

# Ostrander Point Wind Energy Park Themed Response Document

## Draft REA Reports and April 2011 Public Meeting

The following has been prepared in response to the most common questions/concerns raised by stakeholders during the review of the Draft Renewable Energy Approval (REA) reports issued in February 2011 and at/following the public meeting held on April 12, 2011. The purpose of this document is to provide stakeholders with a general response to their questions/concerns. Questions are set out in bold and Italic font below, with responses following in regular font. Questions have been worded in an attempt to capture similar questions/concerns.

Please note that comments received via comment card/email and the applicable responses have been documented within the Consultation Report and will be included as part of Gilead's REA Application.

### Health and Safety

---

***Will there be health impacts as a result of the turbines being located near existing residences? Where can I obtain a copy of the studies used to support your conclusions regarding health effects displayed at the public meeting?***

A detailed review of available information related to public health and safety has been provided within the Draft REA reports (available online at [www.gileadpower.com](http://www.gileadpower.com)) and will be included in the final REA reports. Specifically, the Draft Construction Plan Report and Draft Design and Operations Report discuss the potential health and safety impacts associated with the Project. We have concluded that with the implementation of appropriate construction and operations protocols, there is minimal increased or new risk to public health and safety from the Project. In addition, under O. Reg. 359/09, minimum setback requirements (which this Project meets) were introduced by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) specifically to ensure the protection of people and the environment from wind farm projects.

### Natural Environment

---

***How will Gilead protect Blanding's Turtle when the project is located in the middle of its permanent habitat?***

Gilead has applied for an *Endangered Species Act* (ESA) permit with respect to Blanding's Turtle. Under the ESA, Gilead must demonstrate an overall benefit to the species in order to obtain the permit.

As detailed in the REA reports (specifically the Natural Heritage Assessment/Environmental Impact Study (NHA/EIS)) Gilead designed the project layout with specific consideration to minimizing impacts to Blanding's Turtle and specifically to minimizing the amount of habitat directly impacted. Additional mitigation measures included Gilead postponing Project construction from August to October so that construction activities take place outside of the timing windows when Blanding's Turtle would be present and active onsite. Gilead has also committed to habitat creation for Blanding's Turtle to provide overall net benefit to the species.

***I don't think that wind projects should be located in an Important Bird Area (IBA). How will Gilead guarantee the protection of migratory birds along the South Shore IBA?***

The land portion of the South Shore IBA stretches from Prince Edward Point to Point Petre and north to Army Reserve Road, of which the Ostrander Project occupies only approximately 0.2%.

O. Reg. 359/09 and MNR guidance documents (*Bats and Bat Habitats: Guidelines for Wind Power Projects and Birds and Bird Habitats: Guidelines for Wind Power Projects*) do not prohibit development in IBA's. However, siting projects within IBA's requires more detailed preconstruction studies to determine potential impacts of the wind farm on birds and bats. Environment Canada was consulted regarding the field program to assess potential impacts of the Ostrander Project and also provided input on the draft Environmental Review Report (February 2009). Environment Canada also provided recommendations for mitigation and monitoring to be conducted during and post-construction of the Ostrander Project. These recommendations have been incorporated into the Construction Plan Report and Design and Operations Report. Environment Canada's comments are provided in Appendix C of the NHA/EIS report.

The NHA/EIS discusses the significance of the Ostrander site for migratory birds including an area of significant wildlife habitat in the form of seasonal concentration areas – stopover habitat for migratory landbirds. The potential effects to birds using this habitat and mitigation measures to minimize these effects are discussed in the NHA/EIS. The NHA/EIS report indicates that it is anticipated that bird mortality (per MW) would be similar to nearby facilities, and that experts believe the level of mortality at wind energy facilities during migration is not believed to be significant at the population level.

In addition, as detailed in the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan, Gilead will implement mitigation measures including operational controls if mortality thresholds developed by the MNR are exceeded by the Project. The operational controls include periodic turbine shutdown which would effectively eliminate the potential for additional bird mortalities above threshold numbers during critical migration periods.

