

BELLEVILLE TS DEMORESTVILLE SOLAR

SunEdison Canada

Belleville TS Demorestville – Solar Energy Project

Consultation Report



M a r c h 7 , 2 0 1 2

Table of Contents

List of Appendices	ii
List of Tables	iii
1. Overview	4
1.1 Renewable Energy Approvals Legislative Requirements.....	4
1.2 The Consultation Process.....	4
2. Public Notices.....	5
2.1 Notice of Project Commencement and First Public Meeting	5
2.2 Notice of Final Public Meeting	5
2.3 Distribution of Documents for Review.....	6
3. Agency Consultation	6
3.1 MNR Review	6
3.2 MTC Review	7
3.3 Quinte Conservation Authority (QCA).....	7
3.4 Ontario Ministry of Environment (MOE).....	7
3.5 Agency Comments and Concerns	7
4. Aboriginal Consultation.....	8
4.1 Director’s List	8
4.2 Distribution of Notices and Reports	9
4.3 Additional Consultation Activities.....	10
4.3.1 Aboriginal Comments and Concerns	11
5. Municipal Consultation.....	12
5.1 Consultation Form.....	12
5.2 Consultation Summary.....	14
5.2.1 Municipal Comments and Concerns	16
6. Public Consultation.....	17
6.1 Summary of Comments	17
6.1.1 First Public Meeting, September 13, 2010 / December 9, 2010.....	17
6.1.2 Final Public Meeting, November 8, 2011.....	17
6.1.3 Other Public Consultation	17
6.1.4 Public Comments and Concerns	18
7. Consideration of Public, Municipal and Aboriginal Input	25
7.1 Alterations to the Proposal to Engage in the Project.....	25
7.2 Alterations to the Required REA Reports	25

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Stakeholders List
Appendix B	Notices, Sample Letters, and Material from the First Public Meeting
Appendix C	Notices, Sample Letters, and Material from the Final Public Meeting
Appendix D	Correspondence with the Public
Appendix E	Correspondence with Agencies
Appendix F	Correspondence with the Municipality
Appendix G	List of Aboriginal Communities from MOE
Appendix H	List of Aboriginal Communities from Hatch
Appendix I	Sample Letters to Aboriginal Communities
Appendix J	Subsequent Correspondence with Aboriginal Communities

List of Tables

Table 2-1	Publication of Public Notices.....	6
Table 4-1	Distribution of First Public Meeting Notices	9
Table 4-2	Distribution of Final Public Meeting Notices and Reports.....	10
Table 4-3	Summary of Additional Consultation Activities with Aboriginal Communities.....	10
Table 4-4	Comments/Concerns from Aboriginal Groups/Communities and Responses.....	11
Table 5-1	Municipal Consultation Form Distribution	12
Table 5-2	Municipal Feedback	13
Table 6-1	Comments/Concerns from Public and Responses	18
Table 7-1	Alterations to the Proposal to Engage in the Project	25
Table 7-2	Alterations to the Required REA Reports	25

1. Overview

SunEdison is proposing a single Class 3 Solar Facility with a nameplate capacity of 10 MW (AC) in the area of the hamlet of Demorestville, Ontario. If approved, this facility will convert solar energy into electricity to be fed into the Hydro One distribution grid. The defined project location covers approximately 36 hectares (ha) on Part of Lot 51, Concession 1, geographic Township of Sophiasburgh, Prince Edward County (single tier municipality). The project has received a 20-year Feed-in-Tariff contract from the Ontario Power Authority to sell the generated electricity to the Ontario electricity grid. As such, the project is anticipated to operate until at least 2033, at which time it may continue to generate electricity or the site may be decommissioned and the land returned to its former vacant use.

1.1 Renewable Energy Approvals Legislative Requirements

Ontario Regulation (O.Reg.) 359/09—*Renewable Energy Approvals under Part V.0.1 of the Act*, (herein referred to as the REA Regulation) made under the *Environmental Protection Act* identifies the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) requirements for renewable energy projects in Ontario. The REA Regulation has since been amended by O.Reg. 521/10, which came into effect as of January 1, 2011. Per Section 4 of the amended REA Regulation, ground mounted solar facilities with a name plate capacity greater than 12 kilowatts (kW) are classified as Class 3 solar facilities and do require a REA.

Consultation is a requirement of the REA process as stipulated by Sections 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 of the REA Regulation. In addition, the Ministry of Environment (MOE) has prepared draft guidelines called “*Technical Bulletin Five-Guidance for Preparing the Consultation Report*” (MOE, 2010) and “*Technical Guide to Renewable Energy Approvals*” (MOE, 2011) outlining the Ministry’s expectations and guidelines for appropriate consultation, including the development of a Consultation Report as part of the REA application package. This Consultation Report has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the REA Regulations and the MOE technical bulletin.

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

1.2 The Consultation Process

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

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

The following report sections provide:

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

2. Public Notices

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

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

Two public meetings were held, in accordance with O.Reg. 359/09, Part 4, Section 15, in the Hamlet of Demorestville, Ontario. Notices were initially published at least thirty (30) days in advance of each respective meeting in local newspapers distributed to neighbouring communities of the Project. The notification process and publications are detailed in the rest of this section of the report, Section 2.

2.1 Notice of Project Commencement and First Public Meeting

The Belleville TS Demorestville - Solar Energy Project Renewable Energy Approval process began in 2010 with A Notice of Project and First Public Meeting published in The Intelligencer on July 31, 2010 and in the Picton County Weekly on August 12, 2010, as detailed in Table 1-1, below. The Initial Public Meeting was held on September 13, 2010 at the Waterford Sophiasburgh Town Hall, 2711 County Road No. 5, Demorestville, Ontario.

