher than average and thereby damage docks during freeze thaw, or cause increased shore erosion. In fact there is no planned change in lake levels.	N/A	N/A	Water Management Plan – Section 9

Table D6
Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups – Phase 2 Consultation Period

Date	Industry/ Stakeholder Group	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
December 15, 2008	OPG	Teleconference	Discussion of the operations plan including water flow and level control.	N/A	N/A	Water Management Plan – Section 9
December 15, 2008	OPG and MNR	Teleconference	Discussion of the operations plan including water flow and level control.	N/A	N/A	Water Management Plan – Section 9
January 9, 2009	Go Home Lake Cottage Owners Association (GHLCOA)	Email from SREL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SREL noted that website has different address than SREL used for mailing. • Offered to meet with executive. • Asked to confirm receipt of mailing 	GHLCOA will forward information to appropriate representative.	January 9, 2008	N/A
January 12, 2009	MLA	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquired as to the operating plan for the facility • Other concerns included scenic flow over the south dam, improvement to electrical service in Muskoka; requirement of a performance bond; release of the ESR; economic incentives from the government; effects to local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of meeting were done by MLA and posted on its website. • Plant will be operated as per the WMP. • Scenic flows have not yet been determined. • SREL will not have control of distribution, instead Hydro One. • SREL is not aware any performance bond requirements. 	January 12, 2009	Water Management Plan – Section 9; Aesthetics: 6.3.5

Table D6
Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups – Phase 2 Consultation Period

Date	Industry/ Stakeholder Group	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
			employment; current schedule; penalties for non-conformance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies of ESR will be on website and available locally for review. • There should be little effect on local employment and may be some improvement. • Current schedule is for start of construction November, 2009. • Refer to MNR for penalties. 		
January 12, 2009	MLA	Email from SREL	Expressed thanks for the meeting	Indicated that they now have a better understanding of the project and SREL's responsibilities.	January 13, 2009	N/A
April 13, 2009	MRPOA	Email	<p>They are drafting a report to the members and want help with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can a run-of-river plant also run in peaking mode? • Are there monetary incentives that encourage operators to run in peaking mode? • If so, do these apply to SREL's proposal? • Are there penalties to address running peaking mode as opposed to run of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plant will be designed to be run of river mode at the request of regulatory agencies. • A 35% premium would be paid during peak times. • Bala will not be peaking. • SREL would violate our operating plan and be subject to penalties on the company and operator if peaking were to occur. • Ideas are still being considered as to how to best "hide" the downstream face. 	April 14, 2009	N/A

Table D6
Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups – Phase 2 Consultation Period

Date	Industry/ Stakeholder Group	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
			river? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have there been revisions to the design/aesthetics of the outflow spillway to the Moon River? 			
April 22, 2009	CP Rail	Telephone call from SREL	Enquired as to whether CP Rail has issue with the project.	N/A	N/A	N/A
April 22, 2009	CP Rail	Email from SREL	Provided General Arrangement drawings of the project for information purposes.	N/A	N/A	N/A
May 14, 2009	CP Rail	Email from SREL	Requested meeting CPRail, MNR and Purks Place.	N/A	N/A	N/A
May 20 and 21, 2009	CP Rail	Email from SREL	Follow-up email to request a meeting. Provided a list of potential topics to be discussed including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline of proposed project including layout and timing 	CP Rail responded that they are not in a position to meet at this time. Will contact SREL to schedule meeting in future.	May 21, 2009	N/A

Table D6
Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups – Phase 2 Consultation Period

Date	Industry/ Stakeholder Group	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction impacts to CPRail property and tenant's business (Purk's Place) • Long-term operational impacts to CPRail property and tenant's business • Possible mitigation and/or compensation strategies for these impacts • Next steps. 			
June 1, 2009	MRPOA	Phone call from SREL	SREL requested permission to attend a members meeting in response to scheduled presentation by project opposition.	Permission received from MRPOA.	June 5, 2009	N/A
June 6, 2009	MRPOA	Members Meeting	Discussion topics included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety • Loss of recreation use • Performance Bonds • Appearance • Want SREL to look at south dam idea • Presented to members how to request that the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant changes have been made since the last members meeting presentation by SREL. • ESR will be available after it is reviewed by various agencies. • South dam idea would not be considered by SREL 	June 6, 2009	Safety: Sections 5.3.2 and 6.3.2.

Table D6
Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups – Phase 2 Consultation Period

Date	Industry/ Stakeholder Group	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
			project be “bumped up” in the approvals process.			
June 12, 2009	MLA	Meeting with executive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquired as to the consideration of the south dam as a potential project location by the “Save the Bala Falls” group. • The impact of the GEA on Project. • complete landscaping plan? • When to start construction? • New jobs? • New issues? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STBF feel south dam option is a safer and provides less impact to recreation. • GEA shouldn’t affect project, may reduce some zoning control. • A landscaping plan will be completed during detailed design. • Construction delayed to fall 2010 • 50 person years, 8-10 MM in local products and services • SREL and municipality are investigating a new permanent snowmobile bridge. 	n/a	Section 5.1: Construction Activities
June 17, 2009	MLA	Email from SREL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sent MLA paper by Muskoka Watershed Foundation on Power Generation 	N/A	N/A	N/A
June 23, 2009	CP Rail	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting set for August 5, 2009 	June 23, 2009	N/A
June 25, 2009	MRPOA	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the proposed environmental approvals process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Things are clearly laid out however, it appears that if SREL does not publish NOC 	June 25, 2009	N/A

