

Appendix C

Agency Correspondence

REOT

District NHA Records Review for Renewable Energy Projects

WDP Canada: Napier

Wind, Solar, Biomass

Ministry of Natural Resources

Renewable Energy Operation Team

August 11, 2011

Revised August 29, 2011

NHA Records Review

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------|---|
| Project Name: | Napier Wind Project | | | |
| Project Location: NOTE: project is north of Napperton Dr., East of Kerwood Rd and south of the 402 | MNR District | Aylmer | Municipality | Adelaide |
| | | | Adelaide-Metcalf Township | Geo.Twp, Lot(s) & Con(s) Pt. Lt 8, Con4 SER as in 528316 Pt Lt 10 con 4 SER as in D15467 and 77936, except 528317 |
| Applicant: | wpd Canada Corporation (contact: Khlaire Parre khlaire@wdp-canada.ca) | | Phone #: | 905-813-8400 |
| | | | Address: | 2233 Argentia Road Mississauga, ON L5N 2X7 |
| Consultant: | None selected at this time | | Phone #: | |
| | | | Address: | |
| Generation type: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> wind onshore | <input type="checkbox"/> wind offshore | <input type="checkbox"/> solar | <input type="checkbox"/> biomass/biogas |
| Nameplate Capacity: | 5.4 MW | | | |
| Name of MNR Records Reviewer: | Maryjo Tait and Heather Riddell Revised by Amy Cameron | | | |
| Date Records Compiled: | August 11, 2011 Revised August 29, 2011 (by AC) Revised January 3, 2011 (by AC) | | | |
| What Ecodistrict is the project located in? | 7E | | | |