Notices were made available on the Proponent’s website (www.axiopower.ca) and a total of 13 letters were mailed by Prince Edward County on July 19, 2010 to the identified landowners within 120 metres (m) of the Project Location (note that a full list of landowners has not been provided to respect privacy). Additional mailings were completed to agencies (for Stakeholder’s List see Appendix A). Copies of the notice were sent to the Commissioner and Clerk of Prince Edward County, the MNR District Manager (Peterborough District), the MOE District Manager (Kingston District), the Director of Approvals (MOE), and Quinte Conservation Authority. The notice contained information on the Project Location, the proposed size of the project, the Proponent, the process and a key map of the original Project Area. A copy of the Draft Project Description Report was made available at this meeting and a copy was posted on the Proponent’s website (www.axiopower.ca).

At the first public meeting it was made apparent that some landowners did not receive a notice of the meeting in the mail from the Proponent. As a result, an additional first public meeting was held on December 9, 2010 at the Waterford Sophiasburgh Town Hall to ensure that all landowners within 120m were consulted. A total of 15 letters were mailed by Hatch on November 1, 2010 to the identified landowners within 120 metres (m) of the Project Location.

Copies of the First Public Meeting notices, lists of attendees and the display boards presented at the open houses are included in Appendix B. Further details of the open houses are included in Section 5 of this report.

2.2 Notice of Final Public Meeting

The Notice of Final Public Meeting was published in the local newspaper, as detailed in Table 2-1, below, and a total of 31 letters were mailed on September 19, 2011 to the identified landowners within 120 metres (m) of the Project Location (note that a full list of landowners has not been provided to respect privacy), and those individuals who provided their mailing address during the first public meeting. Additional mailings were completed to agencies (for Stakeholder’s List see Appendix A). Copies of the notice were sent to the Commissioner and Clerk of Prince Edward County, the MNR District Manager (Peterborough District), the MOE District Manager (Kingston District), the Director of Approvals (MOE), and Quinte Conservation Authority. Notices were also made available on the proponent’s website (www.sunedison.ca/demorestville).

In order to conform to the requirements of O.Reg. 359/09, the notice contained information on the Project Location, the proposed size of the Project, the Proponents, the process and a key map of the Project

Area. Also included in this notice was the location, time and date of the Final Public Meeting and where the Draft Project Reports were available for public review (both hard copy and electronic versions), dates of the review period and to whom and where comments could be forwarded. A copy of the notice, list of attendees and the display boards presented at the open house are included in Appendix C.

Table 2-1 Publication of Public Notices

Notice	Date Published	Location of Notice	Days Prior to Public Meeting
First Public Meeting (Held September 13, 2010 at the Waterford Sophiasburgh Town Hall, 2711 County Road No. 5)	July 31, 2010 August 12, 2010	The Tribune Express Picton County Weekly	44; 31
Final Public Meeting (Held November 22, 2011 at the Waterford Sophiasburgh Town Hall, 2711 County Road No. 5)	September 21, 2011 & October 21, 2011 October 20, 2011	The Intelligencer Picton Gazette	62; 32 31

2.3 Distribution of Documents for Review

Prior to the final public meeting (held November 22, 2011) the Draft Renewable Energy Approval documents for consultation were made available for public review for at least 60 days, as required by O.Reg. 359/09. These reports were made available on the proponent's website (www.sunedison.ca/demorestville) on September 19, 2011, and were also made available for review at the Prince Edward County municipal office on that same date, 60 days prior to Final Public Meeting.

All project components are proposed to be located within Prince Edward County.

3. Agency Consultation

3.1 MNR Review

On August 13, 2010 the MNR sent a letter to SunEdison advising that a Natural Heritage Assessment was required for the project.

On December 22, 2010 the following documents were submitted by Hatch to the MNR for review to ensure compliance with the Natural Heritage requirements of O.Reg. 359/09:

- *Natural Heritage Assessment, Records Review Report, Belleville TS Demorestville Solar Energy Project*
- *Natural Heritage Assessment, Site Investigation Report, Belleville TS Demorestville Solar Energy Project*
- *Natural Heritage Assessment, Evaluation of Significance Report, Belleville TS Demorestville Solar Energy Project*
- *Natural Heritage Assessment, Environmental Impact Study Report, Belleville TS Demorestville Solar Energy Project*

On February 8, 2011 Hatch re-submitted the NHA documents to the MNR due to the relocation of a Hydro One transmission line to outside of the Project Location. MNR replied on March 7, 2011 with comments regarding the reports and indicated that the reports did not meet the requirements as outlined within REA. Based on this, Hatch re-submitted modified reports to the MNR on June 13, 2011 and again on July 19, 2011. Confirmation that the revised reports met the requirements as outlined within the REA was issued

by the MNR on July 21, 2011. Hatch submitted the Approval and Permitting Requirements Documents (APRD), which is not a REA requirement, to the MNR on August 19, 2011. On November 15, 2011 Hatch sent a letter to the MNR with a project update regarding a change in technology, and the MNR replied on November 24, 2011. On July 27, 2010 and September 19, 2011, the MNR was informed of the two respective Public Meetings.

On January 19, 2012 the Proponent submitted a Natural Heritage Assessment Addendum Report to the MNR outlining the change in project location to be moved 30m north, away from Black Road, as requested by the surrounding neighbours. On January 23, 2012 the MNR replied with a letter, confirming acceptance of the addendum.

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

3.2 MTC Review

The "Stage 1&2 Archaeological Assessment of Belleville TS Demorestville Project, Part of Lots 51 and 52, Concession 1 West of Greenpoint, Sophiasburgh, Prince Edward County, Ontario" report was received by the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC) for review on July 19, 2011. The MTC issued a Letter of Acceptance on August 18, 2011 agreeing with the findings of the report and that the report complied with the Ontario Heritage Act's licensing requirements. The MTC also indicated that a Stage 3 investigation should be carried out. The Letter of Acceptance and the MTC's Comment Letter are included in Appendix E.

3.3 Quinte Conservation Authority (QCA)

QCA staff were consulted throughout the REA process to keep them apprised of the project activities and seek feedback on any QCA concerns with the proposed project. The QCA was informed of both Public Meetings, with notices sent on July 27, 2010 and September 19, 2011. A copy of all correspondence with the QCA is included in Appendix E.