Table D6
Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups – Phase 2 Consultation Period

Date	Industry/ Stakeholder Group	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report
			affect the SREL project?	before the new rules are enacted they will likely fall under the new rules.		
August 5, 2009	CP Rail	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited access for maintenance of abutments and pier with relocation of boom • Could cause additional costs for maintenance of structure • Increased scour of abutments and Pier as a result of additional flows through north channel • Blasting should be done to CP Rail standards, near structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently the bridge and dam are below booms and they continue to be maintained • An underwater inspection will be completed by CP Rail prior to construction to determine if upgrades are required. • SREL will have contractor use CPRail blasting specs. • SREL will prepare a package for CPRail showing drawings and anticipated flows through the north channel. 	August 5, 2009	N/A
September 17, 2009	MLA	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent of false information circulating within the community regarding the project; • Provided information on water level fluctuation and management; 	N/A	N/A	Section 9 Water Management Plan

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
July 24/08	Phone call	Requested to have SREL attend a small focus group prior to the second PIC to discuss the new plan and get an initial public reaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SREL agreed to me a small group for August 9/08. 	July 30/09	
July 31, 2008	Email	Will there be a weekend PIC?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no weekend PIC planned • Comments and queries can be forwarded via the project website, toll free phone line, or by emailing Trion Clarke of Hatch Energy. • All material displayed at the PIC will be available via the Project website. 	July 31, 2008	N/A
August 3, 2008	Telephone Call	Stated concern regarding the Lake Muskoka Water Levels	Information regarding the Muskoka River Water Management Plan and the commitments therein were discussed	August 3, 2008	Hydrology – Section 6.2.2.
Aug 5/08	Email	Requested that meeting for Aug 13 th be added to SREL website.	Note added on website.	Aug 5/08	

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
August 5, 2008	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested copies of submissions for approval by the Township of Muskoka Lakes and the District of Muskoka. Stated that SREL should be making a significant monetary investment of \$2 million for community improvements to the town of Bala "I see no proof in any of your literature that there is any ROI for this community" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No submissions have been made to the Township or Districts 	August 5, 2008	N/A
August 8, 2008	Email	Expressed dissatisfaction with the Open House brochure and artistic rendering.	Expressed thanks for the comment, and indicated that the website material included an updated artists rendering for review.	September 8, 2008	N/A
August 9, 2008	Email	Deep concern regarding the proposed hydroelectric dam, stated concerns regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aesthetics Environmental Impacts 	The project will not involve the construction of a new dam Subsequent email from sender indicating delight and relief that project will not touch falls nor build upon them, still concerned about impact on water and air.	August 10, 2008	Sections 5 and 6 – Effects Assessment of the Natural and Social Environment
August 11, 2008	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental impact to water and air Use of environmentally 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Sections 5 and 6 – Effects Assessment of the Natural and Social Environment

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		clean and safe technology			
August 12, 2008	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the methods used to inform people of the PIC? • Why was a weekday selected as it is difficult for seasonal residents to attend? • Please email a copy of the PIC material 	<p>Publication of Notices in local newspapers, and advised interested local associations, sent letters to all stakeholders as well as government and interested agencies</p> <p>Residents suggested that weekends were to be avoided, and asked for the PIC to be after working hours. Posters will be available on the website after August 13, 2008.</p>	August 12, 2008	Agency, Public and First Nation Consultation – Section 3.
August 12, 2008	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested in seeing a plan view showing location • Land tenure of project location 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Figure 1.2. Land Tenure – Section 2.2.4.2
August 25/08	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested SREL think long and hard about how important the falls and parks place and town docks are to their community (community?) • Expressed a profanity. 	No response	n/a	
Aug 25/08	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that they attended open house • Requested that the latest visual rendering of the proposed dam be sent. • Also requested insight as to what will happen to water flows over falls when the 	SREL is currently revising its artist's rendering of the proposed plant to help with the perceived scale issues.	Sep 4/08	

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		flow is at its minimum. What specific volume will be diverted and what percentage will that be of total			
August 27, 2008	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to locate the presentation material from the PIC on the website • Request that the information is emailed. • Artist rendition was not detailed enough 	Provided the location on the website where information requested is posted.	August 27, 2008	N/A
September 3, 2008	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested to be included on the stakeholder mailing list • Owns a cottage on Bala Bay and is very concerned about water levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email address was added to the stakeholder mailing list • Water levels are addressed in the ESR 	September 3, 2008	Hydrology – Section 6.2.2.
September 3, 2008	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect to the town dock for both swimming and boating 	The construction and operation of the project are not anticipated to affect velocity at the town docks; <i>except that the speed of the water will be increased slightly the closer you are to the railway bridge. We will have a boom in this location indicating that people should not be swimming or boating at or under the rail bridge.</i>	September 17, 2008	Hydrology – Section 6.2.2.Recreation – Section 5.3.7.2 and 6.3.6.
Sept 4/08	Email from SREL to author of opposition website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SREL find that many of the suppositions to be incorrect. • SREL are not in a position in 			