| Feature Type | Present within 120m of project location <small>(yes, no, unknown, N/A)</small> | Present within project location <small>(yes, no, unknown, N/A)</small> | MNR Comments <small>(comments may expand on information provided and/or may include relevant records within the vicinity that were not within project location or 120m of project area)</small> | Information Source <small>(NHIC, district staff, etc. Include the data layer name where possible)</small> |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Provincial Park | No | No | Indicated there are no PP in the records review report and do not carry forward to site investigation. | NRVIS – PP/CR layer |
| Conservation Reserve | No | No | Indicated there are no CR in the records review report and do not carry forward to site investigation. | NRVIS – PP/CR layer |
| Earth Science ANSI* | No | No | Indicated there are no CR in the records review report and do not carry forward to site investigation. | NRVIS – ANSI layer |
| Life Science ANSI | No | No | Ausable River Valley Life Science ANSI is ~13km away Indicated there are no Life Science ANSIs in the records review report and do not carry forward to site investigation. | NRVIS – ANSI layer |
| Wetland | Unknown | Unknown | Kerwood Swamp PSW is ~340m away | NRVIS – evaluated wetland layer |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|---------|--|--|
| | | | | | Wooded area within 120 m of project location could potentially be wetland. Should be investigated determine whether its woodland/wetland using OWES criteria. | |
| Woodland | | Yes | Unknown (cannot tell from shapefile where the exact project location is) | | Woodland within 120 m of project location at the south end of the project along Kerwood Road. Drainage feature appears to go through the woodland. Woodland could potentially be wet and should be further investigated to determine if it is a woodland/wetland. Another woodland appears to touch on the edge of the 120 m buffer at the north end of the project location. Several hedgerows within 120 m of the project location (possibly crossed by the project) | NRVIS – SWOOP imagery and wooded area layer |
| Valleyland | | Unknown | Unknown | | The District Office does not possess Valleylands mapping. Recommend applicant contact the local conservation authority for Valleylands data to complete the records review. Carry forward to site investigation. | Conservation Authority likely has mapping available. Contact St. Clair Region Conservation Authority to obtain this information. |
| Significant Wildlife Habitat | Habitats of Seasonal Concentrations of Animals | Winter deer yards | No | No | Winter deer yards are not common in the general area. Include this information in Records Review and do not carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Moose late winter habitat | Does not apply to the project location | | Include this information in Records Review and do not carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Colonial-Nesting bird breeding habitat (bank and cliff swallows) | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Colonial-Nesting bird breeding habitat (tree/shrub) | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Colonial-Nesting bird breeding habitat (ground) | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Waterfowl stopover and staging areas (terrestrial) | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Waterfowl stopover and staging areas (aquatic) | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Waterfowl nesting habitats | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Shorebird migratory stopover areas | Does not apply to the project location | | Project location is greater than 5km from the Great Lakes shoreline. Include this information in Records Review and do not carry | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---------|--|-------|
| | | | | forward to site investigation. | |
| | Landbird (songbird) migratory stopover areas | Does not apply to the project location | | Project location is greater than 5 km from Great Lakes shoreline (SWHTG). Include this information in Records Review and do not carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | Raptor winter feeding and roosting areas | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | Wild turkey winter range | Does not apply to project location | | Include this information in records review and do not carry forward to site investigation | |
| | Turkey vulture summer roosting areas | Does not apply to project location | | Include this information in records review and do not carry forward to site investigation | |
| | Reptile hibernacula (snakes) | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. . Carry forward to site investigation. Hedgerows, woodlands and drains could contain rock piles or piled debris that could be considered candidate snake hibernacula. The area within 120 m of the project location should be searched for these types of habitat features. | |
| | Bat hibernacula | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. A search of MNM AMIS database for abandoned mines and information about caves and karst topography within 1120m of the project location is required by the applicant to complete the records review for this feature. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | Bat maternity colonies | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | Amphibian breeding habitat (woodland) | Unknown | Unknown | Carry forward to site investigation. Woodlands located in and within 120 m of the project location could contain vernal pools. | SWHTG |
| | Amphibian breeding habitat (wetland) Note: includes bullfrog concentration areas | Unknown | Unknown | Carry forward to site investigation. Woodlands located in and within 120 m of the project location should be further investigated in the field to determine if they are potential wetlands as per the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System manual. | |
| | Migratory butterfly stopover areas | Does not apply to the project location | | Project location is greater than 5 km from Great Lakes (SWHTG). Include this information in Records Review and do not carry forward to site investigation. | |
| Rare Vegetation Communities or Specialized Habitats for Wildlife | Alvars | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | Tall-grass prairies | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | Savannahs | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---------|--|-------|
| | | Rare forest types | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Talus slopes | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Rock barrens | No | No | Not present on or within 120m of project location. Indicate this in records review and do not carry forward to site investigation. | SWHTG |
| | | Sand barrens | No | No | Not present on or within 120m of project location. Indicate this in records review and do not carry forward to site investigation. | SWHTG |
| | | Great Lake dunes | Does not apply to the project location | | Given the distance from any Great Lakes. Include this information in Records Review and do not carry forward to site investigation. | SWHTG |
| | | Habitat for Area Sensitive Species | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. Client should also refer to the Breeding Bird Atlas Squares for further data to complete the records review. | |
| | | Forests providing high diversity of habitats | Does not apply to project location | | Include this information in the records review report and do not carry forward to site investigation | |
| | | Old-growth or mature forest stands | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Foraging areas with abundant mast | Does not apply to project location | | Project not located within the Great Lakes – St. Lawrence Forest. Include this information at records review and do not carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Turtle nesting habitat | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking.. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Turtle over-wintering habitat | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Woodland raptor nesting habitat | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Osprey nesting, foraging and perching habitat | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Moose calving areas | Does not apply to the project location | | Include this information in Records Review and do not carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Moose aquatic feeding areas | Does not apply to the project location | | Include this information in Records Review and do not carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Mineral licks | Does not apply to the project location | | Include this information in Records Review and do not carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Mink, otter, marten, and fisher denning sites | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Highly diverse areas | Does not apply to project location | | Include this information in records review and do not carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Cliffs | No | No | Include this information in Records Review and do not | SWHTG |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------|---------|---------|--|--|
| | | | | | carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | | Seeps and springs | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| Species of Conservation Concern (list all that apply) | Marsh Bird Breeding Habitat | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | Area Sensitive Breeding Birds | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. Applicant should refer to the Breeding Bird Atlas Squares for further data to complete the records review. | |
| | Open Country Breeding Bird Habitat | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. Applicant should refer to the Breeding Bird Atlas Squares for further data. | |
| | Shrub/Early Successional Bird Breeding Habitat | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. Applicant should refer to the Breeding Bird Atlas Squares for further data. | |
| | Terrestrial Crayfish | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | Special Concern Species | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | S1-S3, SH species and communities | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. | |
| | Animal Movement Corridor | Amphibians Movement Corridors | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | No records available – information lacking. Carry forward to site investigation. |