3.4 Ontario Ministry of Environment (MOE)

The MOE was provided with a draft of the PDR and a list of Aboriginal communities to consult with was requested, on June 16, 2010. The list was provided by the MOE to Hatch on October 15, 2010. On July 27, 2010 and September 19, 2011, the MOE was informed of the two respective Public Meetings. On April 15, 2011 Hatch requested information about the water bodies present on and within 120m of the project location. A copy of all correspondence with the MOE is included in Appendix E.

3.5 Agency Comments and Concerns

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

Agency	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Ontario Ministry of the Environment	The Ministry of Environment sent a letter on November 4, 2011 with a list of requirements for the Noise Study Report.	Hatch replied to the MOE on November 11, 2011 explaining how the Noise Study Report already meets the list of requirements.
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources	The Ministry of Natural Resources requested further clarification for a number of items in Hatch's Natural Heritage Reports, including wildlife habitat	Hatch revised the Natural Heritage documents to satisfy MNR's requests, and resubmitted these revised reports to MNR for review

Agency	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>and species at risk.</p> <p>The MNR stated that despite the change in technology for the project, the letter of confirmation issued on July 21, 2011 is still valid.</p>	No response required
Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture	<p>The Archaeological report for the project complies with the Ontario Heritage Act's licensing requirement is accepted into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeology Reports.</p> <p>A stage 3 archaeological assessment is recommended.</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>A stage 3 archaeological assessment will be conducted.</p>
Quinte Conservation Authority	The QCA did not respond with comments or concerns.	

4. Aboriginal Consultation

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

4.1 Director's List

On June 16, 2010, a copy of the Draft Project Description Report was submitted to the Director of Approvals in order to receive the List of Aboriginal Communities to Consult. A response was received from the MOE on October 15, 2010 and identified the following First Nations groups to consult:

1. Alderville First Nation - may have constitutionally protected treaty or aboriginal rights which may be impacted by the project;
2. Hiawatha First Nation - may have constitutionally protected treaty or aboriginal rights which may be impacted by the project;
3. Curve Lake First Nation - may have constitutionally protected treaty or aboriginal rights which may be impacted by the project;
4. Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation - may have constitutionally protected treaty or aboriginal rights which may be impacted by the project;
5. Kawartha Nishnawbe - may have constitutionally protected treaty or aboriginal rights which may be impacted by the project;
6. Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte - may be interested in any negative effects of the project;
7. Northumberland Metis Council - may be interested in any negative effects of the project;
8. Métis Nation of Ontario - may be interested in any negative effects of the project;

4.2 Distribution of Notices and Reports

The Proponent/Hatch initiated consultations prior to receiving the list from the MOE. Table 4-1 and 4-2 below identify the notices and documents sent to each First Nation's group. Responses were received from the Alderville First Nation, Algonquins of Ontario, Beausoleil First Nation, Curve Lake First Nation, Métis Nation of Ontario, Mississaugas of Scugog First Nation, and Hiawatha First Nation.

On September 9, 2011 an email was sent to Chief Nahrgang at Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation to confirm their mailing address. Many attempts were made to contact Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation but no response was received. Therefore, Hatch was unable to forward hardcopies of the project reports to them. The attempts to communicate are documented in Appendix J.

Table 4-1 Distribution of First Public Meeting Notices

Group	First Public Meeting Notice	# Days Prior to First Public Meeting
Alderville First Nation	July 27, 2010	48
Hiawatha First Nation	July 27, 2010	48
Curve Lake First Nation	July 27, 2010	48
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation	July 27, 2010	48
Kawartha Nishnawbe	July 27, 2010	48
Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte	July 27, 2010	48
Northumberland Metis Council	July 27, 2010	48
Métis Nation of Ontario	July 27, 2010	48
Sevens River Métis Council	July 27, 2010	48
Wapiti Métis Council	July 27, 2010	48
Oshawa Durham Region Métis Council	July 27, 2010	48
Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation	July 27, 2010	48
Chippewas of Rama First Nation	July 27, 2010	48
Algonquins of Pikwakanagan	July 27, 2010	48
Moon River Métis Council	July 27, 2010	48
Toronto – York Métis Council	July 27, 2010	48
Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Office	July 27, 2010	48
Credit River Métis Council	July 27, 2010	48
Ottawa Regional Métis Council	July 27, 2010	48
Hamilton-Wentworth Métis Council	July 27, 2010	48
Wahta Mohawk	July 27, 2010	48
Georgian Bay Métis Council	July 27, 2010	48
Mohawk Council of Akwesasne	July 27, 2010	48
Moose Deere Point	July 27, 2010	48
Beausoleil First Nation	July 27, 2010	48

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

Group	Final Public Meeting Notice	# Days Prior to Final Public Meeting	Draft REA Documents	# Days Prior to Final Public Meeting
Alderville First Nation	September 19, 2011	64	September 19, 2011	64
Hiawatha First Nation	September 19, 2011	64	September 19, 2011	64
Curve Lake First Nation	September 19, 2011	64	September 19, 2011	64
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation	September 19, 2011	64	September 19, 2011	64
Kawartha Nishnawbe	September 19, 2011	64	N/A	
Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte	September 19, 2011	64	September 19, 2011	64
Northumberland Metis Council	September 19, 2011	64	September 19, 2011	64
Métis Nation of Ontario	September 19, 2011	64	September 19, 2011	64
Beausoleil First Nation	September 19, 2011	64	N/A	

4.3 Additional Consultation Activities

Additional consultation with Aboriginal groups took place throughout the REA process and is detailed below.