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		this stage of the project to complete detailed design until after the approvals are complete.			
Sep 5/08	1 hour phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussed the rendering presented at the open house 	n/a		
September 8, 2008	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed support for the project pending delivery on committed plans 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list.	September 8, 2008	N/A
September 8, 2008	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Described themselves as local business owners with store frontage on Bala Falls Road, not able to attend any previous meetings. Requested information regarding the impact of the project on Bala Falls Road. Specifically with respect to traffic flow, closing off the road, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conveyed the traffic management plan as presented at the 2008 PIC. 	September 9, 2008	Local Traffic – Section 5.3.4; Figure 5.1.
Sept 10/08	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informed SREL that the opposition had planned a public meeting for Sept 12th in Bala. Offered to speak against the group but would need some further information from SREL. Indicated regatta will not be 	Provided comments and clarifications to opposition, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction period 12-18 months Reiterated traffic control proposal during road work Min. flows etc. Regatta and diving impacts. 	Sep 12/08	N/A

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		anywhere near new intake			
September 12, 2008	Email	Commenter requested to be kept abreast of latest information	Stakeholder was added to the mailing list.	September 12, 2008	N/A
September 15, 2008	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquired as to whether SREL could provide photographs of similar projects • Artist renderings always camouflage and eliminate what they don't want you to see... 	<p>SREL thanked commenter for their inquiry and provided <i>"some examples of projects that show you can make the plants visually acceptable in areas of public gathering"</i>...and included photos of Fenelon Falls, ON; Chaudier Falls, QC; and St. Paulin QC. SREL conveyed that <i>"from conversations with property owners, it seems that it is a desire to have this plant "disappear". Therefore, that is what we are striving for. And if it means simply restoration of the area with native plantings or a more elaborate viewing area/park, we are willing to let the public decide."</i></p>	September 15, 2008	N/A
Sept 15/08	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicated that they had attended the oppositions meeting. • Opposition was saying that rocks would be flying for 17 months and traffic would be closed for weeks, and that kids won't be able to jump off the rail bridge in the future if the project goes 			

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		<p>through.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also discussed that presenters indicated that project would increase flows into lake thereby making boating hazardous and snowmobiler wouldn't be able to go through Bala anymore. 			
Sept 15/08	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested actual photos of previous projects similar to proposed showing the before and buried/park-like setting. Suggested that the plants over the site would die. 	<p>Don't have an example of a fully underground plant. Sent photos of Fenelon Falls, St. Paulin and Chaudiere Falls in Quebec to show possible ways to incorporate into the parks they are located in.</p>	Sep 15/08	N/A
September 16, 2008	Email	<p>Inquiry regarding the tailrace location. <i>Is the outflow indeed all under water or is there a huge steel door that goes up and down and is visible? Above the outlet is that the "lookout" and how high is it and will it be fenced?</i></p>	<p><i>When facing the plant from the Moon River you will see an approximately 15' high wall that will be approximately 25' wide ... This outer visible wall will be finished in some material that is acceptable to the public... The lookout will be in the order of 15' high. It will not be fenced....</i></p>	September 16, 2008	N/A
September 17, 2008	Additional correspondence re: September 16, 2008 Email above	<p><i>Is there a gate in the wall allowing the water to come out?</i></p>	<p><i>The outflow will occur under water....this new wall would essentially be a false wall....[for aesthetics purposes]</i></p>	September 17, 2008	N/A

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
September 18, 2008	Phone Conversation	Inquired about <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the potential for locating the project within the south channel the material presented on the website to the MRPOA 	Provided explanation regarding the MNR site release program, and offered for the stakeholder to participate with SREL's advisory committee	September 18, 2008	N/A
September 19, 2008	Phone Conversation	Looking for information on the size/dimensions of land that SREL will be looking to lease from the MNR and the District.	SREL indicated that their website had a diagram from the last open house that delineated the parcels of land by owner.	September 19, 2008	Land Tenure – Section 2.2.4.2.
Spetember 19, 2008	Phone Conversation	Stated concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety when jumping from the railway bridge Flow reduction as a result of the project over the south falls Information regarding the two lane Bailey Bridge Consultation process especially pertaining to local business owners Construction schedule 	SREL replied that while there will be a large boom located at the railway bridge, and that this practice is unsafe and illegal. Flows over the south falls would range from 60m ³ /s in April to 2.1 to 2.7 in summer. Information on the two-lane Bailey Bridge was provided. Information regarding required consultation as per the environmental screening process and additional consultation which has taken place was reiterated. The construction schedule was described as presented during the 2008 PIC	September 19, 2008	Public Safety in the Vicinity of the Project 5.3.2; Construction Site Safety – Section 5.3.3; Public Safety During Plant Operation – Section 6.3.2. Local Traffic – Section 5.3.4; Figure 5.1.Construction Activities – Section 5.1

