

# Appendix B

## Agency Consultation

- Appendix B1. MNR and MTCS  
Confirmation Letters
- Appendix B2. Additional Agency  
Comments

**Appendix B1. MNR and MTCS  
Confirmation Letters**

Renewable Energy Operations Team  
P.O. Box 7000  
300 Water Street  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, South Tower  
Peterborough, ON K9J 8M5

---

March 28, 2012

NextEra Energy Canada  
5500 Service Road, Suite 205  
Burlington, ON L7L 6W6

**RE: NHA Confirmation for Bluewater Wind Energy Centre**

Dear Tom Bird:

In accordance with the Ministry of the Environment's (MOE's) Renewable Energy Approvals (REA) Regulation (O.Reg.359/09), the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) has reviewed the natural heritage assessment and environmental impact study for the Bluewater Wind Energy Centre located in Huron County submitted by Nextera Energy Canada on March 26, 2012.

In accordance with Section 28(2) and 38(2)(b) of the REA regulation, MNR provides the following confirmations following review of the natural heritage assessment:

1. The MNR confirms that the determination of the existence of natural features and the boundaries of natural features was made using applicable evaluation criteria or procedures established or accepted by MNR.
2. The MNR confirms that the site investigation and records review were conducted using applicable evaluation criteria or procedures established or accepted by MNR, if no natural features were identified.
3. The MNR confirms that the evaluation of the significance or provincial significance of the natural features was conducted using applicable evaluation criteria or procedures established or accepted by MNR (if required).
4. The MNR confirms that the project location is not in a provincial park or conservation reserve.
5. The MNR confirms that the environmental impact assessment report has been prepared in accordance with procedures established by the MNR.

In accordance with Appendix D of MNR's Natural Heritage Assessment Guide, a commitment has been made to complete pre-construction assessments of habitat use for candidate significant wildlife habitats. MNR has reviewed and confirmed the assessment methods and the range of mitigation options. Pending completion of the pre-construction assessments and determination of significance, the appropriate

mitigation is expected to be implemented, as committed to in the environmental impact study for the following candidate significant wildlife habitats:

- Reptile Hibernaculum (features RH-01, RH-02)
- Bat Maternity Colony (features BMC-02, BMC-03, BMC-10, BMC-12, BMC-14)
- Amphibian Woodland Breeding (features AWO-03, AWO-04, AWO-05, AWO-06, AWO-08, AWO-11)
- Amphibian Wetland Breeding (feature AWE-01)

In addition to the NHA, Environmental Effects Monitoring Plans that address post-construction monitoring and mitigation for birds and bats must be prepared and implemented. It is recommended that post-construction monitoring plans be prepared in accordance with MNR Guidelines and be reviewed by MNR in advance of submitting a REA application to MOE in order to minimize potential delays in determining if the application is complete.

This confirmation letter is valid for the project as proposed in the natural heritage assessment and environmental impact study, including those sections describing the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan and Construction Plan Report. Should any changes be made to the proposed project that would alter the NHA, MNR may need to undertake additional review of the NHA.

Where specific commitments have been made by the applicant in the NHA with respect to project design, construction, rehabilitation, operation, mitigation, or monitoring, MNR expects that these commitments will be considered in MOE's Renewable Energy Approval decision and, if approved, be implemented by the applicant.

In accordance with S.12 (1) of the Renewable Energy Approvals Regulation, this letter must be included as part of your application submitted to the MOE for a Renewable Energy Approval.

Please be aware that your project may be subject to additional legislative approvals as outlined in the Ministry of Natural Resources' *Approvals and Permitting Requirements Document*. These approvals are required prior to the construction of your renewable energy facility.

If you wish to discuss any part of this confirmation or additional comments provided, please contact me at [jim.beal@ontario.ca](mailto:jim.beal@ontario.ca) or 705-755-3203.

Sincerely,



Jim Beal  
Renewable Energy Provincial Field Program Coordinator  
Regional Operations Division  
Ministry of Natural Resources

- cc. Ian Hagman, District Manager, MNR Guelph District
- cc. Amy Cameron, A/Renewable Energy Field Advisor, MNR REOT
- cc. Erin Cotnam, A/Renewable Energy Coordinator, MNR Southern Region

cc. Narren Santos, Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch, MOE  
cc. Sandra Guido, Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch, MOE  
cc. Jessica MacKay Ward, Ecologist, AECOM

Culture Programs Unit  
Programs & Services Br.  
900 Highbury Avenue  
London, ON N5Y 1A4  
Tel: 519-675-6898  
Fax: 519-675-7777  
e-mail: [shari.prowse@ontario.ca](mailto:shari.prowse@ontario.ca)

Unité des programmes culturels  
Direction des programmes et des services  
900, av. Highbury  
London, ON N5Y 1A4  
Tél: 519-675-6898  
Télé: 519-675-7777  
e-mail: [shari.prowse@ontario.ca](mailto:shari.prowse@ontario.ca)



Mr., Mrs.

Mr. / Mrs.  
Address  
City, Province, Postal Code  
Phone, Fax

**RE: NextEra Energy Canada, ULC, Bluewater Wind Energy Centre Geographic Township of Stanley, Hay and Tuckersmith, Huron County, Ontario, FIT-FJI7S7X, MTCS File HD00689, P001-609-2010, P218-040-2011 and P316-017-2012**

Dear Mr./Ms.

On the subject of the proposed development and related activities required under the Environmental Protection Act regarding the proposed development under the Energy Act...

Under the Environmental Protection Act, the proposed development is required to comply with the Ontario Heritage Act's requirements, including the preparation of a development plan and the identification of heritage resources. The determination of historic Euro-Canadian archaeological potential is based on the documentation indicating occupation from the middle of the 19th century onwards as well as the presence of historic transportation routes.

Please refer to the attached document...

**Stage 1, P001-609-2010, February 13, 2012, Received February 14, 2012, Entered into Register March 19, 2012**

Golder applied archaeological potential criteria commonly used by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport to determine areas of archaeological potential within the study area. The archaeological potential for Aboriginal and Euro-Canadian sites was deemed to be moderate to high on these properties. For pre-contact Aboriginal sites this assessment is based on the presence of nearby potable water sources, level topography, agriculturally suitable soils, and known archaeological sites. For post-contact Aboriginal sites this assessment is based on the presence of nearby potable water sources, level topography, and historic Euro-Canadian anecdotal evidence. The determination of historic Euro-Canadian archaeological potential is based on the documentation indicating occupation from the middle of the 19th century onwards as well as the presence of historic transportation routes. As a result, Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended for potential wind turbine sites and their associated infrastructure.

**Stage 2, P218-040-2011 and P319-017-2012, February 13, 2012, Revised March 23, 2012, Received March 26, 2012, Entered into Register April 5, 2012**

*The Stage 2 assessment of the Bluewater Wind Energy Project resulted in the identification of 25 archaeological sites, including seven historic Euro-Canadian and 18 pre-contact Aboriginal. Recommendations for each location are found below.*

***Location 1***

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 1 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal biface.*

*Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 1.***

***Location 2***

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 2 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact piece of chipping detritus. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 2.***

***Location 3***

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 3 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact piece of chipping detritus. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 3.***

***Location 4 (AjHj-5)***

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 4 (AjHj-5) resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal projectile point. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 4.***

***Location 5***

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 5 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal biface. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 5.***

***Location 6 (AjHj-12)***

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 6 (AjHj-12) resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal projectile point. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 6.***

### **Location 7**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 7 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal wedge. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 7.***

### **Location 8 (AjHj-13)**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 8 (AjHj-13) resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal projectile point. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 8.***

### **Location 9**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 9 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal scraper. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 9.***

### **Location 10**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 10 resulted in the recovery of primarily late 19th century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 10.***

### **Location 11**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 11 resulted in the recovery of two pre-contact Aboriginal artifacts, pieces of chipping detritus. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 11.***

### **Location 12**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 12 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal biface. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 12.***

### **Location 13 (AiHj-6)**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 13 (AiHj-6) resulted in the recovery of mid-to-late 19th century Euro-Canadian historic artifacts. Ironstone ceramics clearly dominate the recovered artifacts, making up 55.81% of the entire artifact assemblage. However given that a significant number of mid-19th century whiteware artifacts were also recovered **it is recommended that Location 5 be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site.** The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Table 3.1 of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011). Prior to conducting the field work the area should be re-ploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit*



excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid and should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

#### **Location 14 (AiHk-1)**

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 14 (AiHk-1) resulted in the recovery of mid-to-late 19th century Euro- Canadian historic artifacts. Only the central portion of the site was included in the study area and yielded a surface collection of 74 artifacts; a higher concentration of artifacts was observed to the north and south of the study area but only artifacts located on the proposed access corridor were recovered. Mid-to-late 19th century whiteware and ironstone ceramics comprised 90.00% of the recovered ceramic assemblage. Given that 47.50% of the ceramic assemblage consisted of mid 19th century whiteware ceramics, **it is recommended that Location 14 be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site.** The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Table 3.1 of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011). Prior to conducting the field work the area should be re-ploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pickup. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid and should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

#### **Location 15 (AiHj-7)**

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 15 (AiHj-7) resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal projectile point. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 6.**

#### **Location 16 (AiHk-2)**

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 16 (AiHk-2) resulted in the recovery of 20 primarily late 19th century and early 20th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 16.**

#### **Location 17**

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 17 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact piece of chipping detritus. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 17.**

#### **Location 18**

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 18 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact piece of chipping detritus. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 18.**

### **Location 19**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 19 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact piece of chipping detritus. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 19.***

### **Location 20 (AiHj-8)**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 20 (AiHj-8) resulted in the recovery of 39 primarily late 19th century and early 20th century historic Euro-Canadian artifacts. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 20.***

### **Location 21**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 21 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal biface. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 21.***

### **Location 22**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 22 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact piece of chipping detritus. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 22.***

### **Location 23**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 23 resulted in the recovery of an isolated pre-contact Aboriginal biface. Despite the intensification of survey intervals no additional artifacts were recovered. Given that the cultural heritage value or interest of the site has been sufficiently documented, **no further archaeological assessment is recommended for Location 23.***

### **Location 24 (AiHj-9)**

*The Stage 2 assessment of Location 24 (AiHj-9) resulted in the recovery of 63 mid-to-late 19th century Euro-Canadian historic artifacts. Only the eastern portion of the site was included in the study area and yielded a surface collection of 63 artifacts; a higher concentration of artifacts was observed to the west of the study area but only artifacts located on the proposed access corridor were recovered. Given that mid-to-late 19th century whiteware and ironstone ceramics comprised 74.42% of the recovered ceramic assemblage, **it is recommended that Location 14 be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site.** The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Table 3.1 of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011). Prior to conducting the field work the area should be re-ploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test unit laid out in a five metre grid and should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.*

**Location 25 (AjHj-14)**

The Stage 2 assessment of Location 25 (AjHj-14) resulted in the recovery of 86 mid-to-late 19th century Euro- Canadian historic artifacts. Only the eastern portion of the site was included in the study area and yielded a surface collection of 63 artifacts; a higher concentration of artifacts was observed to the west of the study area but only artifacts located on the proposed access corridor were recovered. Given that mid-to-late 19th century whiteware and ironstone ceramics comprised 86.95% of the recovered ceramic assemblage, **it is recommended that Location 14 be subject to a Stage 3 assessment prior to any ground disturbance activities to further test the nature and density of the site.** The Stage 3 assessment should employ both the controlled surface pick-up and hand excavated test unit methodology as outlined in Table 3.1 of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Government of Ontario 2011). Prior to conducting the field work the area should be re-ploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid and should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

It is recommended that the site be re-ploughed and allowed to weather

prior to conducting the field work. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid and should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

It is recommended that the site be re-ploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid and should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

It is recommended that the site be re-ploughed and allowed to weather for the controlled surface pick-up. The test unit excavation should consist of one metre by one metre square test units laid out in a five metre grid and should be excavated by hand to a depth of five centimetres within the subsoil. Site specific land registry research should also be conducted as part of the Stage 3 assessment.

Thereby,



Director

Ontario Heritage Foundation

Dr. [Name] [Title], [Address]

\* In no way will the Ministry be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result: (a) if the Report(s) or its recommendations are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent; or (b) from the issuance of this letter. Further measures may need to be taken in the event that additional artifacts or archaeological sites are identified or the Report(s) is otherwise found to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.

Ministère du Tourisme,  
de la Culture et du Sport

Culture Services Unit  
Programs and Services Branch  
Culture Division  
401 Bay Street, Suite 1700  
Toronto ON M7A 0A7  
Tel.: 416 314-3108  
Fax: 416 314-7175

Ministère du Tourisme,  
de la Culture et du Sport

Unité des services culturels  
Direction des programmes et des services  
Division de culture  
401, rue Bay, bureau 1700  
Toronto ON M7A 0A7  
Tél. : 416 314-3108  
Télééc. : 416 212-7175



March 22, 2012

**Mr. Marc Rose**

Senior Environmental Planner  
AECOM Canada Ltd.  
300 Town Centre Blvd, Suite 300  
Markham, ON  
L3R 5Z6

**RE: Bluewater Wind Energy Centre**

**Location: Multiple Lots in Municipalities of Bluewater and Huron East, Huron County**

**OPA Reference Number: FIT –FJ17S7X**

**MTC DPR File No.: PLAN-40EA042**

Dear Mr. Rose:

This letter constitutes the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's written comments as required by s. 23(3)(a) of O. Reg. 359/09 under the *Environmental Protection Act* regarding heritage assessments undertaken for the above project.