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

Aboriginal Community/Group	Details of Additional Consultation
Alderville First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 5, 2010: Letter sent to Hatch from Alderville First Nation • May 24, June 28, and June 29, 2011: Phone and email communication between the Proponent and Alderville First Nation
Algonquins of Ontario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 17, 2010: The Algonquins of Ontario sent Hatch a letter.
Beausoleil First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 19, 2010: The Beausoleil First Nation sent a letter to Hatch.
Curve Lake First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 2, 2011: Letter sent to the Proponent to acknowledge receipt of the first Public Meeting Notice • June 30, 2011: Phone and email communication between the Proponent and Curve Lake First Nation
Métis Nation of Ontario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 11, 2011: Email sent to Hatch by the Métis Nation of Ontario requesting an in-person meeting to discuss their possible involvement and learn more about the project • March 18, 2011: Email reply sent to the Métis Nation of Ontario by the Proponent indicating that they welcome the opportunity to meet and discuss the current Projects • June 5, 2011: Meeting held between the Proponent and the Métis Nation of Ontario in Ottawa, Ontario, to discuss the project and how

Aboriginal Community/Group	Details of Additional Consultation
	the Proponent and the Métis Nation of Ontario could work together
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 30, 2011: The Proponent and the Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation communicated by phone and by email.
Hiawatha First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 30, 2011: The Proponent and Hiawatha First Nation communicated by phone and by email.
Kawartha Nishnawbe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 9, 2011: Attempts were made to contact Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation, but no response was received.

4.3.1 Aboriginal Comments and Concerns

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

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

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

Aboriginal Community/Group	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Alderville First Nation	On August 5, 2010, the Alderville First Nation indicated that the project falls within their Traditional and Treaty Territory. The Project is deemed by their consultation protocol to have a minimal impact, but they would like to be kept apprised of archaeological findings, burial sites or any environmental impacts, should any occur.	SunEdison communicated with Alderville First Nation by email and phone, indicating that information about archaeological findings and environmental impacts will be made available on the project webpage.
Algonquins of Ontario	The Algonquins of Ontario only require consultation within or immediately adjacent to the Algonquins of Ontario Traditional Territory, or related to proposals on unceded Crown lands or where access is across unceded Crown lands.	None required to date.
Beausoleil First Nation	Acknowledged receipt of project letter and documentation.	None required to date.
Curve Lake First Nation	On May 2, 2011 and November 7, 2011, Curve Lake First Nation sent a letter to the Proponent indicating that Project area is situated within the Traditional territory of Curve Lake Nations, which is incorporated within the Williams Treaty Territory and they strongly suggested that Williams Treaty First Nation also be consulted with. They	An email response was sent to Curve Lake First Nation on June 30, 2011, indicating that information about archaeological findings and environmental impacts will be made available on the project webpage. The Client has subsequently consulted with other First Nations of the Williams

Aboriginal Community/Group	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	requested that they be contacted regarding any Archaeological findings, or if any unforeseen potential negative environmental or Treaty and Aboriginal rights impacts occur.	Treaty.
Métis Nation of Ontario	<p>The Métis Nation of Ontario requested a face to face meeting with each Client to discuss their possible involvement and to learn more about the Project.</p> <p>The Métis Nation of Ontario sent further emails on March 30 and 31, 2011 further clarifying and discussing an upcoming meeting with The Proponent to discuss the Project.</p> <p>During the meeting the Métis Nation of Ontario expressed interested in shadowing the archaeology studies.</p>	<p>The Proponent sent a reply to the Métis Nation of Ontario indicating that they welcome the opportunity to meet and discuss the current Project.</p> <p>The Proponent responded to the Métis Nation of Ontario's emails of March 30 and 31, 2011 regarding location and agenda of an upcoming meeting.</p> <p>On June 5, 2011, The Proponent and the Métis Nation of Ontario met in Ottawa to discuss the Project and how The Proponent and the Métis Nation of Ontario can work together.</p> <p>The Proponent offered to arrange for this to happen.</p>

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

5. Municipal Consultation

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

5.1 Consultation Form

A "Renewable Energy Approval Consultation Form: municipalities, local authorities" (MOE) form was distributed to the Clerk of Prince Edward County as noted in the table below. Included with the consultation forms were two copies of the Draft Renewable Energy Approval Documents for Consultation.

Table 5-1 Municipal Consultation Form Distribution

Recipient of Consultation Form	Date of receipt of Form	Documents	Date of Receipt of Documents	# Days Prior to Final Public Meeting
Victoria Leskie, County Clerk, Prince Edward County	November 12, 2010	Draft REA Documents	September 19, 2011	64

A staff report to the Prince Edward County Council for a Committee of the Whole meeting on November 22, 2011 was produced on November 10, 2011 and sent to the Proponent as the Municipal Consultation Form. The County requested that the Proponent wait until after December 20, 2011 to submit the REA, and no further comments from the County have been received to date. A copy of the report from Prince Edward County and all correspondence is included in Appendix F. A summary of issues raised and how they were addressed is found below.

Table 5-2 Municipal Feedback

Comments Received	Response
Prince Edward County Staff Report	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify the following additional Municipal approvals, permits and authorizations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Overweight/oversize load permits b. Entrance location and construction permit c. Approval of the County for any pole alignment and works within the County road allowance ▪ Require a pre-development agreement between the Municipality and the Proponent for the recovery of municipal costs associated with the project review, approval, construction, operation, and decommissioning. ▪ Require a Traffic Management Plan to be developed by the Proponent in collaboration with the Public Works Department, for review and approval by the Commissioner of Public Works ▪ Require an agreement between the Municipality and the Proponent for the identification of haul roads, the determination of their pre-construction condition, responsibility for repairing damages and the deposit with the Municipality of sufficient security to cover the cost of any damages, etc. ▪ Require a Stormwater Management Plan for review and approval by the Public Works Commissioner. ▪ Require a Grading and Soil Containment and Contingency Plan to be developed in collaboration with the Commissioner of Public Works. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Prior to the commencement of construction we will be sure to discuss any planned oversize/overweight deliveries with the County and obtain any permits required. b. It is understood that an entrance permit and building permits for foundations will be required. c. It is understood that Hydro One will be building new lines along Doxee and Black Roads, however, SunEdison has no insight into the timing or details of this work or to the requirement for agreements between the County and Hydro One. However, SunEdison would be pleased to help facilitate any discussions with Hydro One the County may wish to have. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requested the County to provide additional details of the full costs associated with the noted municipal reviews and a conceptual pre-development agreement, if available, so that these could be included in the REA documentation. ▪ A Traffic Impact Study/Traffic Management Plan has been completed and previously circulated to the County. The Proponent will conduct road condition surveys both before and following the construction of the solar farm on the designated haul route, and SunEdison would bear the cost of any road repairs required as a result of the solar farm construction activity. ▪ A Conceptual Stormwater Management Plan has been completed and previously circulated to the County. ▪ A grading and sediment and erosion control plan is outlined in the Conceptual Stormwater Management Plan that has previously been circulated to the County.