***I feel that Stantec's studies are inadequate for addressing the potential impacts to migrating waterfowl.***

Results of the extensive on-site work programs (over four years) have concluded the Ostrander site does not support significant concentrations of staging waterfowl or colonial waterbirds/shorebirds. As such, these groups of birds are not anticipated to be impacted by the Project. If the mortality thresholds are exceeded, a contingency plan consisting of additional mitigation measures will be implemented to address unexpected impacts. Additional information has been provided in the NHA/EIS.

***Has Stantec determined the cumulative effects of the various turbine projects in the South Shore IBA?***

Gilead had initiated an assessment of cumulative effects in the earlier environmental assessment process under the *Environmental Assessment Act*. Consideration of cumulative effects is not specifically contemplated by O. Reg. 359/09, with the exception of the noise assessment completed and contained within the Design and Operations Report. However, in response to public feedback, Gilead has

undertaken an assessment of the contributions its project could have on the environment in conjunction with other nearby wind projects. This assessment will be filed within the Consultation Report as part of Gilead's REA Application.

***How will Gilead guarantee the protection of raptors in an area where raptors migrate in the fall?***

Raptor migration has been studied at the site for three years. Unlike other sites such as Wolfe Island, the Ostrander site does not appear to support wintering or staging raptors.

Raptor mortality and disturbance effects have been studied at other Ontario wind facilities including those along the Lake Erie shoreline, where the numbers of migrating raptors are much greater than those observed at the Ostrander site. Observed raptor mortality at facilities such as Erie Shores and Port Alma during migration is low relative to the number of raptors passing through. This observation is likely because raptors see and are therefore able to avoid the turbine blades.

To ensure the ongoing protection of raptors, Gilead has committed to follow a threshold approach to protect raptors. Raptor mortality is considered to be significant at 2 raptors/wind power project if there are less than 10 turbines. The MNR indicates that turbine-related mortality below this threshold is unlikely to affect bird populations. If mortality is above this threshold at Ostrander, Gilead will employ contingency measures which include periodic shut-down of turbines or blade feathering at specific times of year. Details are provided in the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan for the Project.

***What scientific proof do you have to guarantee that low frequency sound as well as infrasound and vibrations from wind turbines will not negatively impact wildlife?***

Low frequency noise (LFN) is the term used to describe sound energy in the low but audible region ranging from approximately 10 to 200 Hz. LFN is almost always present in a quiet background setting and is produced by machinery, vehicles, and natural sources including wind, waves, and thunder. To date there is no direct evidence of significant impacts to wildlife as a result of wind turbine noise or vibration.

***It was stated that bat populations would not be affected, however I believe the Wolfe Island Wind Project data demonstrates otherwise. How will bats be protected?***

Bat mortality rates at wind energy facilities are highly variable among regions. Some species of migratory bats are particularly vulnerable, and mortality peaks during the late summer and early fall migration. The MNR, which is the agency responsible for protecting bats, has produced detailed and prescriptive guidelines for post-construction monitoring of bat mortality, and mandatory mitigation requirements for facilities with high bat mortality. A threshold of 10 bats/turbine/year has been established. Post-construction monitoring for bat mortality will occur at the Ostrander Wind Energy Park in accordance with standard protocols established by MNR. If the mortality at Ostrander exceeds the threshold, operational mitigation including periodic turbine shut down or blade feathering at specific times of the year would be required for the duration of the project.

***I am concerned that the Stantec reports are not based on local knowledge or experts (e.g. PECFN, Terry Sprague, and the Prince Edward Point Bird Observatory).***

The NHA/EIS uses existing information including the Prince Edward Point Bird Observatory banding records and information contained within the Prince Edward County South Shore Important Bird Area Conservation Plan. Under O. Reg. 359/09 the proponent of a project must also undertake a site specific investigation of the lands in and within 120 m of the Project Location.