Is any portion of the project located within the Oak Ridges Moraine Plan Area? Yes No

If yes, are any of the following features known to be present on or within 120m of the project location?

- Sand Barrens
- Savannah
- Tallgrass Prairie
- Unknown

Is the project location within the Protected Countryside (Greenbelt)? Yes No

If yes, are any of the following features known to be present on or within 120m of the project location?

- Sand Barrens
- Savannah
- Tallgrass Prairie
- Alvar
- Unknown

* Earth Science ANSI only needs to be considered if it is located within 50m of the project location

REOT

NHA Review Checklist Template

Napier Wind Project

Wind, Solar, Biomass

Ministry of Natural Resources

Renewable Energy Operation Team

January 4, 2012

Natural Heritage Assessment Review Checklist

| MNR RECORDS REVIEW INFORMATION | | | | NHA Review Information | |
|--|--|---|---|--|-------------------|
| Project Name: | Napier Wind Project | | | | |
| Project Location: | MNR District Aylmer | Municipality Twp Adelaide Metcalfe, County of Middlesex | Geo.Twp, Lot(s) & Con(s) Adelaide Geo Twp. Pt. Lt 8, Con4 SER as in 528316 Pt Lt 10 con 4 SER as in D15467 and 77936, except 528317 | MNR Lead Reviewer: | Amy Cameron |
| Applicant: | WDP Canada Corporation (contact Khlaire Parre khlaire@wdp-canada.ca) | Phone #: 905-813-8400 Address: 2233 Argentia Road, Suite 102 Mississauga, ON L5N 2X7 | | Date NHA Submitted: | December 23, 2012 |
| Consultant: | Stantec (contact Nicole Kopysh nicole.kopysh@stantec.com) | Phone #: (519) 836-6050 Ext. 263 Address: Suite 1 – 70 Southgate Drive Guelph, ON N1G 4P5 | | Date NHA Reviewed: | |
| Generation type: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> wind onshore | <input type="checkbox"/> wind offshore | <input type="checkbox"/> solar | <input type="checkbox"/> biomass/biogas | |
| Nameplate Capacity: | 5.4 MW | | | | |
| Name of MNR Records Reviewer: | Maryjo Tait and Heather Riddell Revised by Amy Cameron | | | | |
| Date Records Compiled: | August 11, 2011 Revised August 29, 2011 | | | | |
| What Ecodistrict is the project located in? | 7E | | | | |
| | | | | Submission 1 December 2011 version | January 4, 2012 |
| | | | | Submission 2 (insert version code) | |
| | | | | Submission 3 (insert version code) | |
| | | | | Date NHA Comments Sent to Client | |
| | | | | Submission 1: | January 4, 2012 |
| | | | | Submission 2: | |
| | | | | Date NHA Confirmation Letter Sent to Client | |
| | | | | Insert date | |









Final Review Summary Checklist






(to be completed as review of each report is finalized)

| Report | Meets REA Requirements (O.Reg 359/09) | Not Required √ |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Records Review | Section 25 √ | |
| Site Investigation | Section 26 | |
| Evaluation of Significance | Section 27 | |
| Environmental Impact Study | Section 38 | |