Comments Received	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Require a Driver Reflectivity Analysis to determine the impact, if any, of solar glare on passing drivers and appropriate mitigation measures. ▪ Require an Emergency Response Plan to be developed by the Proponent in collaboration with the Fire Chief. ▪ That the Province develop a regulation requiring annual payment to the municipality from renewable energy projects in the amount of \$7,500 per megawatt plus profit sharing based upon 4% of output plus annual cost of living, exclusive of regular taxes and recovery costs. ▪ That the Province require the decommissioning plan to also address and include plans for repowering to provide ongoing operations of the subject site. ▪ That the Province create a rehabilitation security fund similar to the Aggregate Resources Act to recover the decommissioning of the site should the owner be delinquent. ▪ That the Province require identification of and mitigation measures to address the impact on the County's economy, particularly tourism-dependent business sector (e.g. retail, hospitality) during the construction phase of January to October, 2012. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While reflection from the solar facility will be very limited due to the fact that the panels will always be perpendicular to the sun, and therefore reflection will be directly back at the sun, SunEdison will provide the County with a reflection analysis. ▪ Section 6 of the Construction Plan and Section 2.4 of the Decommissioning Plan both provide ERPs. SunEdison will work with the Fire Chief to develop an acceptable Emergency Response Plan and provide 24-7 key contact information. ▪ This is addressed to the Province and is outside SunEdison's purview. The MOE REA manager was copied on the response. ▪ This is addressed to the Province and is outside SunEdison's purview. The MOE REA manager was copied on the response. However, this note is unclear. The solar farm would be likely only be decommissioned in the event that there is no remaining need for the power of the facility. ▪ This is addressed to the Province and is outside SunEdison's purview. The MOE REA manager was copied on the response. However, SunEdison has prepared a detailed Decommissioning Plan. ▪ This is addressed to the Province and is outside SunEdison's purview. The MOE REA manager was copied on the response.

5.2 Consultation Summary

Table 5-3 Summary of Municipal Consultation

Municipality & Consultation Date	Discussion Summary
<i>Prince Edward County</i>	
July 27, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hatch emailed the Prince Edward County Heritage Committee requesting information about cultural and built heritage potential in the area of the project.
July 15, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Prince Edward County Heritage Committee replied confirming that there are no known built heritage resources in the area of the subject property.
July 27, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hatch sent the Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project and Public Meeting, and two hard copies of the Project Description Report to both the Treasurer and Planning Services Department of Prince Edward County. The letters can be found in Appendix E.

Municipality & Consultation Date	Discussion Summary
November 1, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the subsequent first public meeting described in Section 2.1, Hatch sent another Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project and Public Meeting, and two hard copies of the Project Description Report to both the Treasurer and Planning Services Department of Prince Edward County. The letters can be found in Appendix E.
November 12, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch emailed Prince Edward County the Municipal Consultation Form, requesting it be filled out once all of the project reports were submitted. This email can be found in Appendix E. The completed Municipal Consultation Form is included in Appendix F.
September 19, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch mailed the Notice of Final Public Meeting to Prince Edward County with two copies of the project reports, requesting that they be made available for public review. The letters are included in Appendix E.
September 26, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch emailed Prince Edward County an updated Municipal Consultation Form listing the reports that had been submitted. The email is included in Appendix E.
September 29, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponent made a presentation with an overview of the project to Prince Edward County Council, highlighting the upcoming Final Public Meeting.
October 4, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponent emailed the Prince Edward County Council a diagram showing the distances between the nearest neighbours and the project components, as requested by Councilor Shortt. This email and diagram are included in Appendix E.
November 10, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prince Edward County produced a staff report to the Committee of the Whole for a meeting held on November 22, 2011.
November 21, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponent emailed Prince Edward County discussing some members of the public who had contacted the County to raise concerns about the project.
November 23, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prince Edward County requested time to submit more comments, following a Council meeting on December 20, 2011.
December 1, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponent replied to the County's request in an email explaining SunEdison's commitment to addressing all concerns, and the decision to move the project components further north.
December 6, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponent sent a letter to Prince Edward County agreeing to wait until after December 20, 2011 to submit the REA application. The Proponent also addressed each of the 12 'matters to be addressed' from the November 10, 2011 staff reports.
December 6, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proponent sent letters to Prince Edward County with a response to the public comments included in the agenda for the Committee of the Whole meeting on December 8, 2011.

5.2.1 Municipal Comments and Concerns

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

Table 5-4 Comment/Concerns from Municipalities and Responses

Municipality	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Prince Edward County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visual impacts, or perhaps glare, could be a concern with the public. ▪ Notices for the public meetings could be placed in the Wellington Times, the County Weekly, the Picton Gazette, and countylive.ca. ▪ There are no built or cultural heritage resources on the Project property. ▪ All required permits and authorizations will need to be obtained. ▪ The Proponent and municipality should make a pre-development agreement to cover municipal costs associated with the project. ▪ The Proponent should conduct a pre and post construction road condition survey. ▪ A reflectivity study should be performed. ▪ The Province should implement certain policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No response required. ▪ No response required. ▪ No response required. ▪ All required permits will be obtained. ▪ The Proponent requests more details about the costs. ▪ Road condition surveys will be conducted. ▪ The Proponent will conduct a reflectivity study. ▪ Comments for the Province were forwarded to the MOE REA manager.