***What will you do if bird / bat fatalities are significant? Will turbines be decommissioned?***

As described above, Gilead has committed to following a threshold approach to identify and mitigate potentially significant bird and bat mortality, on the basis of the MNR's *Birds and Bird Habitats: Guidelines for Wind Power Projects and Bats* and *Bat Habitats: Guidelines for Wind Power Projects*. A threshold of 18 birds/turbine/year and 2 raptors/wind power project (for projects such as Ostrander that are less than 10 turbines) has been established. These guidelines are understood to have been established on the basis that turbine-related mortality below threshold levels are unlikely to affect bird populations. If mortality is above the thresholds, Gilead will employ contingency measures which includes periodic shut-down of turbines or blade feathering at specific times of year. A threshold of 10 bats/turbine/year has been established. If the mortality threshold for bats is exceeded, operational mitigation including periodic turbine shut down or blade feathering at specific times of the year would be required for the duration of the project. Details are provided in the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan for the Project. Given these mitigation measures to minimize impacts, the Project will not be decommissioned; rather the mitigation measures will be implemented to ensure impacts remain within the MNR's acceptable thresholds.

***How will the Project impact butterflies which may migrate through the area?***

The inland routes of fall migrating monarch butterflies can change from year to year based upon availability of resources (Monarch Watch, 2006). However, general patterns in movement do occur, in particular the routes used to cross the Great Lakes. If winds are blowing in a favourable off-shore direction, then migrating monarchs will maintain their height, passing above the Great Lakes. However, if there is on-shore winds, monarchs will tend to move along the north shore of the Great Lakes until they come to a peninsula where they congregate in staging areas until winds become favourable (C. Taylor, pers. comm., 2006).

The majority of fall migrating monarchs in Ontario use three such staging areas: Point Pelee, Long Point, and Presqu'île Point in Prince Edward County. Most of the eastern Ontario population of monarchs are believed to cross Lake Ontario from the Presqu'île Point staging site. As many as 8,000 monarchs have been recorded at Presqu'île Point during a single day (Friends of Presquile, undated). Prince Edward Point is also used to a lesser extent. Site investigations conducted at the Ostrander Subject Property indicated that while monarch butterflies were observed at the site during the fall migration period, the site did not support substantial numbers and did not provide significant wildlife habitat in the form of a butterfly stopover site.

The migratory monarch butterfly achieves flight heights significantly greater than most resident butterflies. During migration, this species attains heights above turbine blade sweep range (i.e. greater than 125 m) for approximately three-quarters of daylight hours under ideal wind conditions (i.e., off-shore winds of less than 10 km/h), descending at night to form communal roosts in trees (Calvert, 2001).

If winds are blowing in a favourable off-shore direction, then migrating monarchs from the north generally pass over the Great Lakes without stopping. Under these conditions, migrating monarchs that use this area would be passing over Ostrander at heights well above the turbines. Potential interaction with the Project would only occur when monarchs return to ground level in the evening, during bad weather, or to feed. However, given the relatively small size of the study area (when compared to the broad front of monarch movement through southern Ontario) and the relative lack of high quality habitat at the Ostrander site, the probability of large numbers of monarchs returning to the ground directly into the area of wind turbines is quite low.

Breeding monarchs generally fly at low attitudes (i.e., 0.5 – 3 m above the ground) and would thus be at low risk to collisions with wind turbines.

***What are the effects of herbicides used to control growth around turbines?***

Growth of natural vegetation will not be controlled via the use of herbicides during any phase of the Project.

***Have new boreholes been drilled at the revised turbine locations and provided in an updated report? If not, when will this work be completed and a report produced?***

Additional on-site geotechnical investigations were carried out in late 2010 based on the current Project layout. The REA Application (within the Construction Plan Report) will contain a copy of the Geotechnical Report that was prepared following the on-site investigations.

## **Roads**

---

***How will you construct the bed of the 5.4 km proposed road? Where do you propose to obtain the necessary bed material? Where will you dispose of the overlaid material from the new access roads?***

All details regarding the construction of the Project including the roads have been provided in the REA reports (specifically the Construction Plan Report). This report identifies the types of material to be required, where the material will be obtained and disposed of, and mitigation measures that will be implemented to minimize any potential impacts associated with Project construction. Copies of the REA reports will remain available on the Project website ([www.gileadpower.com](http://www.gileadpower.com)).