Attach a copy of the NHA confirmation letter

Records Review Report (Section 25)

| Content Requirements | Complete  | Page# | Section# | MNR Comments | If revision requested was it completed? <small>(include version code of report and page# where revision(s) completed)</small> |
|---|---|---------|----------|--|--|
| Identifies list of records searched |  | 3.1-3.2 | 3.1 | REOT, NHIC, LIO, RE Atlas, Bat Guidelines, Ontario Parks, St. Clair Region CA, Middlesex County OP, Adelaide-Metcalf OP, Middlesex NH Study, IBA database, Ontbirds Archives, Wildlife atlases (birds, mammals, herps) | |
| Identifies a summary of the results obtained, including the following sources: | | | | | |
| 1. MNR records that relate to provincial parks and conservation reserves |  | 3.4 | 3.2.5 | There are no PP or CR within 120m (confirmed by MNR) | |
| 2. Records related to natural features that are maintained by the: | | | | | |
| i. MNR |  | 3.1 | 3.1 | REOT records review (Appendix C), NHIC, LIO, Ontario Parks | |
| ii. the Crown in the right of Canada and, if applicable |  | 3.2 | 3.1 | Important Bird Areas (IBA) | |
| iii. a conservation authority |  | 3.1 | 3.1 | St. Clair Region CA (Chris Durand) and SCRCA NH features mapping | |
| iv. each local and upper-tier municipality |  | 3.2 | 3.1 | Middlesex County OP and Township of Adelaide-Metcalf OP; Middlesex NH Study (2003) | |
| v. the planning board | Does not apply to project location | | | | |
| vi. the municipal planning authority |  | 3.2 | 3.1 | Middlesex County OP and Township of Adelaide-Metcalf OP; Middlesex NH Study (2003) | |
| vii. the local roads board | Does not apply to project location | | | | |
| viii. the Local Services Board | | | | | |
| ix. the Niagara Escarpment Commission | | | | | |
| Identifies if the project location is <u>in or within 120 metres</u> of a Provincial Park or Conservation Reserve. | | | | | |
| If the project location is in a Provincial Park or Conservation Reserve, provides evidence that engaging in the project is not prohibited by or under the <i>Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act, 2006</i> . | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|-------|---|--|
| Identifies if the project location is <u>in or within 50 metres</u> of an Earth Science ANSI |  | 3.3 | 3.2.2 | There is no ES ANSI within 50m | |
| Identifies if the project location is <u>in or within 120 metres</u> of: | | | | | |
| ANSI (Life Science) |  | 3.3 | 3.2.2 | There is no LS ANSI within 120m | |
| Coastal wetland | Does not apply to project location | | | | |
| Northern wetland | | | | | |
| Southern wetland |  | 3.2 | 3.2.1 | Kerwood Swamp (PSW) is more than 120m away No unevaluated wetlands within 120m | |
| Wildlife habitat | Revisions requested | 3.5 | 3.2.6 | No IBA, area is actively managed agricultural lands with small isolated woodlands and occasional hedgerows 96 bird species, 23 mammals, 9 amphibians, 7 reptiles known to occur in area (Appendix D) NO SWH confirmed but several candidates carried forward to SI Report. REVISIONS REQUESTED See comments in PDF for requested revisions | |
| Valleyland (if south or east of the Canadian Shield) |  | 3.3 | 3.2.3 | No valleylands within 120m – topography relatively flat | |
| Woodland (if south or east of the Canadian Shield) |  | 3.4 | 3.2.4 | Carolinian Forest region (Middlesex County 13.5% woodlands) 2 woodlands within 120m but non within project location. One is significant for size (>4ha) by the Township but none considered significant by the County. | |
| If the project location is in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Area or the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt Plan (other than in settlement areas of either plan area), identifies whether the project location is <u>in or within 120 metres</u> of: | | | | | |
| Sand barren | Does not apply to project location | | | | |
| Savannah | | | | | |
| Tallgrass prairie | | | | | |
| Southern wetlands that are not provincially significant | | | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Areas of natural and scientific interest (life science) that are not provincially significant | |
| Alvars (only in the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt Plan) | |


List any additional records searched (non-legislated):

- Middlesex NH Study (2003)
- IBA database
- OntBirds Archives
- OBBA
- Herp Atlas
- Mammal Atlas
- Christmas Bird Count (Strathroy)

