

**D6 Summary of Consultation  
with Public and Stakeholders  
During Phase I**

**Table D1**  
**Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Industry/ Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report</b>
June 6, 2005	Hydro One Networks Inc.	Telephone Call from HE	HE approached HONI to discuss local hydro line voltage and capacity.	HONI confirmed the voltage to be 44kV.	June 6, 2005	N/A
November 2, 2005	Muskoka Lakes Rate Payers Association	Telephone Call	Requested information on the current status of project and the MNR RFP Program. Stated the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of the project on lakes levels</li> <li>• Maintaining access for the public below Bala Falls</li> <li>• Affects of construction on tourism during construction</li> </ul>	Information regarding the current status of the Project and details of the MNR RFP Program was provided. Stated that concerns mentioned would be addressed during the EA process.	November 2, 2005	Hydrology – Section 6.2.2.; Public Access – Sections 5.3.1 and 6.3.1 and Figures 5.4 and 6.7; Tourism – Sections 5.3.7 and 6.3.6.
December 6, 2005	Communities in Bloom	Written Correspondence	Requested information regarding the location of the Project in relation to a small piece of Crown land adjacent to Bala Bay south falls, which Communities in Bloom are planning to improve	Confirmed that the community's proposed improvements at "Diver's Point" would be on Crown land south and upstream of the South Bala Dam.	December 20, 2005	N/A

**Table D1**  
**Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Industry/ Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report</b>
April 3, 2006	Muskoka Lakes Association		Requested to be kept informed about public meetings and stated the following concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential impacts to water levels</li> </ul>	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Hydrology – Section 6.2.2
Sept 1, 2007	Moon River Property Owners Association	Meeting	Concerns Raised during the September 1, 2007 meeting included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety</li> <li>• Signage/Aesthetics</li> <li>• Water Levels</li> <li>• Impacts to Fish</li> <li>• Recreational Use</li> <li>• Tourism</li> <li>• Local Economy</li> <li>• Pollution</li> </ul>	SREL gave a general overview of the Project and discussed concerns with those present.	September 1, 2007	Employment and Economy – Sections 5.3.9 and 6.3.7. Hydrology – Section 6.2.2. 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.
Sept 13, 2007	HONI		Initial comments provided in the HONI CIA dated September 13, 2007.	N/A	N/A	N/A
October 16, 2007	Laura Rexe, Generations Connections Coordinator,	Written Correspondence	Submission of two signed copies of the Study Agreement for the above named project	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Table D1**  
**Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Industry/ Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report</b>
	System Investment Division, HONI					
November 30, 2007	Algonquin Power, Burgess Power Station – Bala	Written Correspondence from HE	Notice of Commencement mailed separately informing of recent public consultation activities including publication of the Notice of Commencement and PIC.	N/A	N/A	N/A
January 25, 2008	OPG	Written Correspondence	In response to December 5, 2007 letter the following concerns were stated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operation of the Ragged Rapids GS and the affect of the Bala Project on operations</li> <li>• OPG’s continued ability to meet their commitments within the MRWMP</li> <li>• Ensuring that there are minimal impacts on generation and</li> </ul>	SREL is consulting with OPG to determine any potential effects to OPG operations. Consultation is ongoing.	N/A	Water Management Plan – Section 9

**Table D1**  
**Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Industry/ Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report</b>
			operation at the Ragged Rapids GS.			
January 25, 2008	Paul Lafontaine, Asset and Technical Services/Project Manager, OPG – Evergreen Energy	Written Correspondence	Thank you for your notification of the project. The new GS at Bala will have an effect on OPG Ragged Rapids GS. Stated concerns regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flow and water level compliance with the WMP</li> <li>• Ensuring minimal impacts on generation and operation.</li> <li>• Require coordination in the operation of the two stations</li> </ul>	Stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Water Management Plan – Section 9
January 25, 2008	OPG	Written Correspondence	The following concerns were expressed by OPG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operation of the Ragged Rapids GS and the affect of the Bala Project on operations</li> <li>• OPG’s continued ability to meet their</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	Water Management Plan – Section 9