***Who is proposed to monitor the use of the roads, speed limits, protect the species at risk breeding on-site and public access to the turbines and related equipment?***

During the construction phase of the Project, environmental professionals will be on-site in addition to construction personnel conducting work in accordance with the commitments (including adherence to speed limits and delineated work areas) identified within the REA reports and MNR Class EA. During

operation, maintenance staff will be routinely on-site conducting maintenance activities. Contact information will also be made available to local residents to contact Gilead/operations firm to address concerns including misuse of the site (e.g. speeding, vandalism).

Post-construction monitoring (as detailed within the REA reports) will also take place on-site to ensure the Project is operating within the defined limits as prescribed by applicable permits/regulations (e.g. mortality monitoring of bird species). Additional monitoring related to species at risk will be identified within the applicable endangered species permits to be obtained by Gilead.

In addition, to the best of our knowledge there is no monitoring of use of the existing road network on the site.

***I feel the reports do not give sufficient weight to road construction impacts to Blanding's Turtle including impacts associated with changes to the drainage patterns. In addition, have hydrogeological studies been conducted?***

On-site investigations were carried out to assess for the presence of watercourses, flow patterns and aquatic resources (as detailed in the Water Report). Field observations indicate that the site typically ponds water and does not flow/drain in a specific pattern (e.g. towards Lake Ontario). Mitigation measures including minimum setbacks to wetlands, construction of access roads at/near grade and use of permeable materials for access roads and crane pads will be implemented. Effects to the hydrology of the site are predicted to be negligible. Hydrological monitoring will occur during and post-construction. Details are provided in the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan for the Project.

***How will Gilead guarantee the protection of the rare alvar habitat being destroyed by the roads without causing serious and irreversible harm? I believe that the alvar habitat in the area is one of only three places in the world and the only one in North America.***

Alvar habitats are found in a number of locations in the Great Lakes Basin. The Great Lakes Alvar Working Group has identified and assessed more than 120 alvar sites in the Great Lakes Basin. In Ontario, alvar sites occur primarily within a series of nine clusters including Manitoulin Island, the Bruce Peninsula, the Carden Alvar and the Napanee Plain. See "the Great Lakes Alvars" published by the Federation of Ontario Naturalists.

While alvar habitat is locally common in Prince Edward County these vegetation communities are considered provincially rare vegetation communities. A description of the alvar communities is available in the NHA/EIS. The project will result in the direct loss of 1.7% of the alvar habitat on the Ostrander site. This will be compensated through the restoration of 4.2 ha of meadow habitats to alvar, and the management of invasive species in retained alvar habitat (these compensation plans are being developed as part of the Alvar Management Plan in conjunction with the MNR).

***How will you guarantee that a 60 m x 60 m gravel parking lot will not disrupt wildlife nesting areas and degrade the ecology of the area?***

Habitat removal for the gravel parking lot is 0.3 ha of the 324 ha site. The potential for impacts from habitat loss and fragmentation on the Project site are discussed in the NHA/EIS. In addition, the proposed parking lot has been reduced in size from 60 m x 60 m to 21 m x 47 m.

Mitigation measures including post-construction monitoring of disturbance effects and an alvar restoration plan are proposed. Details are provided in the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan for the Project.

***Has there been a study of the potential usage of the roads by the public. I believe public safety could be at risk for public users of the roads.***

Due to the existing limited use of the site, that the site contains existing roads, and that the roads are intended for the use of Project personnel only (although they will be open to the public), no traffic/usage study was determined to be required. In addition, mitigation measures will be implemented including speed limits and information postings to deter the misuse of the roads by members of the public. Contact numbers for Project personnel will also be posted and made available to members of the public to notify Project personnel of improper use of the site.

With regards to public safety, according to the requirements of O. Reg. 359/09, setbacks do not apply to access roads required for Project construction/operation. However, information postings will be made at the site regarding potential safety hazards such as shedding ice. Members of the public will be expected to exercise caution when using the site during events that could result in increased safety hazards (e.g. icing events).