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
September 22, 2008	Email	<i>Can you provide me with the list of the 17 sites that MNR have slated as appropriate generating sites in Ontario? Do you have information on why Bala came to the top of this list as a first site to consider?</i>	SREL provided the site release website. SREL also conveyed that <i>if there is a group that that would like to discuss its concerns with this project. SREL is willing to meet with them.</i>	September 22, 2008	N/A
Sep 22/08	Email	Inquired as to whether SREL attended the oppositions meeting on Sept 14, 2008. What would the flow rate be at the intake? Some people have the misconception that the project will increase the flow through the falls.			
September 23, 2008	Email	<i>Do you have the new artist's rendering? I'd like the renderings to include our view from the water, looking at the 15' wall.</i>	<i>Yes we are working on a new rendering for the project to take into consideration comments received from our August/08 open house. We do expect that this will include a view from the water. When it is ready, it will be posted on our website. We currently expect this to be completed by mid October. Stakeholder was subsequently contacted to advise when the artists</i>	September 25, 2008 and October 25, 2008	Figure 6.6

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
			<i>rendering was made available on the website (October 25, 2008).</i>		
Sep 28/08	Email	Would be helpful to have something visible to relate water flow to instead of just m3/s.			
September 29, 2008	Email	<i>I am in favour of your Bala Falls project... I am in favour of developing responsible green energy where possible and am very excited to see the final plans for development into a usable park setting...A park setting in this location would greatly improve continuity in the town. As a suggestion, I think statistics of actual flow rates of the existing falls at different seasons and water volume figures of projected needs to run the turbines should be distributed as soon as possible. Bala survived, if not thrived for decades with a one lane passage through town. If specific timetables of reduced traffic flows were released, the comments of \18 months of traveling over a single lane Bailey bridge\1 could be</i>	Stakeholder was thanked for his interest in the project and was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR. He was also sent a copy of the SREL flyer "Setting the Record Straight" (See Appendix D)	October 25, 2008	Local Traffic – Section 5.3.4; Figure 5.1.

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		<i>squashed...good luck and I look forward to seeing plans for future development.</i>			
October 3, 2008	Email	<p>The following statements and concerns were made/raised regarding the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit to the community of Bala • Environmental, economical, and aesthetic impacts • Negligible benefit to the province • Economic and cultural impacts • Disruption during construction • Access • Compliance with regulatory standards 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	<p>Employment and Economy – Sections 5.3.9 and 6.3.7. Sound Levels – Section 6.3.4; Appendix C1 – Acoustic Assessment Report. Hydrology – Section 6.2.2. Local Traffic – Section 5.3.4; Figure 5.1. Aesthetics – Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5; Figure 6.6 Public Access - Section 6.3.1. Recreation – Sections 5.3.7.2 and 6.3.6.</p>
Oct 5/08	Email	<p>Addressed to municipality and SREL Indicated that likely that SREL would put up a sterile and contrived eyesore similar to photo attached of rock retaining wall, in order to hold up driveway. Project will remove last vegetative buffer along shoreline.</p>	<p>SRE: continue to listen to concerns and agree that the photo attached is not suitable for this location, but this was not proposed by SREL. SREL have requested that sender join an advisory committee to recommend what wall should look like. Note that this is the only sender that has expressed a desire to see the plant adjacent to the falls.</p>	Oct 10/08	N/A

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
October 5, 2008	Email	Email outlining concerns including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of environmental studies • Water levels • Access to local residences during high water • Legal recourse in the event of damage to buildings or property • Mismanagement of water flows by SREL • Impacts to local businesses • Negative effects to traffic • Emergency response during construction 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Baseline Data Collection Program – Section 4. Employment and Economy – Sections 5.3.9 and 6.3.7. Hydrology – Section 6.2.2. Local Traffic – Section 5.3.4; Figure 5.1. Aesthetics – Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5; Figure 6.6 Public Access - Section 6.3.1. Recreation – Sections 5.3.7.2 and 6.3.6.
October 6, 2008	Email	Upon review of the proposed project the following concerns were submitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetics • Impacts to wildlife, tourism, and local businesses 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Aesthetics – Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5; Wildlife 5.2.10 and 6.2.6; Tourism – Sections 5.3.7 and 6.3.6. Local Businesses – Section 5.3.8
October 7, 2008	Email	The following concerns were submitted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to local businesses • Impacts to Purk’s Place • Impacts to tourism 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Tourism – Sections 5.3.7 and 6.3.6. Local Businesses – Section 5.3.8
October 8, 2008	Email	Stated concerns with the project included:	Responded to concerns stating that the <i>project remains as viable today on the</i>	October 8, 2008	Tourism – Sections 5.3.7 and 6.3.6. Aesthetics – Sections

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of district lands for industrial purposes • Viability of the project • Tourism and economic impacts • Aesthetics • Loss of vegetation • Access to the water 	<p><i>original crown land site as it was when first shown to the public in August 2007. However, in response to clearly stated concerns about the impact this might have on the falls, we chose to move the plant 30 m away from the falls.</i></p> <p><i>We will respect any decision made by the council regarding our request and will build according to their wishes.</i></p> <p>SREL also invited the commenter to join the <i>architectural advisory committee to help with the aesthetics of the project.</i></p>		5.3.6 and 6.3.5; Public Access - Section 6.3.1. Vegetation – Section 5.2.9
October 9, 2008	Email	Stated the following concerns regarding the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetics • Use of District lands for the project 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Aesthetics – Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5;
October 10, 2008	Email	Stated concerns regarding the project include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of waterways for hydroelectric power • Impacts to tourism and the local economy • Safety at the tailrace • Aesthetics 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Aesthetics – Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5; Tourism – Sections 5.3.7 and 6.3.6. Public Safety in the Vicinity of the Project 5.3.2; Construction Site Safety – Section 5.3.3; Public Safety During Plant Operation –