Based on the information contained in the report you have submitted for this project, the Ministry is satisfied with the heritage assessment. Please note that the Ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of the heritage assessment report.\*

The report recommends the following:

## **5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Project Location was determined to represent a single cultural heritage landscape. Primarily mixed-use agricultural activity is consistent with the historic division of land and can be characterized through cash crops, pasture, woodlots and multiple small rural villages and hamlets that dot the landscape. Due to the typical nature of the landscape, cultural heritage value or interest was not identified according to *Ontario Regulation 9/06*.

A detailed inventory was undertaken to identify and evaluate heritage resources. Through a windshield survey, 48 sites 40 years of age or older were documented and evaluated against *Ontario Regulation 09/06*. This included a total of 76 structures; 45 residences and 31 barns. These structures contribute to the character of the vernacular rural landscape. Of these structures, 47 (20 houses and 27 barns) were determined to have cultural heritage value or interest.

No further mitigation is recommended as it was determined that there are no anticipated direct or indirect impacts as a result of the undertaking. The recommendations contained in this report are based on current provincial regulations and guidelines pertaining to the approvals process for wind energy projects in Ontario.

The Ministry is satisfied with these recommendations.

This letter does not waive any requirements which you may have under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Also, this letter does not constitute approval of the renewable energy project. Approvals of the project may be required under other statutes and regulations. It is your responsibility to obtain any necessary approvals or licences.

Please feel free to contact me if you have questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

**Laura Hatcher**

Heritage Planner

Copy to: Meaghan Nelligan-Rivard, Cultural Heritage Specialist  
Older Associates Ltd.

Jeff Muir, Project Manager  
Older Associates Ltd.

Chris Schiller, Manager, Culture Services Unit  
Ministry of Tourism and Culture

\_\_\_\_\_

\* In no way will the Ministry be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result: (a) if the Report(s) or its recommendations are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent; or (b) from the issuance of this letter. Further measures may need to be taken in the event that additional artifacts or heritage resources are identified or the Report(s) is otherwise found to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.

## Appendix B2. Additional Agency Comments

## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Andrew.BRISKIN@HydroOne.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 15, 2010 3:26 PM  
**To:** Cushing, Julia  
**Subject:** RE: Setback guidelines

Julia,

Further to our previous discussion, the table below represents recommended Setback distances measured from the edge of a transmission right-of-way (ROW) to wind turbines.

	Transmission Line Pole Level		
Setback	110kV	138kV	230kV
Wood Pole	500m	250m	Highest of 150m or total height + 10m
Steel Pole	500m	250m	150m

Andrew Briskin  
Tx Sustainment - System Investment  
Hydro One Networks Inc

TCT-15 A10

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

*This email and any attached files are privileged and may contain confidential information intended only for the person or persons named above. Any other distribution, reproduction, copying, disclosure, or other dissemination is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply email or delete the transmission received by you.*

---

**From:** Cushing, Julia [<mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 15, 2010 10:49 AM  
**To:** BRISKIN Andrew  
**Subject:** Setback guidelines

Hi Andrew,

Thank you for responding so quickly to this request. Could you please provide me with the setback guidelines for wind turbines to transmission ROWs?

Thank you.

Julia

Julia Cushing  
Environmental Planner  
[Julia.Cushing@aecom.com](mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com)

**AECOM**

300 Town Centre Boulevard, Suite 300

Markham, Ontario, Canada L3R 5Z6

T 905-477-8400 ext 448 F 905-477-1456

[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)





## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Cushing, Julia  
**Sent:** Monday, July 26, 2010 11:07 AM  
**To:** 'doris.dumais@ontario.ca'  
**Cc:** 'narren.santos@ontario.ca'; 'Samira.Viswanathan@ontario.ca'; Rose, Marc; Deschamps, Vince; 'thomas.bird@nexteraenergy.com'; Williams, Melanie D.  
**Subject:** NextEra Energy Canada's Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Wind Energy Centre Proposals  
**Attachments:** Bluewater\_Draft PDR\_June 28.pdf; Goshen\_Draft PDR\_June 28.pdf; Jericho\_Draft PDR\_June 28.pdf

Good Morning Ms. Dumais,

NextEra Energy Canada, ULC, together with Canadian Green Power, is proposing to construct three wind energy projects in south-western Ontario. The first is proposed in Bluewater and Huron East Townships, Huron County; the second in Bluewater and South Huron Townships, Huron County; and lastly, the third in Municipality of Lambton Shores, Warwick and Brooke-Alvinston Townships, Lambton County, Ontario. These projects are referred to as the Bluewater Wind Energy Centre, Goshen Wind Energy Centre, and Jericho Wind Energy Centre respectively. Although separate Renewable Energy Approval (REA) applications will be submitted for all three projects, the effects assessment will take into consideration the cumulative effects of these three wind energy centres.

In accordance with the document titled *Guidance for Preparing the Project Description Report* (PDR) as part of an application under Ontario Regulation 359/09, we are submitting to you the Draft Project Description Report for each project. It is our understanding that these reports will be used to identify and provide to us a list of Aboriginal communities that have or may have constitutionally protected rights or otherwise may be interested in any effects of the projects. Could you provide to us a timeframe within which we could expect to receive the list of Aboriginal Communities?

Please note that the draft PDRs are also available for public viewing at [www.canadianwindproposals.com](http://www.canadianwindproposals.com). In addition, we will be sending copies of the draft PDRs to the Ministry of Natural Resources, Ministry of Transportation, and the Ministry of Tourism and Culture for their reference.

In addition we are contacting your agency for information and guidance on the requirements related to the preparation of the PDR and the overall process. Specifically, we are interested in receiving information regarding required permits and approvals, any potential constraints, as well as other comments you may have relating to your agency's mandate.

Regards,

**Julia Cushing**  
Environmental Planner  
[Julia.Cushing@aecom.com](mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com)

**AECOM**  
300 Town Centre Boulevard, Suite 300  
Markham, Ontario, Canada L3R 5Z6  
T 905-477-8400 ext 448 F 905-477-1456  
[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)

## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** McNeill, Shannon (ENE) <Shannon.McNeill@ontario.ca>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 30, 2011 1:36 PM  
**To:** Aitken, Sarah  
**Subject:** RE: REA - Waterbodies component

Hi Sarah,

Here are some answers to your questions which we spoke about on the 28<sup>th</sup>:

1. For the water quality component are we required to collect in-situ or lab samples to satisfy MOE? Or are these just field observations of potential impacts?

MOE does not require lab samples for the waterbodies report/water assessment. Mostly we are looking for background information that can be done through a records review and site investigation. We are looking for the proponent to describe the existing water quality and how it may be impacted by the project. For example, if there was discharge from your facility you would need to describe existing conditions, the environmental effect and mitigation.

2. For the water quantity component are we required to collect water velocity readings for any watercourse located within the 120 m buffer?

MOE does not require the proponent to collect water velocity reading. Again MOE is looking for background information that can be done through a records review and site investigation. Please make sure you have sufficient information to describe existing conditions, environmental effect and mitigation.

3. Who will review the aquatic field component (fish community, fish habitat), MOE, MNR or the local CA?

MOE reviews the water assessment and the waterbodies report. You may wish to contact both MNR and the local CA as they may have background information that you can use in your report/assessment.

4. Does MOE want to see a field plan prior to field investigations?

MOE does not have the staffing required to review any draft plans or documents. We do require a field plan prior to the investigation.

I hope this answers your questions. Should you have any additional questions or require clarifications please let me know.

Senior Project Evaluator  
Renewable Energy Team  
Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch  
Ministry of the Environment  
2 St. Clair West, Floor 12A , Toronto, ON M4V 1L5  
P: 416-326-6089 F: 416-314-8452

<http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/en/business/green-energy/>

---

**From:** Aitken, Sarah [<mailto:Sarah.Aitken@aecom.com>]  
**Sent:** March 29, 2011 8:58 AM  
**To:** McNeill, Shannon (ENE)  
**Subject:** REA - Waterbodies component

Hi Shannon,

We spoke quickly yesterday and I was hoping to get your answers in writing so we have them on file.

These questions are regarding the waterbodies technical bulletin. If you could expand on what the MOE requires for each of these parameters that would be greatly appreciated.

1. For the water quality component are we required to collect in-situ or lab samples to satisfy MOE? Or are these just field observations of potential impacts?
2. For the water quantity component are we required to collect water velocity readings for any watercourse located within the 120 m buffer?
3. Who will review the aquatic field component (fish community, fish habitat), MOE, MNR or the local CA?
4. Does MOE want to see a field plan prior to field investigations?

Thanks for your help,

Sarah

**Sarah Aitken, B.Sc.(Hons.)**

Aquatic Ecologist

Environment

D 519.763.7783 ext 5146 M 519.820.0944

[sarah.aitken@aecom.com](mailto:sarah.aitken@aecom.com)

## **AECOM**

512 Woolwich Street, Suite 2 Guelph, ON N1H 3X7

T: (519) 763-7783 F: (519) 763-1668

[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)

This electronic communication, which includes any files or attachments thereto, contains proprietary or confidential information and may be privileged and otherwise protected under copyright or other applicable intellectual property laws. All information contained in this electronic communication is solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it was addressed. If you are not the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that distributing, copying, or in any way disclosing any of the information in this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately, and destroy the communication and any files or attachments in their entirety, whether in electronic or hard copy format. Since data stored on electronic media can deteriorate, be translated or modified, AECOM, its subsidiaries, and/or affiliates will not be liable for the completeness, correctness or readability of the electronic data. The electronic data should be verified against the hard copy.

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Santos, Narren (ENE) <Narren.Santos@ontario.ca>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2011 1:30 PM  
**To:** Bird, Thomas; Cushing, Julia  
**Cc:** de Laronde, Joe (ENE); Mahmood, Mansoor (ENE); Deschamps, Vince; Radue, Marianne; Rose, Marc  
**Subject:** Aboriginal Lists - Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Wind Projects  
**Attachments:** Goshen Wind Energy Centre 2011 April 8 FINAL.pdf; Jericho Wind Energy Centre 2011 April 8 FINAL.pdf; Bluewater Wind Energy Centre 2011 April 8 FINAL.pdf

Good afternoon Mr. Bird:

Please see the attached letter regarding the lists of Aboriginal Communities for the Blue Water, Goshen and Jericho Wind Energy Centres being proposed by NextEra. The original copy will follow shortly in the mail.

Regards,

Narren Santos  
Senior Program Support Coordinator  
Renewable Energy Team  
Environmental Assessment & Approvals Branch, Ministry of the Environment  
2 St. Clair Avenue West, 12a Floor Toronto, ON M4V 1L5  
Phone: 416.314.8442 | Fax: 416.314.6810 | Email: [narren.santos@ontario.ca](mailto:narren.santos@ontario.ca)

---

**From:** Cushing, Julia [<mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com>]  
**Sent:** April 11, 2011 9:48 AM  
**To:** Santos, Narren (ENE)  
**Cc:** Deschamps, Vince; Radue, Marianne; Rose, Marc  
**Subject:** NextEra - Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Projects

Hi Narren,

Thank you for faxing the Director's List to us, unfortunately, only one page came through. Could you please re-send the list?

Thank you,

Julia

**Julia Cushing**  
Environmental Planner  
[Julia.Cushing@aecom.com](mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com)

**AECOM**  
300 Town Centre Boulevard, Suite 300

Markham, Ontario, Canada L3R 5Z6  
T 905-477-8400 ext 448 F 905-477-1456  
[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)

Ministry of the Environment

Environmental Assessment and  
Approvals Branch

2 St. Clair Avenue West  
Floor 12A  
Toronto ON M4V 1L5  
Tel.: 416 314-8001  
Fax: 416 314-8452

Ministère de l'Environnement

Direction des évaluations et des  
autorisations environnementales

2, avenue St. Clair Ouest  
Étage 12A  
Toronto ON M4V 1L5  
Tél. : 416 314-8001  
Télééc. : 416 314-8452



April 8, 2011

MOE File #: SW-10-WF-0103

Mr. Tom Bird  
Environmental Services Project Manager  
NextEra Energy Canada, ULC  
5500 North Service Road, Suite 205  
Burlington, ON L7L 6W6

Dear Mr. Bird:

**RE: Director's Aboriginal Communities List - Blue Water Wind Energy Centre**

The Ontario Ministry of the Environment (Ministry) has reviewed the information provided in the Draft of the Project Description Report (PDR) received for the *Bluewater Wind Energy Centre*. The Ministry has reviewed the anticipated environmental effects of the project (as described in the PDR) relative to its current understanding of the interests of aboriginal communities in the area.