***Will drainage of the site be changed as a result of the new roads? If so, water movement changes could directly affect the sport fishing industry.***

Site investigations were carried out to assess for the presence of watercourses, flow patterns and aquatic resources (as detailed in the Water Report). Field observations indicated that the site typically ponds water and does not flow/drain in a specific pattern (e.g. towards Lake Ontario). As such, drainage of the site will not be impacted by the presence of the access roads and culverts may be installed in locations where ponding of water typically occurs so that water can disperse throughout the site.

In addition, the Project is not predicted to have a net effect on any permanent watercourses and aquatic resources including sport fishing resources. However, aquatic monitoring will be implemented as part of the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan to ensure aquatic flora and fauna are protected.

***Given the shallow depth to bedrock, will blasting be required to install a 1 m deep access road?***

Blasting will not be utilized for the installation of the access roads or turbine foundations. Where shallow bedrock occurs, the depth of the access road will be reduced so that the road is as close to the existing grade as feasible.

## Economics

---

***I believe the area in question is a major tourist area for birds, banding, hiking, and photography. As a result the Project will have a negative economic impact on the County including tourism. The tourism corridor is the entire County, not just the Wine and Taste Trail.***

The Project will contribute economically to the local economy within Prince Edward County. Gilead will pay municipal taxes for the site which are expected to be approximately \$50,000 per year. In addition, approximately \$2.3 million in construction expenditures are estimated to accrue to persons and business in the local area. Due to the Project's remote location within the County, the Project is not anticipated to have a negative impact on the County's tourism industry.

***I believe property values will be negatively affected. I am a real estate broker and have proof that people are avoiding the area because of turbines. What studies were used in your assessment of potential property value impacts?***

Gilead acknowledges public comments and concerns related to potential property value impacts. Based upon the published reports reviewed to date in other areas with established wind plants, there is little evidence of a material negative effect on property value as a result of the presence of wind plants. Studies used to support this conclusion have been provided on the Project website ([www.gileadpower.com](http://www.gileadpower.com)) under the Reference Materials section and were provided at the April public meeting.

***Will Gilead compensate home owners if there is a decrease in property values?***

Gilead does not intend to compensate home owners for any changes (either positive or negative) to property values.

***The term "up to 50%" of the peak labour force means that it could be 1 – 50%. Please elaborate on the potential construction related jobs.***

Local goods and services will be used during the construction phase of the Project when available in sufficient quantity and at competitive prices. We estimate that approximately over \$2.3 million in construction expenditures will accrue to persons and businesses in the local area. Where qualified, skilled trades are available, the key construction related activities accruing to the local area may include:

- Construction of concrete pads for the wind towers.
- Road construction.
- Power pole erection and mechanical installations.
- Electrical installations.
- Site security during construction.

Contractor and construction contracts will be developed following the detailed design stage of the Project.

## **Hydro One Distribution (Transmission) Line**

---

### ***What is the transmission line route? Will the transmission lines be buried?***

As described within the REA Reports and at the previous public meeting, Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One) will be responsible for the design, construction and operation of the distribution line that will connect the Project to the provincial grid. Hydro One has not yet indicated a preferred route for the distribution line. Hydro One has also not yet identified the design aspects (e.g. route, above/below ground) of the distribution line.

### ***How do the turbines hook up to the grid?***

A step-up transformer, located within the base of each turbine tower, is required to transform the electricity generated by each turbine to a common collection system line voltage. From each step-up transformer, 34.5 kV underground collector lines carry the electricity to the proposed 34.5 kV/44 kV transformer at the on-site substation (near the intersection of Babylon Road and Helmer Road). The collector lines will be buried parallel to the access roads. An outgoing 44 kV grid interconnection line (58 m long) will be constructed above ground from the substation to connect to the proposed Hydro One distribution line at Babylon Road. Hydro One will be responsible for the design, construction, and operation of the distribution line from the Project boundary at Babylon Road to the Milford Distribution Station.