6. Public Consultation

6.1 Summary of Comments

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

6.1.1 First Public Meeting, September 13, 2010 / December 9, 2010

Fourteen (14) people attended and signed the sign-in sheet of the First Public Meeting on September 13, 2010, and twelve (12) people attended and signed the sign-in sheet of the subsequent First Public Meeting on December 9, 2010. Generally, comments were positive with people enquiring about noise, safety and security, wildlife, site selection, socio-economic, and visual impacts. Seven (7) comment sheets were obtained from the First Public Meeting and two (2) comment sheets were obtained from the subsequent First Public Meeting on December 9, 2010. The Proponent wrote letters to the stakeholders who attended one of the first public meetings and responded to the comment sheets.

6.1.2 Final Public Meeting, November 8, 2011

Eighteen (18) people signed the sign-in sheet at the Final Public Meeting. Generally, comments were positive with people enquiring about noise, safety and security, wildlife, site selection, socio-economic, and visual impacts. Six (6) comment sheets were obtained from the Final Public Meeting. The Proponent wrote letters to the stakeholders who attended the Final Public Meeting and responded to the comment sheets.

6.1.3 Other Public Consultation

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

On December 17, 2010 a citizens' organization called the Alliance to Protect Prince Edward County sent Hatch an email asking a number of questions about the project. Hatch responded with a letter on February 2, 2011. On February 10, 2011 the Alliance to Protect Prince Edward County sent Hatch an email asking if there were plans for a Phase II or expansion of the Belleville TS Demorestville Solar Energy Project. On March 1, 2011, Hatch responded with an email. All correspondence with APPEC is included in Appendix D and all comments and concerns are included in Table 6-1.

A letter was received on January 8, 2011 describing concerns about visual and auditory impacts of the project. This letter was signed by 24 residents, and is included in Appendix D. The Proponent's response to this letter is also included in Appendix D. On December 9, 2011 the petition was updated with an additional 21 signatures.

In September-December 2011, the Proponent exchanged emails with a few concerned stakeholders. These emails are included in Appendix D.

On November 23, 2011 SunEdison had a meeting with four local residents who were representing the community surrounding the project. The neighbours had three specific requests and SunEdison agreed to meet each of them to the best of their ability. In an email the neighbours expressed acceptance and appreciation for SunEdison's commitments.

In November 2011 some community members distributed a flyer encouraging neighbours to attend the Final Public Meeting, fill out comment forms, and write to Council regarding the project. This flyer is included in Appendix D.

6.1.4 Public Comments and Concerns

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

Table 6-1 Comments/Concerns from Public and Responses

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Noise	<p>Concern about audible sound levels, modeling of low-frequency sound, and sound insulation measures.</p> <p>The substation is very close to two homes.</p> <p>The noise studies were done on the assumption that specific models of equipment would be used and therefore may be unreliable.</p> <p>It is our understanding that winds can affect noise levels and become more important as the distance increases. Prince Edward County has wind. We are not aware of any wind study in the Noise Report.</p> <p>Solar panels that are stationary are less noisy but the proposed facility will have moving panels.</p> <p>Can you explain how noise generated by an inverter + transformer + fan at 102 dBA is reduced to 27.6 dBA at 255 metres? How does this compare</p>	<p>The project will comply with all applicable regulations and guidelines. All inverters will be housed within soundproof enclosures.</p> <p>The location of the substation was chosen to be as far from the houses as possible, but still close to the Hydro One connection point. The homes are outside of the 40-dBA noise limit.</p> <p>The noise emission data for the inverters was provided by the manufacturer. If changes are made to the equipment, they would have to be reviewed and approved by the MOE, and the same noise regulations would still apply.</p> <p>The Noise Modeling Study and the preparation of the Noise Assessment Report was undertaken in accordance with Ministry of the Environment guidelines. More specifically, the study followed the “Basic Comprehensive Certificates of Approval (Air) – User Guide” (MOE, 2004). There is no requirement in the guide to take into account effects from wind.</p> <p>The mechanism that rotates the solar PV modules does not generate any significant noise. Ambient (existing) noise, including insect, bird and road noise, will more than likely exceed anything the solar farm will produce.</p> <p>Sound mitigation measures such as sound-proof walls and acoustical louvers lower the sound. The ground has a much greater influence in reducing the sound pressure level of an inverter/transformer cluster</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>to a wind turbine?</p> <p>Is the sound pressure level of the inverter of 102.2 equal to 97.2 base + 5.0 tonal penalty?</p> <p>Why are the cumulative values for each receptor not shown in Table 4.2 in the Noise Study?</p> <p>Are the noise levels shown averages over a full year or are they maximum values?</p> <p>Could you provide values for POR 3 and add this receptor to Table 4.2?</p> <p>Are the noise levels shown averaged over daytime hours only or over 24 hours?</p> <p>Have you modeled noise using the dBC scale?</p>	<p>compared to that generated by a wind turbine situation 80m above the ground.</p> <p>Yes, this is the sound pressure level prior to mitigation measures.</p> <p>They are shown for three representative receptors in Table 6.2 in Appendix C.</p> <p>The noise levels are the maximum operating noise emissions at 10° C and 70% humidity.</p> <p>The cumulative sound pressure level at POR 3 is 32.6 dBA.</p> <p>The estimated noise levels correspond to the maximum noise emission from the facility assuming a 24-hr operation at full capacity.</p> <p>At this time we have only modeled noise using A-weighted values (dBA).</p>
Visual	<p>Concern about visual impacts of Project. How will the Project consider visibility of the site from the road? Will there be a native vegetation buffer?</p> <p>How many houses will be in sight of the project?</p> <p>When the panels are at their steepest angle, how high will the tops be above the ground?</p> <p>How close to the property line will panels be installed?</p>	<p>The project will comply with all applicable regulations and guidelines. SunEdison has committed to planting and maintaining a native hedge or shrub to mitigate the visual impact of the project. The Proponent will work with directly affected neighbours to install mutually agreeable features.</p> <p>It is expected that one or two homes may be in sight of the project, depending upon the lines of sight and the time of year (i.e., whether the line of sight may be presently obstructed by any deciduous trees or coniferous trees).</p> <p>The panels will be approximately 6 to 7 feet tall at their steepest angle.</p> <p>The panels will be situated approximately (i) 20 metres from the east property line (i.e., between Lots 50 and 51), (ii) 50 metres from the south property line bordering Black</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>Will all power lines on the site run underground?</p> <p>Where will transformers or electrical substations be located? How close will these be to neighbouring homes?</p> <p>Onsite security lighting should be shaded and directed to reflect within the project site.</p> <p>A request was made to move the site location to be 90m back from Black Road.</p> <p>We understand that reflection is highest at certain times of the day and ask if those times have been particularly evaluated and reported in any studies done.</p> <p>The boundary fence and inverter housings should not be white or silver in colour.</p>	<p>Road, and (iii) 400 metres from Doxsee Road.</p> <p>Almost all the power lines are expected to run underground. At the very southwest corner of the site there will be a substation that will transform the voltage from the underground voltage up to a higher voltage. There will then be an overhead distribution line that runs along the north side of Black Road to its intersection with Doxsee Road, at which point it will then run northwest along the east side of Doxsee Road to connect to the existing Hydro One line that crosses the northern part of the property.</p> <p>The substation is located 288m to the nearest neighbour and the closest inverter is located 273m to the nearest neighbour.</p> <p>The Proponent will ensure that night-time lighting is kept to a minimum, and will incorporate shrouds, covers, and/or reflectors, that keep any lighting directly downward.</p> <p>The maximum distance the project location could be moved was 50m, due to the presence of a watercourse and significant forest to the north. This change was made as a result of public feedback.</p> <p>Solar PV modules are specifically engineered to absorb light, rather than reflect it. Nevertheless, appropriate landscaping and buffering will be provided.</p> <p>SunEdison will ensure that the fencing is coloured to fit in with the natural surroundings. The inverters and housings come in a standard neutral grey colour at this time. SunEdison will try to work with the manufacturers to investigate the possibility of additional colour schemes.</p>
Safety and Security	Concern about electricity and stray voltage.	The electricity output will not be dirty. The solar panel output is DC voltage which will be converted to AC voltage using inverters. Hydro One has established standards for harmonics and power quality that the Proponent is confident will meet, or exceed,