Site Investigation Report (Section 26)

Feature type: wetland wildlife habitat woodland valleyland ANSI (earth) ANSI (life) Sand barren Savannah Tallgrass prairie Alvar
 Feature identifier(s): _____





| Content Requirements | Complete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Page # | Section # | MNR Comments | If revision requested was it completed? <small>(include version code of report and page# where revision(s) completed)</small> |
|---|---|------------|------------|--|--|
| Evidence that a physical or alternative site investigation of the air, land and water within 120 metres of the project location was conducted, including: | | | | | |
| a) Date and times of the beginning and end of site investigation and duration of investigation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Appendix B | Table 4.1 | Aug 19, 2011 – ELC, woodlands, candidate SWH Nov 11, 2011 – ELC, woodlands, Candidate SWH | |
| b) Weather conditions during the site investigation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Appendix B | Table 4.1 | Aug 19, 2011 – 30.C, Wind 0, cloud 25%, PPT none Nov 11, 2011 – 6.C, wind5, cloud 80%, PPT none | |
| c) A summary of investigation methods | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 4.1 | 4.1 | Vegetation community and vascular plants assessment Wetland confirmation and delineation Woodlands Wildlife and wildlife habitats | |
| d) The name and qualifications of person(s) who conducted the site investigation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Appendix B | Table 4.1 | Appendix B - Table 4.1 – M Straus for both SI visits (ELC, woodlands and wildlife) | |
| e) The field notes kept by site investigators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Appendix E | Appendix E | Field Forms for ELC cards and information about candidate SWH features and incidental wildlife observations included in Appendix | |
| Assessment of the results of the records review to determine if they are correct, including: | | | | | |
| A summary of any corrections made to the records review (e.g., additional features, etc.) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Appendix B | Table 4.2 | Wetlands – 1 new wetland identified (feature 2) Valleylands – no changes Woodlands – 1 new woodland identified (feature 3) ANSIs – no change SWH – no change – no candidate habitats within 120m | |
| Information relating to each natural heritage feature identified, including its: | | | | | |
| a) type | Revisions Requested | Appendix B | Table 4.3 | Woodlands – Appendix B – Table 4.3 (features 1, 2, 3) Wetlands – Appendix B – Table 5.1 (feature 2) REVISIONS REQUESTED: See comments in PDF for requested revisions | |
| b) attributes | | | | | |
| c) composition | | | | | |
| d) function | | | | | |

| A map showing: | | | | | |
|---|---|------------|----------|--|--|
| a) boundaries of any identified natural features (including provincial parks and conservation reserves) within 120 metres of the project location |  | Appendix A | Figure 3 | Feature 1 – adjacent to nearest project component (collector line) Feature 2 – 37m to nearest project component (feeder line) Features 3 – 26m to nearest project component (R2) | |
| b) the location and type of natural heritage features in relation to the project location | | | | | |
| c) the distance from the project location to the boundaries of identified natural features | | | | | |

Additional Comments:

Evaluation of Significance (Section 27)

Feature type: wetland wildlife habitat woodland valleyland
 Feature identifier: [Woodlands \(feature 1, 2, 3\); wetland \(Feature 2\)](#)