## **Traffic and County Road Impacts**

---

### ***I have not seen any final information with respect to the transportation route to the site including hours of operation, nor have I seen a completed traffic study. Will truck traffic be able to avoid the "morning commute"?***

Details regarding the potential transportation routes to the site have been provided within the REA reports. Discussions are currently taking place with Prince Edward County and City of Quinte West staff related to the development of a Traffic Management Plan to address aspects such as the identification of the transportation route(s), road upgrades/repairs, and traffic planning issues. Construction activities, including component delivery, will take place Monday to Friday during regular working hours. Construction vehicles will be instructed to drive to posted municipal speed limits off-site and limited to a maximum speed limit of 15 km/hr on-site.

### ***Who will pay for road repairs/upgrades?***

Any damages/repairs to local roads as a result of Project construction including the transportation of Project components will be the responsibility of Gilead. Gilead has also committed to develop a Traffic Management Plan with the County to specifically address local concerns related to the transport of Project components and impacts to County roads/traffic.

***Will Gilead compensate businesses if there is a loss in business as a result of construction activities along the haul routes (dust, traffic, access, hydro interruptions)?***

For two years, Gilead has been working with Public Works staff at Prince Edward County and the City of Quinte West to determine the route for transporting turbine components to the site. The majority of the roads considered are paved with the exception of the section of Babylon Road leading to the site entrance. The final route will be determined in discussion with the municipalities and Gilead has committed to completing any necessary repairs to roads as a result of the project. Gilead does not expect any material business interruption as a result of transporting turbine components or construction activities.

## **Decommissioning**

---

***Who is responsible for decommissioning? Gilead should be required to establish a fund/bond to guarantee removal in the event of bankruptcy.***

Gilead is responsible for the decommissioning of the Project including the cost of component removal. Gilead has committed to returning the site to a safe and clean condition after decommissioning of the Project in accordance with MNR requirements to be determined prior to decommissioning.

O. Reg. 359/09 does not require the proponent to provide a fund/bond for the decommissioning of the Project in the event of bankruptcy. Gilead plans to construct over 700 MW of renewable energy over the next 10 years in order to assist the Province to achieve its provincial policy objectives under the Green Energy and Economy Act. Gilead is a company that is well financed and able to complete the development of renewable energy projects across Ontario.

## **Public Consultation**

---

***Why did the MOE instruct Gilead to hold another public meeting?***

Section 16.(1) of O. Reg. 359/09 states that two public meetings must be held. Gilead had previously held only one public meeting under the O. Reg. 359/09 process. As such, Gilead hosted a second public meeting on April 12, 2011 in accordance with the Regulation.

***I believe that a public meeting should include an oral presentation and question and answer period. I did not have the opportunity to hear as a whole the public responses.***

The layout of the public meeting was similar to the layout at previous events and was designed to allow individual stakeholders or small groups to review display boards while having the opportunity to directly ask questions of study team members at each display board. This format allows for multiple discussions to occur at the same time instead of one question and answer at a time in an “open forum” type format. Some people are also uncomfortable asking questions in front of a large group. Gilead was prepared to accommodate an “open forum” period for all attendees had there been sufficient interest or requests at the public meeting.

***I feel there was no balance regarding the information provided. As a result, the members of the community were not provided with the evidence regarding risks to health.***

The information provided via the display boards and reference material was a summary of the information provided within the Draft REA reports. The Draft REA reports were available more than 60 days prior to the meeting and were also provided at the meeting. Stakeholders were provided with all of the information gathered for the Project including a detailed review of the potential effects to public health and safety within the Draft REA reports. The display boards and additional reference materials were simply summarizing tools and were used to display the key results of the Draft REA reports.

***Multiple environmental organizations have called for a cancellation of the project. How can you maintain that you are “listening” to public input?***

Gilead has consulted with members of the public and environmental organizations since 2007 regarding this Project including responding to all comments received from these organizations. “Listening” to public input does not always require agreement with comments being provided, however we have always ensured that all comments have been taken into consideration and have been responded to in a meaningful manner.