In accordance with section 14 of Ontario Regulation 359/09 "Renewable Energy Approvals under Part V.0.1 of the Act" (O. Reg. 359/09) made under the *Environmental Protection Act*, please find below the list of aboriginal communities who, in the opinion of the Director:

- i) have or may have constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights that may be adversely impacted by the project (s.14(b)(i)):

<b>Aboriginal Community</b>
<b>Common Name:</b>
<b>Reserve Name:</b>
<b>Contact Information:</b>
Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point Kettle Point 44 RR 2 Forest ON N0N 1J0 Phone (519) 786-2125 Fax (519) 786-2108
Chippewas of the Thames First Nation Chippewas of the Thames 42 RR 1 Muncey ON N0L 1Y0 Phone (519) 289-5555 Fax (519) 289-2230



Aamjiwnaang First Nation Sarnia 45 978 Tashmoo Avenue Sarnia ON N7T 7H5 Phone (519) 336-8410 Fax (519) 336-0382
Bkejwanong Territory Walpole Island First Nation Walpole Island 46 RR 3 Wallaceburg ON N8A 4K9 Phone (519) 627-1481 Fax (519) 627-0440
Oneida Nation of the Thames Oneida 41 RR 2 Southwold ON N0L 2G0 Phone (519) 652-3244 Fax (519) 652-9287
Historic Saugeen Métis 204 High Street, Box 1492 Southampton ON N0H 2L0 Phone (519) 483-4000

OR

ii) otherwise may be interested in any negative environmental effects of the project (s.14(b)(ii)):

Munsee-Delaware First Nation Munsee-Delaware Nation 1 RR 1 Muncey ON N0L 1Y0 Phone (519) 289-5396 Fax (519) 289-5156
-Delaware Nation Moravian of the Thames Moravian 47 RR 3 Thamesville ON N0P 2K0 Phone (519) 692-3936 Fax (519) 692-5522

**NOTE:** None of the foregoing should be taken to imply approval of this project or the contents of the PDR. This letter only addresses the requirement of the Director to provide a list



You should also be aware that information upon which the above list of aboriginal communities is based is subject to change. Aboriginal communities can make assertions at any time, and other developments, for example the discovery of Aboriginal archaeological resources, can occur that may require additional aboriginal communities to be notified. Should this happen, the Ministry will contact you. Similarly, if you receive any feedback from any aboriginal communities not included in this list, as part of your consultation, the Ministry would appreciate being notified.

Please contact Narren Santos at (416) 314-8442 should you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Doris Dumais', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Doris Dumais  
Director – Approvals Program  
Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch

cc: Mansoor Mahmood, Renewable Energy Team, Ministry of the Environment  
Joe de Laronde, Aboriginal Affairs Branch, Ministry of the Environment

## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Aitken, Sarah  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2011 3:04 PM  
**To:** Cushing, Julia  
**Subject:** FW: NextEra Waterbodies workplan

**Categories:** Red Category

---

**From:** McNeill, Shannon (ENE) [<mailto:Shannon.McNeill@ontario.ca>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 12, 2011 11:36 AM  
**To:** Aitken, Sarah  
**Cc:** Lower, Nicola; Deschamps, Vince  
**Subject:** RE: NextEra Waterbodies workplan

Hi Sarah,

Thanks. I appreciate you sending your work plan to me for the Waterbodies Reports for NextEra. As I mentioned to you in one of our recent calls, you do not require MOE approval for your work plan. Further, we unfortunately do not have the staff power either to review any draft documents. As long as you meet all the requirements for the Waterbodies Report found in O. Reg 359/09 you should be on the right track.

I will however, keep the work plan on file. I look forward to receiving your submission in the future.

Should you have any further questions please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

Shannon McNeill  
Senior Project Evaluator  
Renewable Energy Team  
Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch  
Ministry of the Environment  
2 St. Clair West, Floor 12A , Toronto, ON M4V 1L5  
P: 416-326-6089 F: 416-314-8452

<http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/en/business/green-energy/>

---

**From:** Aitken, Sarah [<mailto:Sarah.Aitken@aecom.com>]  
**Sent:** May 11, 2011 8:47 AM  
**To:** McNeill, Shannon (ENE)  
**Cc:** Lower, Nicola; Deschamps, Vince  
**Subject:** NextEra Waterbodies workplan

Shannon,

Please accept this AECOM work plan for conducting the water assessments and water body reports for the NextEra Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Wind Energy Centres as required under Ontario Regulation 359/09. Please note that this work plan was developed through correspondence and input from both the local Conservation Authorities in the study area and the review of the Guidance for Preparing Water Assessment and Water Body Reports as part of an Application under O.Reg.359/09.

We anticipate starting our field investigations within the next couple weeks. Please let us know if we require confirmation/comments from MOE prior to the start of field investigations, otherwise we will continue as planned. If you require a meeting to discuss the workplan or any issues regarding the workplan please let me know as soon as possible so we can schedule a meeting.

Please let me know if you require any further information. I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,  
Sarah

**Sarah Aitken, B.Sc.(Hons.)**  
Aquatic Ecologist  
Environment  
D 519.840.2221 M 519.820.0944  
[sarah.aitken@aecom.com](mailto:sarah.aitken@aecom.com)

**AECOM**  
55 Wyndham Street North, Suite 215  
Guelph, ON N1H 7T8  
T: (519) 763-7783 F: (519) 763-1668  
[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**Subject:** FW: NextEra - Waterbodies

---

**From:** McNeill, Shannon (ENE) [<mailto:Shannon.McNeill@ontario.ca>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 16, 2011 4:39 PM

**To:** Aitken, Sarah

**Subject:** RE: NextEra - Waterbodies

Hi Sarah,

Thanks for the reminder email. I have been a bit swamped here.

In terms of the protocol outlined below in your email of November 3, 2011. I am assuming this protocol is for the alternative site investigation. If so, the approach sounds reasonable. If not, please be advised that you are required to conduct a site investigation as per section 31 of Ontario Regulation 359/09.

For the questions and answers provided in your October 24, 2011 email (below) detailing our phone conversations, they appear to accurately reflect our conversation. For questions number 4, I believe that Sandra Guido of my office has provided you with a response. If not, please let me know.

1. What is required for the Alternative Site Investigation for Waterbodies?
  - Explanation as to why site could not be properly assessed (i.e. property access issues, health and safety reasons)
  - Conduct records review and desktop study (i.e. orthoimagery, drain classifications, thermal regimes, watershed maps)
  - Provide dates of when records were reviewed
  - Details regarding NextEra's attempt at contacting landowners for property access and their response – we don't need to provide property owner detail just property number
  - AECOM does not need to provide hard copies of data collected from records review just a summary, however we should provide it upon request
2. Can roads and collection lines be built within the 30 m setback of a permanent or intermittent waterbody?
  - Yes as long as all negative impacts are mitigated
3. The local conservation authority was not able to provide us with the Average annual high water mark, therefore we are using top of bank will this be sufficient?
  - AECOM needs to provide a rationale as to why the AAHWM was not provided and how TOB will be used
4. AECOM has a site that is a farm pond that was dammed and is still online, is this considered a waterbody?
5. Is the area of disturbance considered part of the project location?
  - Yes, it is part of the construction and laydown area and therefore all setbacks should be applied.

Regards,

Shannon McNeill  
Senior Project Evaluator  
Environmental Approvals Branch  
Ministry of the Environment

2 St. Clair West, Floor 12A, Toronto, ON M4V 1L5  
P: 416-326-6089 F: 416-314-8452

<http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/en/business/green-energy/>

---

**From:** Aitken, Sarah [<mailto:Sarah.Aitken@aecom.com>]  
**Sent:** November 16, 2011 4:22 PM  
**To:** McNeill, Shannon (ENE)  
**Subject:** FW: NextEra - Waterbodies

Hi Shannon,  
Sorry to bother you again, I was wondering if you have had a chance to review the protocol below for aerial photo interpretation and also address comments from an October 24<sup>th</sup> email.  
Please let me know if you have any questions.

I look forward to hearing from you,  
Sarah

**Sarah Aitken, B.Sc.(Hons.)**  
Aquatic Ecologist  
Environment  
D 519.650.8621 M 519.820.0944  
[sarah.aitken@aecom.com](mailto:sarah.aitken@aecom.com)

**AECOM**  
50 Sportsworld Crossing Road, Suite 290 \*New\*  
Kitchener, ON N2P 0A4  
T 519.650.5313 F 519.650.3424

 *Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.*

---

**From:** Aitken, Sarah  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 03, 2011 10:39 AM  
**To:** McNeill, Shannon (ENE)  
**Cc:** Lower, Nicola  
**Subject:** NextEra - Waterbodies

Hi Shannon,

As you know we are currently wrapping up our detailed field surveys for waterbodies identified through the records review process for the NextEra wind farm study. Before we finalize work on the study areas for this year, I just wanted to outline our protocol for site selection so that if MOE did have suggestions for changes to this, they can be incorporated before the end of the field work and before we start again next year.

We are currently conducting a desktop study to ensure we have not missed any potential waterbodies that were not identified through the records review process, and wanted to present this protocol to MOE for approval.

AECOM incorporated a three step process to ensure all waterbodies and potential waterbodies were investigated. Within this three step process we developed protocols for both detailed field surveys for identified waterbodies and reconnaissance level surveys for potential waterbodies. The three step process is outlined below:

1. Records review – we identified all waterbodies using CA layers, MNR waterbody layers and any other applicable layers or information provided to us by the agencies.
2. From this records review:
  - Where AECOM identified a water feature a full waterbody assessment was conducted
  - Where no water features were identified from the records review, a desktop air photo **interpretation** exercise was conducted to identify any potential waterbody features using all applicable GIS layers including the conservation authority layers and contour lines to determine any potential waterbodies
3. Air photo interpretation
  - If there was evidence of a potential waterbody based on the air photo interpretation, AECOM completed a full waterbody assessment to determine if it could be considered a 'waterbody' under O. Reg 359
  - If no evidence of a waterbody was found from the air photo interpretation, no study deemed necessary (not investigated further)

#### Cross-referencing

To ensure every study area has been completely investigated, we have also cross referenced notes from both the terrestrial teams and microsites teams noting presence of any water features and where they were found. If water was noted these sites were fully investigated.

As we approach the end of our field season this year, and the writing of our report, please could you confirm whether you are in agreement with this approach.

Many thanks for your time and if you have any questions please let me know,

Sarah

**Sarah Aitken, B.Sc.(Hons.)**  
Aquatic Ecologist  
Environment  
D 519.650.8621 M 519.820.0944  
[sarah.aitken@aecom.com](mailto:sarah.aitken@aecom.com)

**AECOM**  
50 Sportsworld Crossing Road, Suite 290 \*New\*  
Kitchener, ON N2P 0A4  
T 519.650.5313 F 519.650.3424

 *Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.*

## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Cushing, Julia  
**Sent:** Friday, February 03, 2012 12:55 PM  
**To:** Owen, Jennifer  
**Subject:** FW: sample of groundwater calculations to support dewatering conclusion

For the consultation file.

---

**From:** Guido, Sandra (ENE) [<mailto:Sandra.Guido@ontario.ca>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 02, 2012 1:50 PM  
**To:** Rose, Marc  
**Cc:** BIRD, THOMAS; Wardman, Marie; Cushing, Julia  
**Subject:** RE: sample of groundwater calculations to support dewatering conclusion

Hi Marc,

The MOE's Hydrogeologist for Southwestern Region reviewed the calculations and documentation you submitted and provided the following comments for your consideration:

1. The appropriate dewatering formula's for determining flows in Powers and Sichert was used. The primary dilemma is the estimating of the hydrogeologic coefficients that get plugged into the formulas.
2. Two soil types and respective hydraulic conductivities (K) have been used for the entire project area, sand/silt:  $10^{-5}$ m/s, and silt/clay till:  $10^{-7}$ m/s. Most wind farm projects dealt with to date have extended for kilometers covering vast areas potentially crossing many different soil type boundaries. It is unclear how representative these soil types will be for site specific soils and therefore K values across the entire project area. The area extent of the project is unknown. There is only one reference that mentions the sand/silt runs down the middle of the study area.
3. The K values given are assumed values only, there is no reported site specific data as support. Assumptions for K values that are off by just a small amount can result in significant differences in resultant flow volumes to be dewatered. This means the margin of error could easily see the flow (Q) greater than the 23,000 L/day estimate and beyond the 50,000 L/day PTTW trigger amount.
4. The dewatering activities document makes no allowances for the removal of rain water from the excavations. If a storm event occurs during the construction phase the dewatering of the storm water also needs to be accounted for in flow calculations.
5. When such desk top projections are being generated as support documentation for permit applications, it is common for the requested water taking amounts to be double if not triple the projected flow (Q) values to allow for buffer and precipitation factors.

Based on the above comments, if you were to re-do the calculations, what would the result be? Would you still conclude that less than 50,000 L/d would be dewatered during construction of the Bluewater Wind Energy Centre?

Please let me know if you have questions regarding the comments above and I will pull in the Hydrogeologist.

Thank you,  
Sandra

Sandra Guido  
Senior Program Support Coordinator  
Service Integration Unit  
Environmental Approvals Access and Service Integration Branch  
Ministry of the Environment  
2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A Toronto ON M4V 1L5  
Tel: 416.327.4692 Fax: 416.314.8452  
[sandra.guido@ontario.ca](mailto:sandra.guido@ontario.ca)

**From:** Rose, Marc [<mailto:Marc.Rose@aecom.com>]  
**Sent:** January 12, 2012 1:30 PM  
**To:** Guido, Sandra (ENE)  
**Cc:** BIRD, THOMAS; Wardman, Marie; Cushing, Julia  
**Subject:** sample of groundwater calculations to support dewatering conclusion

Hi Sandra,

Further to our conversation on Tuesday, we've prepared the attached appendix to show the calculations that we used to support our conclusion that less than 50,000 L/d would be dewatered during construction of the Bluewater Wind Energy Centre. Can you please circulate the appendix to the appropriate technical reviewers so that we can confirm that the analysis is sufficient for the REA?