**Table D1**  
**Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Industry/ Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report</b>
			commitments within the MRWMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring that there are minimal impacts on generation and operation at the Ragged Rapids GS.</li> </ul>			
February 25, 2008	Brian McElwain, VP, Muskoka Lakes Association	Email	Interested in seeing an artists rendering of the project	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Figure 6.6
February 25, 2008	Brian McElwain, VP, Muskoka Lakes Association	Email	Thanks for replying so quickly	SREL has reiterated its intention to provide landscaping and exterior design to compliment the surroundings.	February 27, 2008	Figure 6.6
February 27 2008	Brian McElwain, VP, Muskoka Lakes Association	Email	Thanks for your help and support – Muskoka and Bala Falls are very beautiful places and the final structure must be built in such a way as to be “in harmony with the environment”	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Table D1**  
**Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Industry/ Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report</b>
April 10, 2008	Bill Purkis, Owner, Purk's Place Boat House and Marina	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can you provide an update of the project status?</li> <li>• When and where will work begin?</li> <li>• Stated concern re: impacts to his business</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SREL would like to set up a meeting to discuss the project further.</li> <li>• SREL is completing a feasibility study to address options to address concerns raised at 2007 PIC</li> <li>• Conveyed that there will be no construction in 2008</li> <li>• Informed Mr. Purkis that some geotechnical investigations will be conducted the following week</li> </ul> <p>Conveyed interest in talking to him and other area stakeholders over the next month</p>	April 11, 2008 (by phone)	Construction Activities – Section 5.1; Local Businesses – Section 5.3.8
April 11, 2008	Owner of Stone Church	Phone conversation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inquired as to whether the project would encroach on his land.</li> <li>• The owner of the Stone Church asked if it was going to affect parking area beside Purk's Place.</li> <li>• Concerned if there was enough water to</li> </ul>	<p>SREL responded to the various queries by the owner of the Stone Church stating that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The Project would not encroach on the lands associated with the Stone Church</li> <li>•The use of the parking lot at Purk's Place was not</li> </ul>	April 11, 2008	Figure 1.2 – General Arrangement Construction Activities – Section 5.1; Local Businesses – Section 5.3.8

**Table D1**  
**Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Industry/ Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report</b>
			generate power and if SREL were connected to the Burgess Plant	determined at this time <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Ensured him that there was indeed enough water to generate electricity</li> <li>•SREL are not connected to the Burgess Plant</li> <li>•SREL conveyed that they were currently completing a feasibility study for the Project</li> </ul>		
April 26, 2008	Peter Hemming, Chari, Communities in Bloom	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Together with the Bala Cranberry Festival, Communities in Bloom is undertaking improvement to the area between the northeast corner of Bala Falls Rd and Muskoka Road 169.</li> <li>• Before planning further – what are the intentions of SREL on this parcel of land where drilling has recently taken place</li> <li>• When can these plans be confirmed</li> </ul>	At the Scheduled PIC on August 13, 2008 SREL will be in a position to convey to the public the intended plans and timelines for the project.	July 30, 2008	Project Description – Section 1.2; Tourism – Sections 5.3.7 and 6.3.6.

**Table D1**  
**Comments Received from Industry/Stakeholder Groups During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Industry/ Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s) and Concerns</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section(s) of Environmental Screening Report</b>
May 7/08	SREL/Purk's Place	in-person meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rough sketches of the proposed configuration of new plan were discussed.</li> <li>• Purk's Place indicated that there would be implication on the business, in particular water access/docking.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding lack of road access during construction period were also raised.</li> <li>• Purk's Place agreed to get back to SREL with possible impacts and start discussions regarding mitigation/compensation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short term options of locating a trailer at divers point to maintain operations throughout the construction period were suggested but rejected by Purk's Place as not being feasible. A second option of closing for the construction season and SREL providing compensation for lost revenues was also suggested.</li> <li>• Long term options to move the docks to "divers point" on the other side of the rail tracks were discussed as was possibly a shoreline path under the tracks to connect the docks to the building.</li> </ul>	May 7, 2008	Section 6.3.1: Public Access