***Why has Stantec not made it public that they are a member of the Canadian Wind Energy Association? Based on Stantec’s involvement, how can Stantec’s assessment not be biased?***

Stantec was founded in 1954 and provides independent, professional consulting services in a broad range of fields including environmental sciences, planning and engineering. Stantec staff are formally educated and trained. The Stantec professionals are leaders in their respective fields and maintain the highest standards of personal and professional integrity.

Stantec is a member of a number of industry associations in a variety of sectors. Membership serves as a mechanism to stay abreast of industry activities, policies, learning and information exchange opportunities and other industry initiatives. The Canadian Wind Energy Association publishes its member directory on its website, which is publically accessible.

## **Other Comments**

---

***PEC Council has requested a moratorium on wind projects until health studies are completed. Will you honor the PEC Council motion? If not how can you position yourself that this project has been accepted by the public?***

Gilead is aware of the PEC Council request for a moratorium to the Ontario Government. Gilead will continue to discuss the Project with PEC Council and staff to address any ongoing concerns they may have regarding the Project.

***What are the impacts to the water table as a result of the construction of the Project? Will water testing take place before and after construction? What will Gilead do to ensure drinking water is protected and restored if impacted?***

As noted in Section 3.1 of the Construction Plan Report, there is potential for groundwater to be encountered during the installation of the turbine foundations, access roads, and underground collector lines. If encountered, groundwater seepage will be controlled during grubbing and stripping and during subsequent excavation and fill placement. As such, it is possible that some temporary and local dewatering activities may be required when installing the tower foundations, access roads, and/or underground collector lines. However, it is unlikely that quantities withdrawn will exceed the threshold for the MOE's requirement for a Temporary Permit to Take Water (i.e. >50,000 L per day) let alone negatively affect off-site groundwater quality, quantity, or movement.

If well water quality or quantity is disturbed as a direct result of construction (either by the installation of Project infrastructure or from component transportation), Gilead will provide a temporary potable water supply until corrective measures are taken and will comply with MOE Guideline B-9: Resolution of Groundwater Interference Problems.

***Why build in such a populated area and not up north (James Bay)? A fire at the site could have devastating impacts on neighbouring properties.***

The site has a proven wind resource due to its location along the Lake Ontario shoreline, has transmission capacity at the Milford DS, and is suitable for wind energy development based on the results of the REA reports and the willingness by MNR to provide a Commercial Wind Energy Lease for the site. Developments are also proposed by Gilead and other developers for Projects within northern Ontario, however not all wind power can be established in that region alone (due to various factors including transmission capacity).

With respect to potential fire hazards, as detailed in the Construction Plan Report, an Emergency Response Plan in addition to a plan for forest fire prevention and preparedness (in accordance with MNR and County requirements) will be developed by the construction contractor and/or Gilead. These plans will be developed with input from the County (Fire Chief) to determine the extent of emergency response resources and response actions of those involved. The plan will be finalized and provided to the MNR and County prior to construction.

***I believe this Project should be studied as an Individual Environmental Assessment.***

The Project is being assessed under O. Reg. 359/09 which requires proponents to obtain a REA issued under the *Environmental Protection Act*. The requirement to conduct an "Individual Environmental Assessment" is a requirement of separate legislation (*Environmental Assessment Act*) that no longer applies to this Project.

***If Gilead is sold or becomes bankrupt, will the new owner(s) be bound to the agreed upon terms and conditions of the project?***

Yes, the new owner would be bound to the conditions of the REA approval.

***If this Project is to be located completely on Crown land, why has Gilead purchased two additional land parcels north of the Project site?***

Gilead has purchased additional lands around the Project site for the purposes of habitat creation/restoration in accordance with the anticipated conditions of the ESA permits for Blanding's Turtle and Whip-poor-will. Gilead is committed to providing an overall net benefit to these species which includes the creation of more habitat than will be removed for the purposes of the Project.

***What is the construction schedule of the Project?***

Construction is currently planned for October 2011 with commercial operation commencing in early 2012.

***Gilead claims to be a green company, but what other types of energy development projects are Gilead involved in (e.g. tar sands)?***

Gilead Power Corporation is a renewable energy company that believes that wind energy is an important resource to Ontario's energy future. Gilead currently conducts business solely in the wind industry.