Thanks!  
Marc

**Marc Rose, MES, MCIP, RPP**  
Senior Environmental Planner  
Environment  
D: 905-477-8400 x388 C: 416-579-8628  
[marc.rose@aecom.com](mailto:marc.rose@aecom.com)

**AECOM**  
300 Town Centre Blvd., Suite 300  
Markham, Ontario L3R 5Z6  
T: 905-477-8400 F: 905-477-1456  
[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)



## Owen, Jennifer

---

**From:** Cushing, Julia  
**Sent:** Monday, July 26, 2010 11:23 AM  
**To:** 'chris.schiller@ontario.ca'  
**Cc:** Rose, Marc; Williams, Melanie D.; 'thomas.bird@nexteraenergy.com'  
**Subject:** NextEra Energy Canada's Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Wind Energy Centre Proposals  
**Attachments:** Jericho\_Draft PDR\_June 28.pdf; Bluewater\_Draft PDR\_June 28.pdf; Goshen\_Draft PDR\_June 28.pdf

Good Morning Mr. Schiller,

NextEra Energy Canada, ULC, together with Canadian Green Power, is proposing to construct three wind energy projects in south-western Ontario. The first is proposed in Bluewater and Huron East Townships, Huron County; the second in Bluewater and South Huron Townships, Huron County; and lastly, the third in the Municipality of Lambton Shores, Warwick and Brooke-Alvinston Townships, Lambton County, Ontario. These projects are referred to as the Bluewater Wind Energy Centre, Goshen Wind Energy Centre, and Jericho Wind Energy Centre respectively. Although separate Renewable Energy Approval (REA) applications will be submitted for all three projects, the effects assessment will take into consideration the cumulative effects of these three wind energy centres.

In accordance with the recommendation outlined in the document titled *Guidance for Preparing the Project Description Report* (PDR) as part of an application under Ontario Regulation 359/09, we are contacting your agency for information and guidance on the requirements related to the preparation of the PDR and the overall process. Specifically, we are interested in receiving information regarding required permits and approvals, any potential constraints, as well as other comments you may have relating to your agency's mandate. We have included a copy of the draft PDRs for each of the projects above to provide you with background information and context for our request. Please note that the draft PDRs are also available for public viewing at [www.canadianwindproposals.com](http://www.canadianwindproposals.com).

Regards,

**Julia Cushing**  
Environmental Planner  
[Julia.Cushing@aecom.com](mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com)

**AECOM**  
300 Town Centre Boulevard, Suite 300  
Markham, Ontario, Canada L3R 5Z6  
T 905-477-8400 ext 448 F 905-477-1456  
[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)

## Memorandum

To	April Nix (MNR Guelph)	Page 1
CC	Heather Riddell (MNR Aylmer), Tara Lessard (MNR Clinton)	
Subject	NextEra Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Wind Energy Centres, Natural Heritage and Water Assessments – Work Plan	
From	Vince Deschamps	
Date	June 8, 2010	Project Number 60155032

As discussed at our June 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, our work plan for conducting natural heritage and water assessments of the NextEra Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Wind Energy Centres is as follows:

### 1. Undertake Records Reviews

The purpose of the Records Review is to identify preliminary constraints and opportunities that will inform NextEra with regards to selecting preliminary turbine locations. It will also confirm the site investigations that will be required. Specific activities that will be undertaken during the records review include:

- **Natural Heritage:** Under the REA and Ontario Regulation 359/09, Natural Heritage refers primarily to terrestrial features including wetlands, but excluding aquatic habitat and water bodies. AECOM will conduct a Records Review to identify, delineate and categorize the significance of terrestrial habitats in the study areas in accordance with Section 25 of Ontario Regulation 359/09. The analysis will consist of a desktop review of available literature, online databases and remotely-sensed data, which will be verified and confirmed through consultation with the MNR.
- **Water and Water Bodies:** As part of the REA, Ontario Regulation 359/09 criteria have been included in Section 30 with respect to water and water bodies, which include lakes, permanent streams, intermittent streams, and seepage areas. To ensure that each project does not impact surface water features, an investigation of the 120 metre radius of the proposed project is required to determine if any water bodies are present (it is not anticipated that there are any lake trout lakes in the project areas). To meet these objectives, AECOM will search and analyze records that relate to water bodies within 120 metres of the project sites by contacting and obtaining mapping and other information from the MNR, the Ausable-Bayfield and St. Clair Conservation Authorities, municipalities and other agencies as required.

In addition, as part of the REA process, AECOM will undertake records review to identify groundwater resources, cultural heritage resources (i.e., Stage 1 Archaeological and built heritage assessments) and sensitive receptors (for noise and shadow flicker analysis) in the three project areas.

## 2. Prepare Constraints Mapping

Constraints mapping will be prepared in GIS for each project area, based on information collected as part of the records review. Specifically, the mapping will include the following features:

- Wetlands (Provincially Significant and Non-provincially significant), habitats of endangered and threatened species, Life Science Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs) and areas previously identified as significant wildlife habitat, significant woodlands or significant valleylands within 120 metres of the project sites;
- Protected areas (i.e., Pinery Provincial Park, Conservation Reserve, Environmentally Sensitive Areas, Important Bird Areas, etc.) within 120 metres of the project sites;
- Watercourses and water bodies within 120 metres of the project sites;
- Earth Science ANSIs within 50 metres of the project sites;
- Surficial geology;
- Private water wells;
- Known archaeological sites and areas of archaeological potential;
- Designated built heritage features;
- Infrastructure and linear facilities (e.g., roads, utility lines, pipelines, railways, etc.);
- Man-Made Structures (e.g., airports, buildings, towers, etc.);
- Communities and municipal boundaries; and,
- Sensitive noise receptors.

AECOM is utilizing data from Land Information Ontario (LIO), Ministry and Natural Resources (MNR), Natural Heritage Information Center (NHIC), and Natural Resources and Values Information System (NRVIS), and will incorporate additional data provided by MNR and other agencies as appropriate. In addition, AECOM will identify adjacent lands considerations and recommend buffers from ecological features, built features and property lines. These will be mapped in compliance with Ontario Regulation 359/09.

## 3. Site Investigations

Once NextEra has developed a site layout for each wind energy centre, based on the constraints mapping, AECOM will undertake detailed site investigations to gather additional information about the conditions at and around the turbines and all ancillary facilities, including access roads, underground electrical collection systems, and transformer stations. This information will be used to conduct the assessment of effects associated with each project, and the cumulative effect of all three projects. Specific information regarding site investigations is as follows:

- Natural Heritage: Natural Heritage Site Investigations will satisfy Section 26 of Ontario Regulation 359/09. Site investigations will be undertaken where the project is within 120 metres of any natural feature identified in the records review. The need for, and extent of, field surveys will be largely dependent upon the proximity of the individual turbines and other constructed facilities relative to natural vegetation communities and wildlife habitats. One or more of the following types of field investigations may be required at individual sites:
  - Avian surveys: spring and fall bird migration, breeding birds and winter birds;
  - Bat monitoring, in accordance with MNR's *Draft Bats and Bat Habitats – Guidelines for Wind Power Projects* (March 2010);

- Ecological Land Classification and mapping, to the Vegetation Type level (e.g., FOD5-1 for Dry-Fresh Sugar Maple Deciduous Forest Type);
  - One to three-season vegetation inventories;
  - Wetland, ANSI boundary delineation and confirmations;
  - Breeding amphibian surveys; and,
  - Species-specific investigations for Species at Risk.
- **Water and Water Bodies:** Water Site Investigations will satisfy Section 31 of Ontario Regulation 359/09. Additional site investigations will be conducted to ground truth the locations of surface water features identified during the desktop study, and to determine if any additional water bodies are present. The investigations will identify the boundaries of the water bodies, and the distance of the boundaries to the project.

Site investigations will also determine if there are any corrections needed to features identified during the Records Review stage. Site investigation reporting will include: mapping, weather, dates of surveys, summary of methods, qualifications of investigator etc. as required in the REA.

In addition, as part of the REA process, AECOM will also conduct site visits to ground truth geological mapping and determine the presence of any potential surface water - groundwater interaction areas, as well as to determine the need for confirmatory testing pitting and / or drilling. AECOM will also undertake Stage 2 Archaeological Assessments and detailed reviews of cultural heritage resources identified during the Records Review.

#### **4. Undertake an Effects Assessment**

Based on the information collected during the Records Review and subsequent site investigations, an effects assessment will be conducted to identify the effects of constructing and operating the project on the various components of the environment. The evaluation of significance will satisfy Section 27 of Ontario Regulation 359/09. As mentioned previously, our effects assessment will consider the effects of each project on its own and the cumulative effects of all three projects being constructed and operated simultaneously. It will involve the following steps:

- **Determine Likely Effects** – describe the potential and/or likely effects, both positive and negative, on the existing environment that may occur as a result of the project;
- **Identify Mitigation Measures** – identify specific mitigation, compensation, or enhancement measures that will need to be implemented to avoid, minimize, or other reduce the severity of any likely adverse effects of the project on the environment and/or the effects of the environment on the project
- **Determine Residual (Net) Effects** – describe the residual or net effects after the identified mitigation measures have been applied.

During the effects assessment, we will also identify elements of an environmental effects monitoring plan in respect to any negative environmental effects that may result from the installation of the turbines. The assessment of project-related effects will focus on interactions between the project components and natural heritage features and water bodies identified during the records review and site investigations (i.e., features within 120 metres of the project, as per Sections 37-40 of Ontario Regulation 359/09). The need for any additional field surveys will dependent upon the final locations

of the individual turbines and other structures relative to these natural features identified in earlier work, and the type of mitigation required.

In addition, as part of the REA process, AECOM will conduct additional analyses not associated with natural heritage or water bodies, but required under the REA process. These include a Cultural Heritage Analysis, Wind Turbine and Substation Noise Analysis, Shadow Flicker Analysis and Visual Impact Assessment.

#### **5. Confirmation from Ministry of Natural Resources**

AECOM intends to consult with the MNR throughout the course of the project. As per Section 28 of Ontario Regulation 359/09, AECOM will also seek written confirmation from the MNR that the Records Review, Site Investigations and Evaluation of Significance have been made using applicable evaluation criteria or procedures established or accepted by the Ministry, as amended from time to time.

**Ministry of  
Natural Resources**  
615 John Street North  
Aylmer ON N5H 2S8  
Tel: 519-773-9241  
Fax: 519-773-9014

**Ministère des  
Richesses naturelles**  
615, rue John Nord  
Aylmer ON N5H 2S8  
Tél: 519-773-9241  
Télé: 519-773-9014



August 31, 2010

Vince Deschamps  
Senior Environmental Planner  
AECOM  
512 Woolwich St,  
Suite 2 Guelph, ON N1H 3X7

Dear Mr. Deschamps

**RE: Background Information Request – Records Review and Work Plan  
Bluewater & Goshen Wind Farms, Municipality Bluewater & Huron East Huron County  
Jericho Wind Farm, Municipality of Lambton Shores, Township of Warwick**

---

Further to our meeting on June 3 2010, the MNR provides the following additional information and comments for consideration based on the submitted work plan and associated information. It is understood that the area of interest is for NextEra Energy's proposed Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Wind Farms, which are moving through the renewable energy approvals (REA) process.

**About the Renewable Energy Approvals Process**

Under the Ministry of the Environment's Regulation for Renewable Energy Approvals (359/09) under the Environmental Protection Act, there are several requirements for Renewable Energy projects that must be met/addressed pertaining to the protection of natural heritage features. You can find the Regulation online at: [http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/regs/english/elaws\\_regs\\_090359\\_e.htm](http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/regs/english/elaws_regs_090359_e.htm)

More specifically Sections 24-28 of the Regulation outline natural heritage assessment requirements for renewable energy projects. Section 38 also outlines natural heritage prohibitions and Environment Impact Study requirements.

As per Section 28 of the Regulation, the MNR is required to confirm the following with respect to a natural heritage assessment:

- That the determination of the existence of natural features and the boundaries of natural features was made using applicable evaluation criteria or procedures established by the MNR.
- That the site investigation and records review were conducted using applicable evaluation criteria or procedures established or accepted by the MNR, if no natural features are identified.
- That the evaluation of significance or provincial significance of natural features was conducted using applicable evaluation criteria or procedures established or accepted by the MNR.
- That the project location is not in a provincial park or conservation reserve.
- That the environmental impact assessment report(s) has/have been prepared in accordance with the procedures established or accepted by the MNR.

In addition to the Regulation requirements, proponents are also required to provide additional information as outlined in the MNR's Approvals and Permitting Requirements Document for Renewable Energy Projects

(APRD). The APRD contains direction on items outside of the Regulation that must be addressed for the purpose of the MNR's permits and approvals, including but not limited to petroleum resources and species protected under the *Endangered Species Act, 2007*. This document can be found online at <http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/277097.pdf>.

The Natural Heritage Information Centre (NHIC) database may also provide additional natural heritage information. You can submit a request to obtain this information through their website at <http://nhic.mnr.gov.on.ca/>. To obtain digital mapping that the Ministry has available for the natural features mentioned below; please contact Land Information Ontario (LIO), or visit their website at <http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/en/Business/LIO/index.html>.

To obtain more general information about developing renewable energy projects in Ontario, you can also contact the Renewable Energy Facilitation Office (REFO). They can be reached at [REFO@ontario.ca](mailto:REFO@ontario.ca) or 1-877-440-REFO (7336). You can also visit their website at [http://www.mei.gov.on.ca/en/energy/renewable/index.php?page=refo\\_office](http://www.mei.gov.on.ca/en/energy/renewable/index.php?page=refo_office).