**Table D2  
Public Comments Received During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s)</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report</b>
August 27, 2007	Telephone Call	<p>Stated concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to lake levels</li> <li>• Changes to flows, and safety</li> <li>• Noise from the project</li> <li>• Whether the project would require the erection of unsightly poles and if the generating station would interfere with radios of computers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project would operate within the WMP</li> <li>• Some excavation would be required for the intake channel and that safety measures such as boom installation would be taken</li> <li>• Noise generated by the facility would not be greater than the noise presently generated by the falls</li> <li>• It is expected that the facility will connect to the power line running along the road/bridge adjacent to the site and that no impact was expected to radio signals or computers</li> </ul>	August 27, 2007	Hydrology – Section 6.2.2. Sound Levels – Section 6.3.4; Appendix C1 – Acoustic Assessment Report. Electrical Connection and Distribution – Section 1.2.3.
August 30, 2007	Email	<p>Stated Concerns included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic impacts</li> <li>• Noise levels</li> <li>• Impacts to river and lake levels</li> <li>• Effects to traffic and parking, including noise and congestion</li> <li>• Pouring huge amounts of concrete</li> <li>• Location of the project at</li> </ul>	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	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 –

**Table D2  
Public Comments Received During Phase One Consultations**

Date	Method of Communication	Summary of Stated Issue(s)	Response	Date of Response	Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report
		the north dam as opposed to the south dam <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aesthetics</li> <li>• Public access</li> <li>• Operation of the project during low flow periods</li> <li>• Effects to scuba diving</li> <li>• Fish habitat</li> <li>• Land Tenure</li> <li>• Control of the south dam as part of the project scope</li> <li>• Impacts to the Mill Stream</li> </ul>			Sections 5.3.7.2 and 6.3.6. Land Tenure – Section 2.2.4.2. Effects on Existing Local Hydroelectric Generation – Section 5.3.10.
August 31, 2007	Telephone Conversation	Stated questions/concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for public consultation.</li> <li>• Reason for project location</li> <li>• Inquired about the SOC process and effect of the project on energy costs to the consumers</li> <li>• Capacity of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be a second PIC to provide additional information</li> <li>• MNR released the north Bala site in 2004 based on the available Crown land</li> <li>• The project will have no bearing on energy prices to consumers in Ontario</li> <li>• Not known at this time, 3 to 4 MW is the preliminary published potential capacity</li> </ul>	August 31, 2007	Agency, Public and First Nation Consultation – Section 3. Project Description – Section 1.2.
November 29, 2007	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What kind of support was received during the 2007</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PIC was attended by over 150 people</li> </ul>	December 10, 2007	2007 PIC – Section 3.5.3. Project Description –

**Table D2  
Public Comments Received During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s)</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report</b>
		PIC? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How much power will be generated by the project?</li> </ul> Stated concerns regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aesthetics</li> <li>Bathing at the Falls</li> <li>Positive benefits to Bala Residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Various methods are being examined, drawings and artist rendering will be presented to the community during the 2008 PIC</li> <li>The installed capacity is expected to be between 3 and 5 MW</li> <li>Local benefits would include employment of suitably qualified persons,</li> <li>The purchase of local goods, services and rental equipment during the 12-18 month construction period</li> </ul>		Section 1.2. Aesthetics – Sections 5.3.6 and 6.3.5; Public Access - Section 6.3.1.
November 29, 2007	Email	Please indicate from completed surveys those in favour and opposed to the project	The PIC of August 29, 2007 was attended by over 150 persons. Statistics from this PIC and the one scheduled for 2008 will be available within the ESR.	December 10, 2008	2007 PIC – Section 3.5.3.
November 29, 2007	Email	Stated concerns regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public/tourist access o the water</li> </ul>	It is expected that there will always be access to the Falls, Moon River and Lake Muskoka throughout construction, but not via the construction area, during operation there will be continued access to the water, though some avenues may not be available	December 10, 2007	Public Access - Section 6.3.1.
Dec 5/07	Email	Notification that a complaint was registered with the	Suggest that they contact OWA for further background information on the	Dec 6/07	