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of the Bala Falls as a heritage site 			Section 6.3.2.
October 11, 2008	Email	<p><i>There has been, for many years, an old hydro facility in Bala – why is this not being renovated, updated and utilized?</i></p> <p><i>Are there any plans to return the land and its surroundings to its pre-dig state?</i></p> <p><i>Does the need for additional electric power outweigh the possible damage to Bala’s tourism prospects – both short and long term?</i></p>	<p><i>The old/existing facility in Bala is owned by Algonquin Power, another private developer...</i></p> <p><i>SREL has made some very significant changes to its construction schedule to limit the impacts to Bala's tourism.</i></p>	October 13, 2008	N/A
October 13, 2008	Email	<p>Submitted concerns including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • economic impact • aesthetics • public safety 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list. Some stated concerns we addressed by SREL in an email response, and will be addressed within the ESR.	October 24, 2008	Aesthetics – Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5; Employment and Economy – Sections 5.3.9 and 6.3.7. Public Safety in the Vicinity of the Project 5.3.2; Construction Site Safety – Section 5.3.3; Public Safety During Plant Operation – Section 6.3.2.
October 13, 2008	Email	<p>Stated concerns regarding the project including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • safety • aesthetics • economic impact • traffic 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR. In a response from SREL, the proponent also address many of the stakeholder’s concerns.	October 25, 2008	Aesthetics – Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5; Employment and Economy – Sections 5.3.9 and 6.3.7. Public Safety in the Vicinity of the Project 5.3.2; Construction Site

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noise 			Safety – Section 5.3.3; Public Safety During Plant Operation – Section 6.3.2 Local Traffic – Section 5.3.4; Figure 5.1. Sound Levels – Section 6.3.4; Appendix C1 – Acoustic Assessment Report.
October 13, 2007	Email	Stated the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Bala's economic which is driven by tourism</i> • Safety • Aesthetics 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Safety During Plant Operation – Section 6.3.2 Local Traffic – Section 5.3.4; Figure 5.1. Aesthetics – Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5; Employment and Economy – Sections 5.3.9 and 6.3.7.
Oct 13/08	Email	Follow-up to email of Oct 8/08 Find description of retaining wall is too faint, in the interest of full disclosure; would you be willing to make these items more visible?	Both options will be presented to District Council on Tuesday. Once we have approval for the project we will complete the detailed design of the plant.	Nov 13/08	N/A
October 14, 2008	Email	Stakeholder submitted the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of the public consultation process • Negative impacts to the community of Bala • Consideration of environmental, heritage, economic and scientific 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Sections 5 and 6 – Effects Assessment of the Natural and Social Environment

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		implications			
October 16, 2008	Email	Stakeholder expressed concern with impact on Bala Falls as a focal point of the town	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	N/A
October 17, 2008	Email	Enquiry regarding methods of contact for submitting questions.	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	October 17, 2008	N/A
October 17, 2008	Email	Stated concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety • Aesthetics • Prohibition of people jumping from the rail bridge • Consultation process regarding signage and appearance of safety features 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and their stated concerns were addressed by SREL in some detail. SREL conveyed that there would be a public advisory committee if they would like to join.	October 24, 2008	Agency, Public and First Nation Consultation – Section 3; Safety During Plant Operation – Section 6.3.2 Local Traffic – Section 5.3.4; Figure 5.1. Aesthetics – Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5
October 20, 2008	Email	Stated concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative effects to Tourism 	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Tourism – Sections 5.3.7 and 6.3.6.
October 24, 2008	Email	Inquired regarding the funding of the Project	Provided information on the developer’s responsibilities and MNR’s site release process. Stakeholder was added to the mailing list.	October 24, 2008	N/A
Oct 25/08	Email	Follow-to SREL response for Sep 23 rd email Thanked SREL for new rendering Asked if Astroturf was proposed on top of building and where the hatches were.	Haven’t worked out vegetation details but it will not be Astroturf. Will be done by a landscape architect and is based on a streetscape plant that the Chamber of Commerce had done for the area.	Oct 31/08	N/A

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
October 27, 2008	Email	Negative effects to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetics • Water flow • Safety • Tourism • Local economy • The environment • Fish and wildlife habitat 	HE thanked stakeholder for the comments related to the Project. Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR.	October 30, 2008	Aesthetics – Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5; Hydrology – Section 6.2.2 and Figure 6.6; Public Safety – Section 5.3.2. and 6.3.2; Tourism – Sections 5.3.7 and 6.3.6; Employment and Economy – Sections 5.3.9 and 6.3.7; Natural Environment – Section 5.2 and 6.2.
October 27, 2008	Email	<i>I have searched your website and many other but have not found any pros to the power plant as of this moment. Can you please state a few?</i>	Stakeholder was added to mailing list to receive future notifications regarding the Project, and SREL replied to the email stating benefits of the Project including employment; construction workforce spending; renewable energy production; etc.	October 31, 2008	Table 5.4; Conclusions and Recommendations - Section 12.
October 27, 2008	Email	Expressed concern with the aesthetics of the Project	SREL responded with additional information regarding the proposed landscape design.	October 31, 2008	Aesthetics – Section 6.3.5
November 11, 2008	Email	Resort operator in the area offered accommodation services during construction of the Project.	Stakeholder was added to mailing list.	November 11, 2008	N/A
November 18, 2008	Email	Inquired as to whether the ESR had been issued for public review and requested a copy be sent to him personally.	Stakeholder was added to the Project mailing list and would therefore be informed of the 30 review period of the ESR and the appropriate locations to do so.	November 18, 2008	N/A