## **Natural Heritage Information**

### **Wetlands**

With respect to wetlands, parts of the provincially significant Hay Swamp wetland complex are located within the general study area for Goshen and Bluewater. In addition, there are several other wetlands that have been evaluated and identified as not provincially significant within the general study area.

Wetlands located within the study area for the Jericho project include:

- Ausable River Wetland (PSW)
- Bear Creek Source Woodlot (LSW)
- Spicebush Swamp (LSW)
- Thedford Swamp (PSW)
- Warwick Conservation Area (PSW)

Mapping for these features is available through LIO. If you are interested in accessing and reviewing hard copy wetland reports/information for the Bluewater and Goshen study areas, please contact Tara Lessard out of the Clinton Area Office at [tara.lessard@ontario.ca](mailto:tara.lessard@ontario.ca) or 519-482-3601 to make arrangements. For the Jericho study area, please contact Erin Sanders at the Aylmer District Office at [erin.sanders@ontario.ca](mailto:erin.sanders@ontario.ca) or 519-773-4715.

### **Fisheries**

There is also hardy copy fisheries information available for a number of the water courses within the Bluewater and Goshen study areas. Please contact Tara Lessard to make arrangements to access this information.

As for the Jericho study area, please see the attached list of fish species survey data for watercourses within the study area.

### **Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest**

The following regionally significant Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) are located within the Goshen and/or Bluewater study areas:

- Bayfield South Life Science ANSI,
- Dashwood Area Earth Science ANSI,
- Khiva Conservation Forest Life Science ANSI, and
- Hay Swamp Life Science ANSI.

The following ANSIs are located within the Jericho study area:



- Ausable River Valley Life ANSI
- Thedford Brickyard Earth ANSI

Mapping of ANSI features is available through LIO.

### **Woodlands**

There are several old “agreement forests” parcels scattered throughout the Bluewater and Goshen study areas, including:

- Hay Swamp Tract,
- Carroll Tract, and
- Coleman Tract.

The following are within the Jericho study area:

- |                   |                       |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| • Carroll Tract   | • Saddler             |
| • Harpley Tract   | • Sharrow Tract       |
| • Hay Swamp Tract | • Sweltzer Tract      |
| • Mahon Tract     | • Turnbull Tract      |
| • Ratz Tract      | • Webb and Wein Tract |
| • Roy Ratz Tract  |                       |

Some of these lands are currently owned/ managed by the Ausable-Bayfield Conservation Authority, the County of Huron or local municipality; as such these agencies may be able to provide additional information pertaining to these sites. The old agreement forest layer is also available through LIO

There are a number of wooded areas within the general study areas, which appear to range from small hedgerow features to larger woodland communities up to over 100 hectares in size. Several of the woodland communities have also been identified as deer wintering areas, which should also be captured as part of the overall NHA in relation to significant wildlife habitat. Mapping is also available for identified deer wintering areas and wooded areas through LIO.

### **Evaluation of Significance**

An evaluation of significance is required for all natural features within 120 m of the project location. If a natural feature, such as woodland or valleyland is not already evaluated/identified as significant, the MNR recommends applying the criteria outlined in the recently updated Natural Heritage Reference Manual – second edition, which can be found online at: <http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/289522.pdf>. If a feature is already evaluated for significance, please provide the list of criteria that were used to determine significance.

### **Post-Construction Monitoring**

As part of the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan, proponents of wind power projects are encouraged to submit detailed bird and bat post-construction monitoring work plans to the MNR for review, along with the NHA reports. The MNR encourages this to ensure that the post-construction monitoring plan meets the guidelines and to ensure that all wind power proponents are conducting post-construction monitoring in a consistent manner across the province.

The Ministry has guidelines to assist proponents in developing appropriate bird and bat monitoring protocols, including the ‘Guideline to Assist in the Review of Wind Power Proposals: Potential Impacts to Birds and Bird Habitats’ and the recently updated draft ‘Bats and Bat Habitats: Guideline for Wind Power Projects’. These documents are available on the Ministry’s website at [www.mnr.gov.on.ca](http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca) under the Energy–Windpower – Policies, Procedures and Guidelines section. Please note that the MNR is currently in the process of updating the bird guidelines to reflect the recent changes to the renewable energy approvals process.



## **Potential Bat Habitat**

Further, there are areas of karst that may support potential bat habitat within Huron County. Karst mapping is provided through the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines and Forestry (MNDMF). You will need to contact them directly to obtain available karst data and information.

## **Information Relating to APRD Requirements**

Ministry staff are aware of occurrence records of Species at Risk (SAR) within the study areas. More specifically the Ministry is aware of the following occurrences on and/or immediately adjacent to the following study areas:

### Bluewater Wind Farm Study Area:

- Northern Brook Lamprey (Special Concern) in the Bayfield and Bannockburn Rivers
- Milksnake (Special Concern), and
- Goldenseal (Threatened).

### Goshen Study Wind Farm Study Area:

- Goldenseal (Threatened),
- Green Dragon (Special Concern),
- Blanding's Turtle (Threatened),
- Eastern Hog-nosed Snake (Threatened), and
- historical record for American Badger (Endangered).

### Jericho Wind Farm Study Area:

- Round Pigtoe (Endangered),
- Mudpuppy Mussel (Endangered),
- Northern Riffleshell (Endangered),
- Snuffbox (Endangered),
- Eastern Hog-nosed Snake (Threatened),
- Queensnake (Threatened),
- Spiny Softshell (Threatened),
- Spotted Turtle (Endangered),
- Blanding's Turtle (Threatened),
- Butternut (Endangered),
- Dwarf Hackberry (Threatened),
- Dense Blazing Star (Threatened),
- Eastern Flowering Dogwood (Endangered),
- Heart-leaved Plantain (Endangered),
- Goldenseal (Threatened),
- Prothonotary Warbler (Endangered),
- Loggerhead Shrike (Endangered),
- Hooded Warbler (Special Concern), and
- Acadian Flycatcher (Endangered).

### Within these areas of Huron County:

- Butternut (Endangered),
- American Ginseng (Endangered),
- Gray Fox (Endangered),
- Barn Owl (Endangered),
- Wavy-rayed Lamp-mussel (Endangered),
- Queen Snake (Threatened),
- Least Bittern (Threatened),
- Black Redhorse (Threatened),
- Redside Dace (Threatened),
- Eastern Fringed Prairie Orchid (Historical - Threatened),
- Whip-Poor-Will (Threatened),
- Monarch Butterfly (Special Concern),
- Common Nighthawk (Special Concern),
- Short-eared Owl (Special Concern),
- Tuberos Indian Plantain (Special Concern),
- Black Tern (Special Concern),
- Louisiana Water-thrush (Special Concern),
- Eastern Ribbonsnake (Special Concern), and
- Snapping Turtle (Special Concern).

It should also be noted that because the province has not been surveyed comprehensively for the presence of SAR, the absence of an element occurrence does not indicate the absence of the species. Consequently, the presence of element occurrences is useful to flag the presence of a SAR in an area, but is not an appropriate tool to determine whether a species is present at the local (property-scale) level.

Based on the study areas for the Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho projects and given the potential for SAR to occur within this area, natural heritage surveys should include SAR investigations where there is species-appropriate habitat. Ministry staff recommend undertaking a comprehensive botanical inventory of the natural heritage features within the study area for terrestrial systems and include aquatic habitat investigations where appropriate, to inform the development of a map of all vegetation communities and aquatic habitats within the study areas. The vegetation communities should be classified as per the “Ecological Land Classification for Southern Ontario” system, to either the “Ecosite” or “Vegetation Type” level, depending on the habitat specificity of potential SAR within the study area.

This information can then be used to identify potential habitats associated with the list of SAR species provided above. Where potential habitats are identified a more detailed investigation should occur to confirm the presence of SAR species. The survey report for SAR should also describe how each SAR was surveyed for, and provide a rationale for why certain species, if any, appearing on the list provided were not the subject of the survey.

### **Petroleum Resources**

With respect to Petroleum Resources, due to possible safety concerns when selecting turbine locations, it is also recommended that you review the Ontario Oil, Gas and Salt Resources Library for information about known well and pool locations (<http://www.ogsrlibrary.com/>) of petroleum in the study area. The Ontario Oil, Gas and Salt Resources Library is the most accurate source of petroleum resource information available. Some additional information pertaining to set back requirements from petroleum resource operations is included within the MNR’s APRD document.

### **Fisheries**

With respect to fisheries information, this information may be used as part of the water report where applicable, or in the identification of SAR and associated habitat. Other fisheries information should be collected in order to address any possible requirements or approvals such as from the Conservation Authority or Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

## **General Comments on the Work Plan**

### **Project Location**

With respect to the work plan in general it should be noted that references to “project sites” should reflect the definition of project location as defined in the Regulation. While the current work plan identifies the general study area this will also need to be refined to reflect the project location as this information becomes available.

### **Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH)**

The first bullet in Section 2 identifies that significant wildlife habitat (SWH) will be identified and mapped through the records review and site investigation processes. It is unclear to Ministry staff as to why important bird areas have been identified separately within the second bullet as these features would appear to be significant wildlife habitat. If these areas are being identified separately in relation to federal requirements, please note that permits/ approvals associated with these requirements are separate from the REA process and not part of the NHA submission.

With respect to Section 3 Ministry staff note that while certain field investigations, that may be used as part of the process for identifying SWH and SAR, have been generally identified. However, other types of investigations for taxonomic groups such as reptiles and mammals should also be included.

When reporting on SWH, please ensure that the records review and site investigation discusses ‘candidate’ SWH within 120 m of the project location and that the evaluation of significance confirms the presence/absence of SWH based on criteria in the Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide where you will see that wildlife habitat is divided into four broad categories:

- 1) Seasonal concentration areas
- 2) Rare vegetation communities or specialised habitats for wildlife
- 3) Habitats of species of conservation concern, excluding the habitats of endangered and threatened species
- 4) Animal movement corridors.

### **Wetlands and ANSI Boundaries**

Bullet 5 refers to wetland delineation and ANSI boundary delineation and confirmation. It should be understood that while the identification of wetland features occurs as part of the site investigation process, the evaluation of wetland features identified through the site investigation process and located within 120m of the project location form part of the evaluation of significance within the NHA.

It should also be understood that the delineation and confirmation of ANSI features is not part of the NHA process. Where the project location falls within 120m of a provincially significant life science ANSI or 50m of a provincially significant earth science ANSI, the EIS requirements within Section 38 apply. Information relating to regional ANSIs may support the identification of other natural heritage features such as significant wildlife habitat and potential habitat for SAR.

### **Mapping**

In addition to the requirements for reporting of site investigations as per Section 26, mapping of the project location in relation to identified natural features is also required as part of the site investigation. Please refer to Section 26 (3)3 of the Regulation for the mapping requirements. Please ensure that this mapping includes mapping of wildlife habitat and/or ‘candidate’ SWH identified during site investigation.

### **Environmental Effects**

With respect to Section 4 – Undertake an Effects Assessment, it appears that this section incorporates requirements pertaining to the evaluation of significance and environment impact study report requirements as part of the NHA, and the preparation of the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan (EEMP). Ministry staff would generally recommend that this section be clarified to separately identify work that will address each of these components. Further, only the evaluation of significance and environment impact study report (where applicable) comprise parts of the NHA submission. The EEMP is a separate report required within the REA process and not a part of the NHA. However, where elements of the NHA are also incorporated into the EEMP, such as with post-construction bird and bat monitoring, Ministry staff may also be able to provide input into the development of these elements.

While the Ministry supports the consideration of cumulative effects of all three projects being constructed and operated simultaneously given the close proximity of the three study areas, it should be understood that for the purposes of the NHA submission to MNR for confirmation, three separate NHA studies will be submitted.

Finally, it is recommended that you also review any other information available from the Counties of Huron and Lambton, the Municipalities of Bluewater, South Huron, and Lambton Shores and the Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority, if you have not already done so.

I trust this information will be of assistance in the development of the natural heritage assessment.

If you have any questions about the information provided for the Bluewater and Goshen projects please contact April Nix at [april.nix@ontario.ca](mailto:april.nix@ontario.ca) or (519)826-4939 and if you have the same about the information provided for the Jericho project, please contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "H. Riddell". The signature is written in a cursive style with a period at the end.

Heather Riddell

A/Planning Ecologist, Aylmer District  
(519) 773-4723  
heather.riddell@ontario.ca

c. April Nix (MNR)  
Julia Cushing (AECOM)  
Thomas Bird (Nextera)

## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Cushing, Julia  
**Sent:** Monday, July 26, 2010 11:37 AM  
**To:** 'daraleigh.irving@ontario.ca'; 'mike.stone@ontario.ca'  
**Cc:** Rose, Marc; Williams, Melanie D.; 'thomas.bird@nexteraenergy.com'  
**Subject:** NextEra Energy Canada's Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Wind Energy Centre Proposals  
**Attachments:** Jericho\_Draft PDR\_June 28.pdf; Bluewater\_Draft PDR\_June 28.pdf; Goshen\_Draft PDR\_June 28.pdf

Good Morning Ms. Irving and Mr. Stone,

NextEra Energy Canada, ULC, together with Canadian Green Power, is proposing to construct three wind energy projects in south-western Ontario. The first is proposed in Bluewater and Huron East Townships, Huron County; the second in Bluewater and South Huron Townships, Huron County; and lastly, the third in the Municipality of Lambton Shores, Warwick and Brooke-Alvinston Townships, Lambton County, Ontario. These projects are referred to as the Bluewater Wind Energy Centre, Goshen Wind Energy Centre, and Jericho Wind Energy Centre respectively. Although separate Renewable Energy Approval (REA) applications will be submitted for all three projects, the effects assessment will take into consideration the cumulative effects of these three wind energy centres.