**Table D2  
Public Comments Received During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s)</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report</b>
		umbudsman with respect to the release of the 18 waterpower sites..	site release.		
December 9, 2007	Email	Please keep me abreast of developments	Stakeholder was added to the mailing list	May 6, 2008	N/A
December 12, 2007	Telephone Call (BALA INFO LINE MESSAGE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resident of the Wahta Mohawk First Nation</li> <li>In favour of renewable energy initiatives</li> </ul>	Stakeholder was added to mailing list.	December 12, 2007	N/A
December 17, 2007	Email	Effect to flows over the south dam: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>will flows over south dam be diverted (by raising the dam?)</li> <li>how will this change throughout the year?</li> </ul>	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Hydrology – Section 6.2.2.
January 2, 2008	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would it make more sense to combine the Burgess Falls dam and proposed new dam into one larger station?</li> <li>How much compensation flow would continue to flow over the dam and how would this change throughout the day and season?</li> <li>Would there be tourist</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Burgess plant is not associated with SREL who must consider available discharge after an allowance for the diversion flow required by Burgess.</li> <li>The compensation flow is usually determined in consultation with regulatory agencies, and may vary seasonally or daily.</li> <li>It is expected that there would be access by foot to the ground level between the North Bala dam and</li> </ul>	January 29, 2008	Hydrology – Section 6.2.2. Public Access - Section 6.3.1. Figure 6.6.

**Table D2  
Public Comments Received During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s)</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report</b>
		<p>access to the “ground level” at the south side of the north falls?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the PIC will the building size and orientation be final? Please provide.</li> <li>• Please move the dam further south to preserve the view of the falls from the north</li> </ul>	<p>the new powerhouse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drawings showing the proposed building size will be available at the 2008 PIC</li> </ul>		
January 10, 2008	Email	Has there been an independent verification of potential generation?	SREL has undertaken generation estimates based on existing hydrological data	January 29, 2008	N/A
February 2, 2008	Email	Understands that site was released to achieve goal of creating approx. 7800 MW from renewable sources.. Encourage the Township of Muskoka Lakes to seek a land swap with the province so that the development can take place on land adjacent to the south falls.	SREL has already approached the municipality regarding this type of option and they seem receptive. SREL’s goal is to leave Bala an even nicer place when the project is finished.	Feb 3/09	
February 22, 2008	Telephone Conversation	Requested information regarding the Project and stated the following concern:	Individual was added to the stakeholder mailing list and advised that minimizing disruption to the road would be a feature of the project	February 22, 2008	Local Traffic – Section 5.3.4; Figure 5.1.

**Table D2  
Public Comments Received During Phase One Consultations**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Method of Communication</b>	<b>Summary of Stated Issue(s)</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Relevant Section of Environmental Screening Report</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interruption to Muskoka Road 169, preventing passage through town.</li> </ul>	development.		
April 17, 2008	Email	The following concerns were stated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flooding above and below the damsite</li> </ul>	Stakeholder was added to mailing list and stated concerns are addressed within the ESR	N/A	Hydrology – Section 6.2.2.
June 5, 2008	Telephone Call	Concerned about starting construction in 2008 on land owned by Bill Purkis, and any drilling/blasting on his land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction will not be starting in 2008</li> <li>• Drilling/blasting will not be conducted on Mr. Purkis' land</li> <li>• Indicated that SREL is very open to discussing solutions to the construction and long term issues associated with impacts to Purk's Place</li> </ul>	June 5, 2008	N/A