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
Nov 20/08	Email	Will the project be required to sound a siren before operation of the turbine? If so how loud, how long would it last, and how often would it go off. What is the total square footage of the proposed plant and the height above the water and above the road from the Moon River side?	Sirens will not be required or used for this modern project. No outside noise will be discernable from the plant operations The frontage will be about 25', but not sure at the moment of the square footage. This width is less than some relatively small cabins in the area.	Nov 21/08	
December 4, 2008	Email	Requested information regarding specific water levels during operation at spring break-up, summer months and during fall.	Provided the stakeholder with a copy of the Water Management Plan for the upstream and downstream water bodies, stating also that SREL is obligated to maintain water levels in this range.	January 14, 2008	Water Management Plan - Section 9
Dec 15/08	Email	Have heard that the ESR is completed and being circulated to Ministries. The guidelines suggest that it would be appropriate to a draft copy to be sent to interested parties/stakeholders in advance of its formal release. Would you send me a draft copy? What is the specific timing and will it be before or after Christmas?	SREL is currently making edits to the draft ESR. Some sections are yet to be reviewed by the various agencies for initial comments. We will be required to circulate the report to the public after the Notice of Completion is issued. A date for this has not been set and won't occur until all comments from agencies have been discussed. Upon NOC, copies will be provided at various locations around Bala for public review and posted on website for a period of 30 days.	Dec 17/08	N/A

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
December 17, 2008	Email	Requested to be kept abreast of Project developments. Does SREL anticipate a round of edits to ESR due to comments from Ministries which are currently reviewing it? Would there be a need to send it back to those Ministries to be sure they are happy with the modified document.	SREL confirmed that the stakeholder was on the mailing list and replied that they would be kept abreast of any developments. SREL will have to see what comments are received from the Ministries to know what the next step will be.	December 17, 2008	N/A
December 19, 2008	Written Correspondence	Stated concerns included potential impacts to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic flow • Pedestrian safety • Emergency services • Construction traffic safety • Public access • Boat access to Bala • Economic impact to local businesses • Employment during construction • Tourism • Bala Cranberry Festival • Weekly farmers market • Annual regatta at the town docks • Scuba diving 	Thank you for your comments; these will be assessed within the Environmental Screening Report. Stakeholder was added to mailing list.	January 15, 2009	Local Traffic – Section 5.3.4; Figure 5.1.; Public Safety – Section 5.3.2.; Construction Site Safety – Section 5.3.3; Recreation – Section 5.3.7.2; Employment and Economy – Sections 5.3.9 and 6.3.7. Sound Levels – Section 6.3.4; Appendix C1 – Acoustic Assessment Report. Effect on Areas for Public Use – Section 6.3.6.1; Hydrology – Section 6.2.2. Aesthetics – Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5; Figure 6.6 Public Access - Section 6.3.1 and 6.3.6.; Land Tenure – Section 2.2.4.2. Permits and Approvals – Section 1.9;

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries impacts in the Moon River and Lake Muskoka • Economic impact of the Project on the sport fishery • Effect of blasting on adjacent structures • Stakeholder Consultation • Construction noise • Boat navigation • Swimmers • Negative effects as a result of construction activities • Government funding and estimated cost of the project • Permits and approvals • Water levels • Energy output in KW and households 			Stakeholder Consultation – Section 3; Summary of Potential Effects, Proposed Mitigation and Residual Effects During the Construction Phase – Table 5.4; Economic Benefits – Section 5.3.9.2.; Employment and Economic Opportunities – Section 6.3.7.
January 11, 2009	Email	Inquired as to the study of various environmental components including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Quality • Fishing and Spawning Beds • Safety • Impact of Construction • Town and Waterfront Events (Tourism) 	Responded with some information on those specific environmental components and provided a description of the process for reviewing the Environmental Screening Report. The stakeholder was added to the mailing list for the Project.	January 11, 2009	Public Safety – Section 5.3.2.; Construction Site Safety – Section 5.3.3; Effect on Areas for Public Use – Section 6.3.6.1.