In accordance with the recommendation outlined in the document titled *Guidance for Preparing the Project Description Report (PDR)* as part of an application under Ontario Regulation 359/09, we are contacting your agency for information and guidance on the requirements related to the preparation of the PDR and the overall process. Specifically, we are interested in receiving information regarding required permits and approvals, any potential constraints, as well as other comments you may have relating to your agency's mandate. We have included a copy of the draft PDR for each of the projects above to provide you with background information and context for our request.

We have addressed this request to both of you because the Projects fall within the Guelph and Aylmer District MNR jurisdictions. Please note that the draft PDRs are also available for public viewing at [www.canadianwindproposals.com](http://www.canadianwindproposals.com).

Regards,

**Julia Cushing**  
Environmental Planner  
[Julia.Cushing@aecom.com](mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com)

**AECOM**  
300 Town Centre Boulevard, Suite 300  
Markham, Ontario, Canada L3R 5Z6  
T 905-477-8400 ext 448 F 905-477-1456  
[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)

## Owen, Jennifer

---

**From:** Bentley, Kevin (MTO) [Kevin.Bentley@ontario.ca]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 27, 2010 7:51 AM  
**To:** Cushing, Julia  
**Cc:** McInnis, Steve (MTO)  
**Subject:** RE: NextEra Energy Canada's Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Wind Energy Centre Proposals

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

I have forwarded your email to Steve McInnis the manager of our Corridor Management Section for his consideration and response.

Kevin

---

**From:** Cushing, Julia [<mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com>]  
**Sent:** July 26, 2010 11:43 AM  
**To:** Bentley, Kevin (MTO)  
**Cc:** Rose, Marc; Williams, Melanie D.; [thomas.bird@nexteraenergy.com](mailto:thomas.bird@nexteraenergy.com)  
**Subject:** NextEra Energy Canada's Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Wind Energy Centre Proposals

Good Morning Mr. Bentley,

NextEra Energy Canada, ULC, together with Canadian Green Power, is proposing to construct three wind energy projects in south-western Ontario. The first is proposed in Bluewater and Huron East Townships, Huron County; the second in Bluewater and South Huron Townships, Huron County; and lastly, the third in the Municipality of Lambton Shores, Warwick and Brooke-Alvinston Townships, Lambton County, Ontario. These projects are referred to as the Bluewater Wind Energy Centre, Goshen Wind Energy Centre, and Jericho Wind Energy Centre respectively. Although separate Renewable Energy Approval (REA) applications will be submitted for all three projects, the effects assessment will take into consideration the cumulative effects of these three wind energy centres.

In accordance with the recommendation outlined in the document titled *Guidance for Preparing the Project Description Report* (PDR) as part of an application under Ontario Regulation 359/09, we are contacting your agency for information and guidance on the requirements related to the preparation of the PDR and the overall process. Specifically, we are interested in receiving information regarding required permits and approvals, any potential constraints, as well as other comments you may have relating to your agency's mandate. We have included a copy of the draft PDRs for each of the projects above to provide you with background information and context for our request. Please note that the draft PDRs are also available for public viewing at [www.canadianwindproposals.com](http://www.canadianwindproposals.com).

Regards,

**Julia Cushing**  
Environmental Planner  
[Julia.Cushing@aecom.com](mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com)

**AECOM**  
300 Town Centre Boulevard, Suite 300  
Markham, Ontario, Canada L3R 5Z6  
T 905-477-8400 ext 448 F 905-477-1456  
[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)



## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Cushing, Julia  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 01, 2011 2:30 PM  
**To:** 'april.nix@ontario.ca'  
**Cc:** Deschamps, Vince; Rose, Marc; Williams, Melanie D.  
**Subject:** NextEra - Bluewater and Goshen Wind Energy Centres  
**Attachments:** Bluewater.zip; Goshen.zip

Hello April,

I had a conversation today with Heather Riddell (MNR) regarding the setbacks to petroleum resource operations. Heather indicated to me that the procedure for verifying the existing resources and associated setbacks is to provide both of you with GIS shapefiles for the Study Area boundary and for the existing Petroleum Resources in the Study Area (the Jericho shapefiles for Heather, and the Bluewater and Goshen shapefiles for you) as well as a list which summarizes these resources.

It is my understanding that you will forward this information to the Petroleum Resource Centre and request that they confirm the accuracy and completeness of this information, and that they provide the boundaries of the operation, whether any decommissioned wells were done so by today's standards and any information on required setbacks. Heather indicated this process may take between 3 weeks to one month. As such, I have attached the required data, please contact me if you require any additional information.

Thank you for your assistance.

Regards,

Julia

**Julia Cushing**  
Environmental Planner  
[Julia.Cushing@aecom.com](mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com)

**AECOM**  
300 Town Centre Boulevard, Suite 300  
Markham, Ontario, Canada L3R 5Z6  
T 905-477-8400 ext 448 F 905-477-1456  
[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)



## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Nix, April (MNR) <April.Nix@ontario.ca>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 04, 2011 11:19 AM  
**To:** Cushing, Julia  
**Subject:** RE: NextEra - Bluewater and Goshen Wind Energy Centres

Julia,

We've heard back from PRC and it would appear that the well locations provided when compared to the information in MNR's records don't appear to match. The MNR information does however match the records available on the Ontario Oil, Gas and Salt Resources Library (OGSRL), and as such it is recommended that you download the most up-to-date well location information. This information is updated monthly on the 15<sup>th</sup> of the month.

The requirements for setbacks from petroleum resource operations are outlined in Section 7.8 of the APRD. Once you know the project location for the Wind Farms you will need to determine if their project components fall within 75 metres of any petroleum wells or associated works. If so, further information regarding these wells may be obtained from the OGSRL. If you have specific technical questions regarding interpretation of the information please let me know.

Also please note that MNR can not guarantee the accuracy of the data in the Ministry's records as some of the information is historical and may be inaccurate or incomplete. Further the well data retrieved in the search of the MNR's database are only the wells of which we are currently aware. Other wells may exist in the project area for which we do not have any records.

If any wells in addition to the wells identified in the database search are encountered during project development, please contact MNR and let us know.

Cheers,

**April**

April Nix  
Renewable Energy Planning Ecologist  
Ministry of Natural Resources, Guelph District  
1 Stone Road West  
Guelph ON, N1G 4Y2  
(P) 519-826-4939  
(F) 519-826-6849  
email: [april.nix@ontario.ca](mailto:april.nix@ontario.ca)

---

**From:** Cushing, Julia [<mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com>]  
**Sent:** April 8, 2011 12:42 PM  
**To:** Nix, April (MNR)  
**Cc:** Deschamps, Vince; Radue, Marianne; Rose, Marc  
**Subject:** FW: NextEra - Bluewater and Goshen Wind Energy Centres

Hello April,

I wanted to follow up with you about the request we sent you in February regarding petroleum resources in the Bluewater and Goshen study areas.

Can you confirm when we will receive this information?

Thank you,

Julia

---

**From:** Cushing, Julia  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 01, 2011 2:30 PM  
**To:** 'april.nix@ontario.ca'  
**Cc:** Deschamps, Vince; Rose, Marc; Williams, Melanie D.  
**Subject:** NextEra - Bluewater and Goshen Wind Energy Centres

Hello April,

I had a conversation today with Heather Riddell (MNR) regarding the setbacks to petroleum resource operations. Heather indicated to me that the procedure for verifying the existing resources and associated setbacks is to provide both of you with GIS shapefiles for the Study Area boundary and for the existing Petroleum Resources in the Study Area (the Jericho shapefiles for Heather, and the Bluewater and Goshen shapefiles for you) as well as a list which summarizes these resources.

It is my understanding that you will forward this information to the Petroleum Resource Centre and request that they confirm the accuracy and completeness of this information, and that they provide the boundaries of the operation, whether any decommissioned wells were done so by today's standards and any information on required setbacks. Heather indicated this process may take between 3 weeks to one month. As such, I have attached the required data, please contact me if you require any additional information.

Thank you for your assistance.

Regards,

Julia

**Julia Cushing**  
Environmental Planner  
[Julia.Cushing@aecom.com](mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com)

**AECOM**  
300 Town Centre Boulevard, Suite 300  
Markham, Ontario, Canada L3R 5Z6  
T 905-477-8400 ext 448 F 905-477-1456  
[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)

## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Nix, April (MNR) <April.Nix@ontario.ca>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2011 12:04 PM  
**To:** Aitken, Sarah  
**Cc:** Deschamps, Vince; Riddell, Heather (MNR); Harkins, Erin (MNR)  
**Subject:** RE: NextEra Wind Energy  
**Attachments:** Inland Ontario Lakes Designated for Lake Trout Management.pdf

Hi Sarah,

With respect to the Bluewater and Goshen sites,

For the water bodies report please note that the Great Lakes are not considered Lake Trout Lakes for the purpose of the Renewable Energy Approvals regulation.

Only those lakes listed in the *Inland Ontario Lakes Designated for Lake Trout Management ,May 2006* (as amended and revised) are considered Lake Trout Lakes for the purpose of the regulation (see document attached).

You should be directing questions regarding Jericho to Heather Riddell in Alymer District.

Cheers,

## April

April Nix  
Renewable Energy Planning Ecologist  
Ministry of Natural Resources, Guelph District  
1 Stone Road West  
Guelph ON, N1G 4Y2  
(P) 519-826-4939  
(F) 519-826-6849  
email: [april.nix@ontario.ca](mailto:april.nix@ontario.ca)

---

**From:** Aitken, Sarah [<mailto:Sarah.Aitken@aecom.com>]  
**Sent:** March 28, 2011 11:36 AM  
**To:** Nix, April (MNR)  
**Cc:** Deschamps, Vince  
**Subject:** NextEra Wind Energy

Hi April,

We are in the process of completing our records review for the waterbodies requirements for MOE.

It is not anticipated that there are any lake trout lakes in the project areas, however; can you please confirm if there are any within the Jericho, Bluewater or Goshen study areas.

Thankyou,  
Sarah

**Sarah Aitken, B.Sc.(Hons.)**  
Aquatic Ecologist  
Environment  
D 519.763.7783 ext 5146 M 519.820.0944  
[sarah.aitken@aecom.com](mailto:sarah.aitken@aecom.com)

**AECOM**

512 Woolwich Street, Suite 2 Guelph, ON N1H 3X7

T: (519) 763-7783 F: (519) 763-1668

[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)

This electronic communication, which includes any files or attachments thereto, contains proprietary or confidential information and may be privileged and otherwise protected under copyright or other applicable intellectual property laws. All information contained in this electronic communication is solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it was addressed. If you are not the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that distributing, copying, or in any way disclosing any of the information in this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately, and destroy the communication and any files or attachments in their entirety, whether in electronic or hard copy format. Since data stored on electronic media can deteriorate, be translated or modified, AECOM, its subsidiaries, and/or affiliates will not be liable for the completeness, correctness or readability of the electronic data. The electronic data should be verified against the hard copy.

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

**Subject:** FW: Next Era ELC/Amphibian field survey protocols

---

**From:** Riddell, Heather (MNR) [mailto:Heather.Riddell@ontario.ca]

**Sent:** Monday, May 16, 2011 3:53 PM

**To:** Jolly, Dave

**Cc:** MacKay Ward, Jessica; Nix, April (MNR)

**Subject:** RE: Next Era ELC/Amphibian field survey protocols

Hi Dave,

The Aylmer and Guelph offices of the MNR reviewed the ELC and amphibian protocols provided for the Nextera projects (Jericho, Goshen and Bluewater) and provide the following recommendations in response.

### **Amphibian Studies and Candidate SWH**

It should be understood that general feature-based criteria found in the Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide (SWHTG) can be used to identify Candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) using simple investigation methods such as visual scans. This information should be used to identify natural features, including Candidate SWH.

For the purposes of the site investigation, it is unclear what methods were used to identify the various Candidate SWH amphibian breeding habitats. When applying the SWHTG there are two types of amphibian breeding habitats to separately consider – wetland and woodlands habitats. Each feature (habitat) should be identified and discussed separately in the NHA site investigation and evaluation of significance reports.

Where Candidate SWH meets the habitat-based criteria from the SWHTG and proponents are proposing development in or within 120m of a Candidate SWH, an evaluation of significance is required.

Point Count, Transect, Floristic Studies, Egg mass/larval counts and Observational Studies are examples of methods for evaluating significance of natural features, and must be completed at the appropriate time of year. These methods are intended to document the significance of Candidate SWH, meaning the activity and behaviour, as well as abundance and diversity of specific species using these habitats. These types of studies including amphibian breeding call studies should be reported within the methods and results of the Evaluation of Significance Report.