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
		<p>any concerns there may be with respect to this issue.</p> <p>Stray voltage occurs because of inadequate grounding and neutral current with a high impedance path. It can be aggravated on three phase lines by load imbalance. The proposed Demorestville project will connect to the Hydro One 44 kV line that connects to Belleville Transformer Station (TS) or Picton TS. The 44 kV line is ungrounded and a separate system from the rural system that supplies most of Prince Edward County. It is physically and literally isolated from contributing to stray voltage.</p>
Water: Surface, Ground, Stormwater	<p>A request for the monitoring of wells close to the site before, during and after construction of the proposed solar facility.</p> <p>I would be interested in learning where your water well location information came from.</p>	<p>The Proponent will contact and notify directly affected neighbours about our proposed ground water monitoring plan, and let these residents know that we are offering pre-construction, construction, and post construction well water monitoring.</p> <p>The water well information came from MOE's database of water wells, a windshield survey, and review of aerial photos.</p>
Terrestrial, Soil	None received.	None required.
Wetland	None received.	None required.
Wildlife	<p>Concern regarding impact to habitat that the Project will have. What considerations have been made to minimize impact to wildlife?</p> <p>How can an avian survey on one June day determine the state of migratory birds?</p>	<p>The project must meet Ministry of Natural Resources requirements for mitigating impacts to wildlife.</p> <p>Established evaluation criteria are used in determining what constitutes significant migration habitat. It was determined during the site surveys in the spring of 2011 (which included a formal Ontario Bird Breeding Atlas point count survey, and a vegetation and habitat assessment) that the Project Location would not constitute significant migration habitat as it is an active farm property.</p>
Restoration/ Re-vegetation	None received.	None required.
Technical	Will the solar panels track the sun? What is the directional sweep?	The solar panels will track the sun from east to west each day.
Agricultural	None received.	None required.
Cultural/Built Heritage	Our heritage home is within 300	We believe that you may be referring to a