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
Feb 15/09	Email	Indicated that had read SREL's Feb 10/09 letter to the Township of Muskoka Lakes and would like to discuss some other ideas about a south dam idea. Requested a phone conversation	Yes would be available for discussion. However, drawing that done by sender has intake located so that most of the available head at the site is lost. Also, idea would require realignment of road, a new bridge, disruption to access for two neighboring businesses, and use of CP Rail land. Would also require a new underpass under existing live rail line.	Feb 17/08	N/A
Feb 18/09	Email followed by lengthy phone conversation Follow-up email from SREL	Request meeting with SREL to discuss south channel idea. Attached a presentation made by sender to District Council	Discussed at length why the idea presented to District Council is too expensive to be feasible and that it incorporates private land that SREL does not have access to and would require CPRail to give permission to work under the live rail line. Project outlined would also have a very small fraction of the capacity of the proposed plant due to the configuration. Reviewed another idea by sender again and find that this idea reduces the flood capacity of the south dam and thereby puts the lake at risk of flooding. Also, long draft tube would require extensive blasting in the south channel to achieve submergence of the turbine.	Feb 18/09 Feb 20/09	N/A

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
Feb 22/09	Follow-up email	<p>Wouldn't currently proposed option also reduce flood capacity of dam in north channel? How can flood capacity for south idea reduce for day-to-day operation? Doesn't agree that south idea is more expensive. Understands it may be more difficult to build in south channel and may produce less power, but why should SREL maximize profits? Understand the long draft tubes aren't the norm, but possibly another turbine could be used. Agree demolishing Bala Falls bridge could make construction more difficult, however, would need a large crane for both options. Ad would need to use temp bridge for proposed option as well. South dam idea could be designed to actually increase flow in south channel. Would like SREL to seriously consider this idea again.</p>	<p>Issues have already been discussed on phone in great detail. The key reason SREL are not pursuing south dam idea is that it would reduce flood capacity of the south dam during construction and operation. The proposed idea by sender would require extensive work to be completed in the river bed.</p>	Feb 23/09	N/A

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
Feb 26/09	Follow-up email	Indicated that MNR had not evaluated the flood capacity for the south dam idea. But they would not endorse or accept any design that would reduce discharge capacity of either dam or adversely affect water level or flood mitigation controls. Requested accurate drawing of proposed power plant and surrounding site in advance of release of ESR so stakeholders can work cooperatively in finding a balance solution	Agree with comments about MNR's position on the south dam. SREL did look at the south dam about a year ago when suggested by a councilor. Indicated that have written letters to Township and District why south dam idea is not being pursued, and will forward them if required. Have discussed this issue not at length with the sender and will reserve further comment until the ESR is released or a presentation is made to the District.	Feb 26/09	N/A
Mar 2/09	Email	Requested meeting with board of directors of SREL	Inquired as to the agenda for the meeting.	Mar 2/09	N/A
Mar 4/09	Follow-up email	To be sure investors know that while power station in Bala is green energy it is being done in a way that isn't good for Bala and that there is an option that is.	Appreciate concern, but board has been fully briefed on sender's south dam idea including copies of presentation to township and district as media coverage with statements from sender and associates. Also confirm that one of the board members has already spoken to the sender personally. Suggested a letter to the board to be more appropriate or have co-chairman J. Wildman call to discuss further	Mar 3/09	N/A

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
Mar 4/09	Email	Re: construction phase: Will north falls need to be shut off? Will people be allowed below north dam? What precautions need to be taken due to any possible weakening of north dam due to blasting of powerhouse?	Flows will not be modified over dams during construction. Cannot give exact locations of safety fences for construction period at this time, likely that land along south side of north falls will not be accessible, but no reason why north side would not be open Won't be touching the north dam and standard blasting practices shouldn't weaken dam.	Mar 5/09	
Mar 21/09	Email follow-up on email from SREL to MRPOA (Mar 20/09).	Entire North site is part of heritage and will have impact on community. South channel idea is preferred. Has Hatch done flooding assessment on south channel idea? Have a plan to ensure flooding is not an issue in south channel. Would like to take up offer to meet to discuss and understand points raised about idea.	Perhaps meeting is best done with MNR present. Please arrange and let us know. In follow-up email: MNR and SREL project manager have indicated that this issue has been discussed at length with the sender and associates and suggest instead to wait for issuance of the ESR.	Mar 24/09	N/A
Apr 2/09	Email	What is agency progress? How will landscaping questions regarding fencing, soil depth and mature plantings be addressed? What will downstream boom look like?	Landscaping committee fences and boom shown on design, don't expect more at this point. It is our hope that a committee can be brought together to discuss details. Mature plantings will be to sides of	Apr 3/09	N/A

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
			structure, so not an issue for depth of soil. No boom below dam, only around outfall. Size and colour as per Transport Canada regulations. Timing: still awaiting approval to release.		
Apr 4/09	Follow-up email from SREL	Would you be interested in joining advisory committee?	Not at this time, not until after reviewing ESR.	Apr 5/09	
Apr 5/09	Follow-up email from SREL	The south dam idea has been discussed with the sender and associates several times. Suggest that further discussion be delayed until after ESR is released. Offered to meet to discuss project when in town with respect to misconceptions about design	Would very much like to have a dialogue on south channel idea.	Apr 5/09	N/A
Apr 22, 23, 27, 30, May 11, Jun 17 /09	EMAIL x 10 copies from different individuals	Site is inappropriate for a wide range of reasons: health and safety implications. Hereby request an elevation to Individual EA	Inappropriate to request elevation prior to NOC. Public will have 30 days to review and make request after NOC.	Apr 22/09	
Apr 22/09	Email	Site is inappropriate for a wide range of reasons: increased flow changes, increased current around falls, increased current in Bala Bay, fish breeding grounds, displacement of shores, old bridge and train bridge. Hereby			