With respect to the proposed amphibian call studies for the purposes of evaluating the significance of Candidate SWH amphibian breeding habitats, Ministry staff note the following:

1. The proposed method of only two surveys would not include data for the third timing window as per the marsh monitoring protocol, and may not accurately capture breeding activity from later breeding amphibian species. Further given the delayed season due to weather conditions so far this year for some species breeding-related activities, it is recommended that observations from all three of the survey windows should be represented.
2. Amphibian call locations should be within/adjacent to each Candidate SWH identified through the site investigation and provide information to support identifying the diversity and abundance of species using the habitat(s).
3. It is unclear how other amphibian species that cannot be monitored through vocalization studies (such as salamanders) are being considered within the evaluation of significance. Where amphibian woodland habitats are identified as Candidate SWH, evaluations of significance should also capture salamanders when determining the species diversity and abundance of amphibian habitats.
4. The proposed protocol states that surveys will end at 2 a.m., while the marsh monitoring protocol recommends ending surveys at 12 a.m. We recommend adhering to the marsh monitoring program and ending surveys at 12 a.m., as opposed to 2 a.m.

This same approach for identifying Candidate SWH should be applied to all other potential habitats and appropriate evaluations are required where Candidate SWH is in or within 120m of the project location.

### **Ecological Land Classification (ELC)**

We noted that the ELC protocol is proposing that soil samples are only taken “at sites that appear transitional (i.e. where it is unclear whether unit is upland or wetland)...”. The criteria presented dictates “ii) the moisture regime should be >6 (i.e. wet) and iii) ground cover should reflect >50% wetland vegetation”. The most recent guidance available, which assists with determining when an ELC community meets the definition of a wetland in Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES), states that when an ELC community has a moisture regime of 5 or more and contains 50% or more wetland plants it is considered a wetland by OWES. Therefore, we suggest that soils data is collected for each community and that the OWES 3rd edition southern manual is utilized to determine if any communities are wetlands. The boundaries of wetlands should also be delineated using OWES, not ELC, i.e. ELC and OWES protocol should not be combined, but used separately as they both serve separate purposes. Where MNR has previously identified/ evaluated wetland features, the boundaries were assigned using OWES; however, if additional information is collected and revisions to an OWES boundary proposed this needs to be communicated within the NHA.

ELC should be completed by individuals who have completed ELC training. Where ELC is being completed to the Ecosite level the field cards should be completed, and included as part of the field notes. This should include soils information.

If any Endangered and/or Threatened species at risk (SAR) species are encountered during ELC surveys, this information is not to be reported within the NHA, but should be provided to the Ministry in a separate report to meet the requirements of Approvals and Permitting Requirements Document (APRD).

It is our understanding that these projects do not currently have a Feed-in Tariff (FIT) contract, but are awaiting the results of Economic Connection Testing (ECT). Given the number of renewable energy applications we are receiving at this time, we are prioritizing our reviews of Natural Heritage Assessments and work plans for renewable energy projects. Those projects that currently have FIT contracts with OPA are being given first priority given the timelines they are required to meet. As such, we will be unable review any additional survey protocols for these projects at this time.

Should the status of these projects change and a FIT contract be awarded to any one of these projects, please let us know and Ministry staff would work to review and provide comments on the work plan at that time.

If you have any questions please let me know.

Regards,

Heather

**Heather Riddell**

A/ Planning Ecologist  
MNR, Aylmer District  
(519) 773-4723

---

**From:** Jolly, Dave [mailto:Dave.Jolly@aecom.com]  
**Sent:** May 10, 2011 2:08 PM  
**To:** Riddell, Heather (MNR)  
**Cc:** MacKay Ward, Jessica  
**Subject:** RE: Next Era ELC/Amphibian field survey protocols

Thx Heather; I appreciate your attention to this ASAP as it will make our field investigations more accurate and efficient.



---

**From:** Riddell, Heather (MNR) [mailto:Heather.Riddell@ontario.ca]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2011 1:54 PM  
**To:** Jolly, Dave  
**Cc:** MacKay Ward, Jessica  
**Subject:** RE: Next Era ELC/Amphibian field survey protocols

Hi Dave,

I'm glad you double-checked because for some reason that email when to my Junkmail filter. I am just seeing it now. I don't know that we will be able to provide a response by tomorrow. We commonly need a couple weeks to review workplans, etc. given our current workload, but I will circulate it with technical staff and try to get back to you soon.

Regards,  
Heather

**Heather Riddell**  
A/ Planning Ecologist  
MNR, Aylmer District  
(519) 773-4723

---

**From:** Jolly, Dave [mailto:Dave.Jolly@aecom.com]  
**Sent:** May 10, 2011 1:46 PM  
**To:** Riddell, Heather (MNR)  
**Cc:** MacKay Ward, Jessica  
**Subject:** RE: Next Era ELC/Amphibian field survey protocols

Thx Heather:

I'll take a look at documents to pull out info for our field investigations. Did you receive our ELC/vegetation + Amphibian survey protocols? Any word on when you can get back to me on them as ideally we would like to start field investigations as early as tomorrow?



---

**From:** Riddell, Heather (MNR) [mailto:Heather.Riddell@ontario.ca]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2011 1:36 PM

**To:** Jolly, Dave  
**Cc:** MacKay Ward, Jessica  
**Subject:** RE: Next Era ELC/Amphibian field survey protocols

Hi Dave,

It's called the Wetland Characteristics and Ecological Functions Assessment tool and it's located in Appendix C (Page 80) of the Natural Heritage Assessment Guide (NHAG). Please note that the Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) Criteria Schedules are draft and the SWH Technical Guide should be the primary reference to use for criteria for identifying candidate SWH and evaluating Candidate SWH for significance.

Regards,  
Heather

**Heather Riddell**  
A/ Planning Ecologist  
MNR, Aylmer District  
(519) 773-4723

---

**From:** Jolly, Dave [mailto:Dave.Jolly@aecom.com]  
**Sent:** May 10, 2011 11:25 AM  
**To:** Riddell, Heather (MNR)  
**Cc:** MacKay Ward, Jessica  
**Subject:** Re: Next Era ELC/Amphibian field survey protocols

Hi Heather:

You mentioned an OWES tool that we might be able to use as a possible short cut to full OWES for Next Era sites. Did I hear that correctly? If so, please provide details or where you can find it in the Natural Heritage Assessment Guide or Significant Wildlife Habitat Ecoregion Criteria Schedules Addendum to Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide.



---

**From:** Jolly, Dave  
**Sent:** Monday, May 09, 2011 6:41 PM  
**To:** 'heather.riddell@ontario.ca'  
**Cc:** 'april.nix@ontario.ca'; MacKay Ward, Jessica; Deschamps, Vince; Radue, Marianne  
**Subject:** Re: Next Era ELC/Amphibian field survey protocols

Hello Heather and April:

Please find attached the protocol procedures we are using to perform ELC/vegetation & amphibian surveys for Next Era sites. We have conducted 1 amphibian survey at all sites within the foot print of turbines and few, if any, met the criteria for significant wildlife habitat. Thusly, we feel that only a total of two amphibian surveys would suffice to capture a representative sampling of amphibians found. The timing of this second amphibian survey would be near the end of this month. With regards to following MNR guidelines to determine significant wildlife habitat, valleylands, etc.



we would conduct the short version ELC (ie. assessing vegetation to classify polygons) and obtain a soil profile whenever there is some doubt as to whether a site is a wetland. If you could kindly provide your input on this ASAP, preferably by Wednesday so we can begin ELC/vegetation surveys that would be great.



## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Cushing, Julia  
**Sent:** Monday, January 02, 2012 12:04 PM  
**To:** Owen, Jennifer  
**Subject:** FW: NextEra - Timing of site investigations for NHA reports

**Categories:** Red Category

For the consultation record.

---

**From:** Boos, John (MNR) [<mailto:john.boos@ontario.ca>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 28, 2011 11:59 AM  
**To:** MacKay Ward, Jessica  
**Cc:** Rose, Marc; Cushing, Julia; Bird, Thomas; Kamstra, James  
**Subject:** RE: NextEra - Timing of site investigations for NHA reports

Jessica,

What you outline below is what we discussed and is accurate.

Soil Data for ELC; although soils are recommended for proper ELC methods, just doing vegetation descriptions to Ecosite is suitable for this process except where there are questions for wetland e.g. wet meadows or lowland woodland/swamp areas. Also utilize soil probes to build the soil profiles, not soil pits.

Prism Sweeps are required when determining if you have >10 large diameter trees within a woodlot or ELC polygon within a larger woodlot that would qualify as a Bat Maternity Roost (Not Hibernacula or winter roosts, these are in caves or mines). This is the only SWH that would require this and only within mature to overmature forest stands.

Some site investigation work can be done during the fall and winter. However there are certain features that may require a seasonal visit to re-confirm or determine if a feature should be considered or is significant. An example is for rare or special concern plant species, some of these are only available during certain times of year. Another example is woodland amphibian breeding habitat, there is a vernal pool consideration of water being present until at least mid July. Anything that requires a seasonality for study could be delayed but would have to be written up into the process for determining significance. This would have to follow the App. D of NHAG process and scenarios would need to be included for all outcomes for the EIS report. We could discuss this further if this is not clear. What you state below can be delayed with commitments to completing work pre-construction.

Hope this helps,

Regards,

John Boos  
Renewable Energy Field Advisor - Biologist  
705-755-1748

---

**From:** MacKay Ward, Jessica [<mailto:Jessica.MacKayWard@aecom.com>]  
**Sent:** September 27, 2011 9:38 AM  
**To:** Boos, John (MNR)  
**Cc:** Rose, Marc; Cushing, Julia; Bird, Thomas; Kamstra, James  
**Subject:** NextEra - Timing of site investigations for NHA reports

Hi John,

Thank you for the time you spent answering my questions last week regarding our ongoing field work to complete the Site Investigation Reports for the Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Natural Heritage Assessments. Based on our conversation, I understand the following and would greatly appreciate it if you could please confirm that this is correct with a quick reply to this email.

Soil data:

Soil data is not required to be taken in every ELC polygon. MNR is primarily interested in soils as they relate to the identification of wetlands (although we understand that wetland boundary delineation will follow OWES). We will instruct our field staff to collect soil data only in lowland sites or where the site is potentially a wetland ELC community type.

Prism sweeps:

Prism sweeps are useful in the determination of Bat Hibernacula (Winter Roost and Maternal Colonies), since the criteria for evaluating this type of SWH depends in part on the density of large diameter snags. We will instruct our field staff to collect prism sweep data only in mature forests or sites where there is a relatively high density of large diameter trees.

Timing window for site investigation field work:

Complete site investigations can be undertaken until the leaves are off the trees (generally mid-October), given that it later becomes difficult to see the ground and therefore hard to detect understory plants as well as potential wildlife habitat like vernal pools, rotting logs, etc. After that, partial site investigations can be conducted, including ELC to the ecotype level (as required by MNR) and some indications of candidate significant wildlife habitat. Ideally, this would be done when the ground is not frozen/when there's no snow on the ground, since we can't easily dig soil pits in frozen ground and it obviously becomes very difficult to detect plants/potential habitat features on the ground when it's covered in snow. Depending on the complexity of the site, an additional site visit may be required under more optimal conditions (i.e. in spring/summer). Could you please confirm whether this additional visit can be conducted after submission of the NHA report, provided that a commitment to conduct this work is included in the NHA report and that the EIS lays out mitigation measures that would apply depending on the outcome of the additional field studies?

Many thanks,

Jessica

**Jessica MacKay Ward, Ph.D.**

Ecologist

AECOM

300 Town Centre Blvd, Suite 300, Markham, ON, L3R 5Z6

Tel: 905-477-8400 ext. 225

Fax: 905-477-1456

[Jessica.MacKayWard@aecom.com](mailto:Jessica.MacKayWard@aecom.com)

## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Cameron, Amy (MNR) <Amy.Cameron@ontario.ca>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 11, 2012 11:57 PM  
**To:** MacKay Ward, Jessica  
**Cc:** Beal, Jim (MNR); Boos, John (MNR); Thomas Bird  
**Subject:** Bluewater - MNR Comments for RR and SI Reports  
**Attachments:** 60155032\_08ra\_Dec16-11\_Bluewater NHA\_Records Review and Site Investigation\_MNRcomments\_Jan11,2012\_AC.docx

**Importance:** High

Jessica,

Attached is the Bluewater Records Review and Site Investigation reports with MNR revisions requests inserted as tracked changes/comments.

I've asked John Boos to follow up with you regarding how the mapping needs to be completed, especially for significant wildlife habitat. The major gap at this point is to get the candidate features mapped and a set of corresponding tables that describe the features attributes, composition and function need to be included.

I will be away until next Wednesday January 18th but I will follow-up with you upon my return. In the meantime please review the comments and chat with John about how to move forward with the mapping of the candidate features.

Thanks,

Amy Cameron

A/Renewable Energy Field Advisor  
Renewable Energy Operations Team  
Ministry of Natural Resources  
31 Riverside Drive, Pembroke  
p. 613-732-5506

---

From: Jessica.MacKayWard@aecom.com [mailto:Jessica.MacKayWard@aecom.com]  
Sent: Fri 16/12/2011 1:56 PM  
To: Cameron, Amy (MNR)  
Subject: AECOM SendFiles Notification: Jessica MacKay Ward has sent you files

Jessica MacKay Ward has sent you 20 files using AECOM's File Transfer System.

Jessica MacKay Ward says:

Hi Amy,

This e-mail contains a link to the Records Review and Site Investigations chapters (in Word format) for NextEra's Bluewater Natural Heritage Assessment report. Also included are the links to the 10 figures and 10 of the appendices for the two chapters (in PDF format). Appendix B1 has not been included here as it is a very large file.

We will be sending the entire NHA report, including the Evaluation of Significance and Environmental Impact Study chapters, to you early next week. Please let me know if you have any problems downloading the files or any questions regarding the chapters.