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	metres of your proposed project. It is not “abandoned” as stated in your report on <i>Protected Properties and Heritage Resources</i> and we believe that your proposed facility would infringe on the enjoyment and value of our property	building on the Project property, not your home.
Archaeological	Construction Report (p. 2) notes that a Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment is needed prior to construction.	A Stage 3 Archaeology Assessment was performed, whereby the artefacts were excavated, photographed, and catalogued. The simple fact that the proposed solar farm is going through the permitting process and that an archaeology assessment was triggered has meant that otherwise unknown artefacts have been found and studied. This is actually a benefit to the MTC, the Community, and PEC given it furthers the study and knowledge of the history and culture in the area.
Socio- economic	<p>Interested in providing services to the Project, specifically construction activities (contractor, project management, etc.)</p> <p>The Project will only create one or two permanent jobs.</p> <p>Can you provide us with a ballpark number for the all-in cost of the project – all costs up to the point of starting commercial operation?</p>	<p>Response made to stakeholder, indicating that the contractor chosen will use local labour and materials to the extent possible.</p> <p>There will be extensive local job creation and procurement of supplies during the approximately 6-months of construction. Given SunEdison currently has (1) 9.1 MW solar farm in operation (FirstLight1), is constructing (1) 10 MW solar farm at Sandhurst, and has (6) other FIT contracts going through REA that will ultimately be constructed, there will be meaningful full time permanent jobs created in the area. In total, when or if all of these farms are constructed the estimate is for between 15 to 18 full time jobs.</p> <p>A 10MW solar farm can cost between \$50 and \$55 million to construct. With time, as volumes increase and manufacturing capacity is increased and improved, the costs will drop.</p>
Site Selection	<p>The site chosen is well suited for the project.</p> <p>Will there be a Phase Two of development?</p>	<p>No response required.</p> <p>Under the FIT program, the Proponent can only construct the one 10 MW solar facility that is being proposed for this property. A subsequent expansion of this facility on this property is not possible.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>The project covers a huge area.</p> <p>This facility is to be located on land deemed agricultural. There are other sites in the area that are not agricultural and where noise, reflection, visual ambience and real estate values are not issues.</p>	<p>SunEdison considers 36 hectares (89 acres) as a reasonable size for a 10 MW solar PV power plant.</p> <p>Under the Green Energy Act, renewable energy generation is permissible on lands zoned rural, light industrial and, depending on the soil classification, lands zoned for agriculture (Class 3 or higher).</p>
Other	<p>Concern about an increase in ambient temperature.</p> <p>Concern that very few residents pay for the Belleville Intelligencer newspaper, and instead read their news from the Picton Gazette, Wellington Times, and County Weekly News.</p> <p>There are incomplete and incorrect SunEdison reports regarding the proposed facility.</p> <p>We do not monitor the MOE's EBR web site and would like to be contacted when the MOE deems the project submission complete.</p> <p>There may be many more solar farms coming to Prince Edward County.</p> <p>Solar is more benign than wind.</p> <p>Concerns about abandonment of the project without proper decommissioning and clean up.</p>	<p>The resident was assured that there would be no increase in ambient temperature due to the presence of the solar farm.</p> <p>Hatch will post the Notice of Final Meeting in the Picton Gazette in addition to the Belleville Intelligencer newspaper.</p> <p>The 3 points the Group raised will be corrected in the reports and studies and we thank the Group for picking up these inaccuracies in the documentation.</p> <p>The Proponent will notify you when the MOE deems the project submission complete, and it is posted to the EBR.</p> <p>Regarding grid capacity, SunEdison (Miller) explained the process that developers go through and stated that grid capacity, or lack therefore, is the single biggest limiting factor to renewable energy development in the Province. In addition, the feeder SunEdison is connecting to has two other 10 MW projects connecting to it (Northland Power), therefore, it is extremely unlikely any additional 10 MW projects could connect.</p> <p>Agree regarding the comment about solar being "more benign than wind". In fact solar PV is one of the most, if not the most benign forms of power generation know to man.</p> <p>There will be residual value in all of the equipment at the end of the 20-year contract. The REA will have conditions that</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>Other projects in Ontario have carefully taken community feedback, reported that feedback, and included it in changes to subsequent reports. There is no evidence of this in any reports that we have read.</p> <p>It is our understanding that SunEdison has leased other land on Black Rd. and Doxsee Rd. Local residents should be given an opportunity to become aware of this as additional projects will have a tremendous impact on our small community.</p> <p>The information panels at the Final Public Meeting presented a modest amount of information and there were no written materials to supplement them.</p>	<p>require the Decommissioning Plan to be updated prior to decommissioning to further detail the planned activities. We respect the need to be a responsible long-term neighbour and maintain an efficient and tidy operation.</p> <p>SunEdison will provide the names and phone numbers of employees dedicated to this Project during Construction and throughout Operations. SunEdison has and will consider all of the community's and other stakeholder's comments and questions. SunEdison is committed to working with directly affected neighbours.</p> <p>This is the only contracted solar facility we are aware of in the immediate area. The 44kV Hydro One distribution line that the Demorestville solar farm would connect to has no additional capacity to accommodate another large-scale solar farm.</p> <p>In total there were 16 display panels which provided information about the Proponent, the REA process, the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the project, water body and natural feature information, the proposed facilities and potential environmental effects and mitigation. Furthermore, hard copies of all the draft study reports were available at the open house for review.</p>
Positive Feedback	<p>Like the idea of solar panels and making good use of the land.</p> <p>Recommendation to MOE to consider loosening stiff regulations.</p> <p>Project Location a good fit for solar panels and will be good for the county.</p>	<p>No response required.</p> <p>No response required.</p> <p>No response required.</p>

7. Consideration of Public, Municipal and Aboriginal Input

7.1 Alterations to the Proposal to Engage in the Project

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

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

Comment / Concern	Alteration to the Project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that very few residents pay for the Belleville Intelligencer newspaper, and instead read their news from the Picton Gazette, Wellington Times, and County Weekly News. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hatch posted the Notice of Final Meeting in the Picton Gazette in addition to the Belleville Intelligencer newspaper.

7.2 Alterations to the Required REA Reports

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

Table 7-2 Alterations to the Required REA Reports

Comment / Concern	Alteration to the Reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Move the project as far away from Black Road as possible ▪ Use native vegetative buffers to mitigate the visual impact as much as possible ▪ Onsite security lighting should be shaded and directed to reflect within the project site. ▪ We do not monitor the MOE's EBR web site and would like to be contacted when the MOE deems the project submission complete. ▪ A request for the monitoring of wells close to the site before, during and after construction of the proposed solar facility. ▪ Reflectivity is a concern. ▪ There are incomplete and incorrect SunEdison reports regarding the proposed facility ▪ The County requires a Road Condition Survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The entire Project was shifted 30m north, resulting in a 50m setback from Black Rd. In order to accomplish this, the Natural Heritage Assessment and Water Body Assessment reports were amended. ▪ SunEdison has committed to working with the neighbours to develop an agreeable landscaping plan that will mitigate visual impact. ▪ SunEdison will ensure that night-time lighting is kept to a minimum, ensure that lighting is directed downward and use motion detectors where possible. ▪ SunEdison will notify the members of the public who signed the petition when the Demorestville MOE submission is posted to the EBR, as well as communicate with them the commitments we are making. ▪ SunEdison will directly notify affected neighbours about the proposed ground water monitoring plan. ▪ SunEdison will perform a Reflectivity Study. ▪ The 3 points the residents raised were corrected in the reports and studies. ▪ The Proponent will conduct road condition surveys both before and following the construction of the solar farm on the designated haul route.