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		request an elevation to Individual EA			
Apr 24/09	Email	North falls is tourist area. Would diminish view of falls and eliminate natural aspect of land south of falls. Urge SREL to consider south channel idea.	Have looked at south dam idea and it is not feasible as we don't have rights to land, would change flood capacity of south dam and put Lake at risk of flooding.	Apr 24/09	
May 11/09	Email	Public are having a town hall meeting on Sunday regarding updates to project. When do you expect ESR to be released? What is impact of DFO interest? What is current construction schedule? Is there an updated artist's rendering?	Would be pleased to attend, but have other commitments. Will be in town on Thursday and will be meeting with some public representatives. SREL are in final stages of wrapping up ESR but don't have date for NOC yet. Will be presenting to District council during 30 day review period. Don't have a new construction sched at this time. Suggested that group nominate members to join advisory committee.	May 13/09	N/A
May 12/09	email	Why can the ESR not be released to public at same time as agencies?	It is important to get agencies comments on items they see are issues and make appropriate changes prior to getting to public.	May 13/09	N/A
May 13/09	Email follow-up to May 13 and Apr 6/09 emails	Would like to meet with SREL in Toronto or Burlington to discuss south channel, safety fences, safety boom, height of power station, exterior lighting, etc.	SREL has made a determination that the south channel is not on the table as previously discussed. Follow-up emails from senders, insist on discussing south dam idea. SREL	May 13/09	N/A

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
			agreed to allow it on the agenda.		
May 18/09	Email	How will installation of facility affect business, tourism, economy in Bala? Has there been a study of effects? What restrictions to public access? What barriers will be used to restrict access?	Information will be explained in ESR.	May 20/09	
May 20/09	Follow-up email	30 day review will not be sufficient to address concerns about destruction of aquatic life. What studies have been performed on habitat and aeration to determine effects on ecosystem? Concerned about aquatic life going through turbines.	Studies have been completed. After the 30 day review, you may request to MOE that they compel us to do additional studies.	May 20/09	
May 21/09	Follow-up email	Concerned about long term community impact with respect to local economy, Purk's Place, fencing, access, tailrace boom requirements, South falls idea.	FAQ section of website provides many answers to these questions.	May 21/09	N/A
May 26/09	Email	Concerned regarding ichthyoplankton and zooplankton passing through turbines will be killed due to pressure changes and turbulence			

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		<p>similar to Nanticoke thermal facility. With Burgess plant, virtually all water entering Moon River will now pass through a turbine. This will result in most of the water being sterilized and have a detrimental effect on the ecosystem.</p>			
May 27/09	Meeting with members of Save the Bala Falls and Bala Falls Community Association as requested on Apr 6 and May 11	<p>South dam ideas Safety issues Attendees provided 27 questions to be answered and returned.</p>	<p>South dam ideas have intrinsic engineering issues as well as land ownership.</p>	N/A	N/A
May 27/09	Follow-up email	<p>Thank you for meeting with us. You have a great way of putting information into perspective and appreciated your time.</p> <p>Could Hatch provide a construction sequence for south dam idea? Powerhouse could be built at location of shield parking lot.</p>	<p>Thank-you, SREL will work through the questions, but it may take a while with 27 of them.</p>	May 27/09	N/A
May 27/09	Email	<p>Concern over endangered species in particular snapping turtles How if Federal Fisheries Act</p>	<p>ESR included an investigation into the presence of endangered species as required and will be available for</p>	May 28/09	

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		being accommodated.	public review following NOC. Will likely require a FAA from DFO prior to construction as part of the federal assessment and permitting process.		
Jul 7/09	Email	<p>OPG/OPP running advisory ad regarding fine for fishing around a power dam.</p> <p>Follow-up email from sender: What happens if there is an accident?</p>	<p>Note that there already are two dams at the location and we will not be adding any new ones. Safety precautions, therefore, should be addressed by the public in the current conditions.</p> <p>We will also be adding safety measures such as safety booms, signage, fencing etc.</p> <p>Follow-up response: Project will be subject to all regulations of other hydro projects. We are working hard to keep the design as “public friendly” as possible, but agree dams are dangerous places with our without power plants. When ESR is published for public review, will have a chance to state objections to the agencies.</p>	<p>Jul 8/09</p> <p>Jul 7/09</p>	
Jul 28/09	Email	Thinks project is an excellent idea. Has cottage directly opposite falls. What is status? Should I write a letter of support?	Thanked sender for support.	Jul 30/09	N/A

**Table D7
Public Comments Received During Phase Two Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
Sep/09	Email	Concerned project will change the look of the falls and how they are used. Also concerned about safety.	SREL have attempted to design and user friendly area with a park atop and viewing platform for sunsets. Safety issues: will provide an area to view falls safely.	Sep 3/09	
Sep 8/09	Email	Given the Aug 18 th failure of Russian Syanao-Shushenskay station and oil spill: How much oil will be contained in powerhouse? What measure to prevent spill? How much insurance to cover damages? What if log caught in turbine? What if penstock ruptures and causes oil leak downstream?	Russian plant over 6,000 times larger than proposed plant Caused by oil filled transformer explosion. We are proposing a dry transformer with no oil, therefore, no risk of spill. All other oils will be stored properly. Logs won't get to turbine as we will have trashracks to keep out large debris at intake. We don't have a penstock and our concrete culvert will not be high pressure since this is a low head plant.	Sep 9/09	N/A