| Content Requirements | Complete  | Page# | Section# | MNR Comments | If revision requested was it completed? <small>(include version code of report and page# where revision(s) completed)</small> |
|---|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| For each natural feature that the project location is closer to than 120 metres (other than ANSIs, as the applicant is only required to consider ANSIs that have previously been confirmed as provincially significant by the MNR): | | | | | |
| a) A summary of the evaluation criteria or procedures used in determining significance/provincial significance of a feature Note: an evaluation of significance identified through the records review is an acceptable determination of significance, provided that the evaluation was done using evaluation criteria or procedures established/accepted by MNR and evidence of the procedures used is submitted by the applicant. | Revision Requested | 5.1 | 5.0 | Wetlands (applied appendix C of NHAG) - assumed significant | |
| | | 5.2 | 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 | Woodlands (applied NHAG woodland criteria) – features 1 and 3 do not meet the criteria for significance. Feature 2 meets 3 of 7 criteria and is considered significant Revision Requested: See comments in PDF for requested revisions. Determine if necessary to add Amphibian Woodland Breeding Habitat as a type of Generalized Candidate SWH to this section. If it needs to be added assume it is significant and carry forward to the EIS report. | |
| Evidence of how information related to natural features obtained during records review, site investigation and consultation with the public, aboriginal communities, municipalities and local authorities was considered by the applicant on the evaluation of significance. |  | Throughout EOS report | Throughout EOS report | Features deemed candidate features were evaluated for significance in the EOS report. All information identified in RR and SI reports have been addressed. | |
| b)The name and qualifications of person(s) who applied the evaluation criteria or procedures |  | 5.6 | 5.4 | Nicole Kopysh, Terrestrial Ecologist and Project Manager James Leslie, Terrestrial Ecologist (wetland evaluator) | |
| c) The dates of the beginning and completion of the evaluation |  | Appendix B | Table 4.1 | September 20, October 31, November 8 & 15, 2011 by James Leslie | |

Additional Comments:





Feature 2 is a significant woodland
 Feature 2 is assumed to be a significant wetland (Appendix C of NHAG)



Environmental Impact Study Report (Section 38(2))

Feature type: wetland wildlife habitat woodland valleyland ANSI (earth) ANSI (life) PPorCR Sand barren Savannah Tallgrass prairie Alvar

Feature identifier: Wetland within 120m assumed significant (Feature 2); significant woodland (feature 2) for size, interior, water protection

An EIS is required where the project location is within 50 m of a provincially significant earth science ANSI, or within 120m of a provincially significant wetland, provincially significant life science ANSI, significant wildlife habitat, a provincial park or conservation reserve, or a significant woodland or valleyland that is south or east of the Canadian Shield.

| Content Requirements | Complete  | Page# | Section# | MNR Comments | If revision requested was it completed? <small>(include version code of report and page# where revision(s) completed)</small> |
|---|---|-------|----------|---|--|
| Identifies and assesses any negative environmental effects on the natural feature, provincial park or conservation reserve | Revision Requested | 6.2 | 6.3.1 | No negative effects anticipated. Cable route to be constructed 37m from feature 2 (woodland and wetland) which is deemed suitable mitigation with no residual effects anticipated. REVISION REQUESTED: See comments in PDF for requested revisions Need to determine if Generalized Candidate SWH (amphibian woodland breeding habitat needs to be added to the EIS report) | |
| identifies mitigation measures in respect of any negative environmental effects |  | 6.3 | 6.3.1 | Cable route to be constructed 37m from feature 2 (woodland and wetland) which is deemed suitable mitigation with no residual effects anticipated. | |
| Describes how the ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS MONITORING PLAN (part of the design and operations report) addresses any negative environmental effects, including a description of: | | | | | |
| i. performance objectives in respect of the negative environmental effects, |  | 6.4 | 6.5 | No negative impacts anticipated | |
| ii. mitigation measures to assist in achieving the performance objectives, |  | 6.4 | 6.5 | No negative impacts anticipated | |
| iii. a program for monitoring negative environmental effects for the duration of the time that the project is engaged in, including a contingency plan to be implemented if any mitigation measures fail. | Revision Requested | 6.4 | 6.5 | No negative impacts anticipated Bird and Bat mortality monitoring prepared as part of EEMP in the Design and Operations Report. The EEMP has been submitted to MNR (REOT) for review and comment. REVISION REQUESTED: Appendix B – Table 6.2 is missing. Please add this | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|-----|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | | table or remove reference to it. | |
| Describes how the CONSTRUCTION PLAN REPORT addresses any negative environmental effects, including a description of: | | | | | |
| i. any negative environmental effects that may result from construction or installation activities on the feature, |  | 6.4 | 6.5 | No negative impacts anticipated. | |
| ii. mitigation measures in respect of any negative environmental effects. |  | 6.4 | 6.5 | None required | |