Thank you!  
Jessica Mackay Ward

These files will be available for download until 12/23/2011

File	Description	Size
Bluewater NHA_AppendixA.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=844c401a-f031-4c32-9579-074b67804f11&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=844c401a-f031-4c32-9579-074b67804f11&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	2,270KB
Bluewater NHA_Fig1-1_StudyArea.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=ca0fee0f-4e9f-4f00-8ff0-0b13b4600ac6&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=ca0fee0f-4e9f-4f00-8ff0-0b13b4600ac6&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	511KB
Bluewater NHA_Fig3-2b_ELC_WECb.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=c20ab093-e469-432a-833f-240ad721c118&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=c20ab093-e469-432a-833f-240ad721c118&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	409KB
Bluewater NHA_AppendixG.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=eb11962f-a61f-4b71-94af-2cac6bc5fb66&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=eb11962f-a61f-4b71-94af-2cac6bc5fb66&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	231KB
Bluewater NHA_Fig3-4_Woodlands.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=a9c3d2eb-ef36-4f07-be2b-364214b492f5&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=a9c3d2eb-ef36-4f07-be2b-364214b492f5&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	481KB
Bluewater NHA_Fig3-5_WildlifeHabitat.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=aebae1de-061a-4f51-bbe0-4b7383d9645a&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=aebae1de-061a-4f51-bbe0-4b7383d9645a&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	627KB
Bluewater NHA_AppendixE.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=7f8e7f13-a2b9-4cd3-83ba-4c770b444979&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=7f8e7f13-a2b9-4cd3-83ba-4c770b444979&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	9,482KB
Bluewater NHA_AppendixH.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=3c50b629-1119-468d-88c7-53d6bf82a114&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=3c50b629-1119-468d-88c7-53d6bf82a114&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	1,524KB
Bluewater NHA_Fig3-3_Wetlands.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=61a2723a-c78c-4922-8e9b-55e7cc0f0116&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=61a2723a-c78c-4922-8e9b-55e7cc0f0116&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	397KB
Bluewater NHA_AppendixI.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=0277751b-0cba-42ce-a188-8617e9a3b611&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=0277751b-0cba-42ce-a188-8617e9a3b611&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	222KB
Bluewater NHA_AppendixD.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=d0d738bd-f55e-48c0-9464-989d32d8be33&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=d0d738bd-f55e-48c0-9464-989d32d8be33&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	78KB
Bluewater NHA_Fig2-1_RecordsReview.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=280614b0-07ca-4b89-9ee1-a1bad4d8b814&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=280614b0-07ca-4b89-9ee1-a1bad4d8b814&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	655KB
Bluewater NHA_Fig3-1_ELC_KeyMap.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=782cbeb8-4af8-4393-b687-b2ab48cee449&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=782cbeb8-4af8-4393-b687-b2ab48cee449&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	666KB
Bluewater NHA_AppendixC.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=7fb28e34-fe74-4857-bada-b681eb255e76&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=7fb28e34-fe74-4857-bada-b681eb255e76&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	1,123KB
Bluewater NHA_Fig1-2_ProjectLocation.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=22596bee-10e1-46c7-a2e3-bc93041603b6&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=22596bee-10e1-46c7-a2e3-bc93041603b6&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	505KB
60155032_08ra_Dec16-11_Bluewater NHA_Records Review and Site Investigation.docx	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=edf3ecd6-c84b-44b4-bd72-c6926a486b25&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=edf3ecd6-c84b-44b4-bd72-c6926a486b25&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	404KB
Bluewater NHA_AppendixF.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=ec7bf9fd-88d1-44df-9dee-d0d314bf4bf0&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=ec7bf9fd-88d1-44df-9dee-d0d314bf4bf0&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	102KB
Bluewater NHA_Fig3-2a_ELC_WECa.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=0804e539-625a-4bb6-b77c-e4f7e381c70d&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=0804e539-625a-4bb6-b77c-e4f7e381c70d&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	1,286KB
Bluewater NHA_AppendixB3.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=38208289-354b-4a84-bfb0-f045253a59cd&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=38208289-354b-4a84-bfb0-f045253a59cd&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	534KB
Bluewater NHA_Fig3-2c_ELC_TLine.pdf	< <a href="http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=8d42503d-8d50-49ed-9a73-fc54351d8e4c&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca">http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=8d42503d-8d50-49ed-9a73-fc54351d8e4c&amp;u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca</a> >	851KB

If you are having trouble accessing the links in this email, you can view this message as a web page by copying the following link and pasting it into your browser:

<http://sendfiles.aecom.com/message.aspx?msgId=144e2bb8-0f28-46fa-a81d-964a16d55cbd&u=Amy.Cameron%40ontario.ca>

If you have any questions, please contact your project manager.

## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**Subject:** FW: Bluewater NHA report submitted - Thank you and congrats!

---

**From:** [Delivery@sendfiles.aecom.com](mailto:Delivery@sendfiles.aecom.com) [<mailto:Delivery@sendfiles.aecom.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, February 15, 2012 6:39 PM

**To:** MacKay Ward, Jessica

**Subject:** AECOM SendFiles Confirmation: Your files have been sent

This is an automatic notification from AECOM's File Transfer system that you have successfully sent 28 files

**Recipient(s):** [amy.cameron@ontario.ca](mailto:amy.cameron@ontario.ca);[jim.beal@ontario.ca](mailto:jim.beal@ontario.ca);[THOMAS.BIRD@nexteraenergy.com](mailto:THOMAS.BIRD@nexteraenergy.com);[marc.rose@aecom.com](mailto:marc.rose@aecom.com)

**Message:** Hi Amy and Jim,

Please find below links to download the Natural Heritage Assessment and EIS for the Bluewater Wind Energy Centre. Included below is our complete NHA and EIS report, as well as a version of the Records Review and Site Investigation chapters with tracked changes to document revisions made to those reports following first submission to MNR. Please let me know if you have any questions or require additional information.

Many thanks,

Jessica These files will be available for download until 2/22/2012

<u>File</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Size</u>
<a href="#">60155032_BLU_Fig2-1_Records Review.pdf</a>		623KB
<a href="#">60155032_BLU_Fig3-1_ELC Key Map.pdf</a>		1,921KB
<a href="#">60155032_BLU_Fig4-1_Significant Features.pdf</a>		534KB
<a href="#">60155032_07ra_Feb-15-12_Bluewater Natural Heritage Assessment and EIS.docx</a>		634KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA_AppendixD.pdf</a>		85KB
<a href="#">60155032_BLU_Fig3-2c_ELC TLine.pdf</a>		357KB
<a href="#">60155032_BLU_Fig3-4_Woodlands.pdf</a>		506KB
<a href="#">60155032_08ra_15Feb-12_Bluewater NHA_Records Review and Site Investigation_revisions.docx</a>		610KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA_AppendixC.pdf</a>		1,124KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA_AppendixA.pdf</a>		9,304KB
<a href="#">60155032_BLU_Fig3-5_Valleylands.pdf</a>		310KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA_AppendixB3.pdf</a>		422KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA_AppendixB2.pdf</a>		19,442KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA_AppendixB1.pdf</a>		521,628KB
<a href="#">60155032_BLU_Fig3-2b_ELC Wind Energy Centre.pdf</a>		355KB
<a href="#">60155032_BLU_Fig3-2a_ELC Wind Energy Centre.pdf</a>		666KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA_AppendixB4.pdf</a>		19,105KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA_AppendixG.pdf</a>		228KB
<a href="#">60155032_BLU_Fig1-1_StudyArea.pdf</a>		550KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA_AppendixF.pdf</a>		170KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA_AppendixH.pdf</a>		1,175KB
<a href="#">60155032_BLU_Fig3-3_Wetlands.pdf</a>		552KB
<a href="#">60155032_BLU_Fig3-6a_Wildlife.pdf</a>		487KB

<a href="#">60155032 BLU Fig1-2 Project Location.pdf</a>	467KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA AppendixB5.pdf</a>	1,842KB
<a href="#">60155032 BLU Fig3-6b Wildlife.pdf</a>	510KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA AppendixI.pdf</a>	181KB
<a href="#">Bluewater NHA AppendixE.pdf</a>	4,364KB

If you wish to check the status of these files, you may do so by [CLICKING HERE](#)



**Mirabelli, Maria**

---

**Subject:** FW: Bluewater EIS for Your Review

-----Original Message-----

From: MacKay Ward, Jessica  
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2012 5:38 PM  
To: 'Cameron, Amy (MNR)'; Bird, Thomas  
Cc: Rose, Marc; Kamstra, James; Beal, Jim (MNR); Boos, John (MNR); Geneau, Nicole  
Subject: Bluewater EIS for Your Review  
Importance: High

Hi Amy,

Please find attached the revised Bluewater EIS for your review (section 5 of the attached document).

With respect to the operational mitigation measures you added to the EEMP in associated with disturbance impacts to bat SWH, our understanding is that these mitigation measures are intended to address mortality impacts to bats rather than disturbance impacts to bat SWH; therefore we have removed the operational mitigation measures you proposed. Please let us know whether this is acceptable to MNR -- I am available to discuss this first thing tomorrow or at your earliest convenience.

Many thanks,

Jessica

Jessica MacKay Ward, Ph.D.  
Ecologist  
AECOM  
300 Town Centre Blvd, Suite 300, Markham, ON, L3R 5Z6  
Tel: 905-477-8400 ext. 225  
Fax: 905-477-1456  
Jessica.MacKayWard@aecom.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Cameron, Amy (MNR) [mailto:Amy.Cameron@ontario.ca]  
Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2012 12:16 PM  
To: MacKay Ward, Jessica; Bird, Thomas  
Cc: Rose, Marc; Kamstra, James; Beal, Jim (MNR); Boos, John (MNR)  
Subject: RE: Bluewater NHA for Your Review  
Importance: High

Tom and Jessica,

I have reviewed the resubmission of the Bluewater NHA (RR, SI, EOS) and it is complete. I've attached the MNR checklist that shows the RR, SI and EOS reports meet the regulation requirements.

One minor detail - Figure 3.6b is missing a natural feature ID label for BMC-10 and RWA-01 this won't hold up your confirmation letter but if the labels could be added when you send us a final hard copy for our file that would be ideal.

I will await the resubmission of the EIS to finalize the Bluewater review.

Thanks,

Amy Cameron

A/Renewable Energy Field Advisor  
Renewable Energy Operations Team  
Ministry of Natural Resources  
31 Riverside Drive, Pembroke  
p. 613-732-5506

---

From: MacKay Ward, Jessica [mailto:Jessica.MacKayWard@aecom.com]  
Sent: Fri 23/03/2012 8:38 PM  
To: Cameron, Amy (MNR)  
Cc: Bird, Thomas; Rose, Marc; Kamstra, James; Beal, Jim (MNR)  
Subject: Bluewater NHA for Your Review

Hi Amy,

Please find attached the revised text for the Bluewater NHA. We have made revisions to some of the figures in response to the comments received - the revised figures are available for download at the links below:

These files will be available for download until 3/30/2012

File

Description

Size

60155032\_BluewaterNHA\_Fig3-2c\_ELC\_Transmission Line.pdf  
<<http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=fa17c270-67e0-4bd9-b2e0-0b1847b29c16&u=Jessica.MacKayWard%40aecom.com>>

526KB

60155032\_BluewaterNHA\_Fig3-4\_Woodlands.pdf  
<<http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=417eca4e-5b93-490a-9971-2b81e6c06fdf&u=Jessica.MacKayWard%40aecom.com>>

389KB

60155032\_BluewaterNHA\_Fig3-2a\_ELC\_Wind Energy Centre.pdf <<http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=0618c587-673e-4a0e-93ac-3ecffcacda71&u=Jessica.MacKayWard%40aecom.com>>

652KB

60155032\_BluewaterNHA\_Fig3-2b\_ELC Wind Energy Centre.pdf <<http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=92a2d52d-45cf-4083-a492-48a-bd94dad4f&u=Jessica.MacKayWard%40aecom.com>>

312KB

60155032\_BluewaterNHA\_Fig3-6a\_Significant Wildlife Habitat.pdf <<http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=daefb622-c120-44e4-915b-63d-425b2771a&u=Jessica.MacKayWard%40aecom.com>>

526KB

60155032\_BluewaterNHA\_AppendixE\_Bluewater WEC Bat Monitoring Report\_2012-03-23.pdf <<http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=e6c13d61-355b-4755-9f3c-68f685af1bbd&u=Jessica.MacKayWard%40aecom.com>>

9,647KB

60155032\_BluewaterNHA\_Fig4-1\_Features Evaluated or Treated as Significant.pdf <<http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=965b6e70-d60f-4b1c-80e6-70d5b6faf06d&u=Jessica.MacKayWard%40aecom.com>>

508KB

60155032\_BluewaterNHA\_Fig3-6c\_Significant Wildlife Habitat.pdf <<http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=36209f29-bdd6-4f47-8f80-be869261b9c6&u=Jessica.MacKayWard%40aecom.com>>

532KB

60155032\_BluewaterNHA\_Fig3-6b\_Significant Wildlife Habitat.pdf <<http://sendfiles.aecom.com/download.aspx?ID=e6a3cf49-99a0-4b49-94e2-d1915d3f27bf&u=Jessica.MacKayWard%40aecom.com>>

539KB

If you are having trouble accessing the links in this email, you can view this message as a web page by copying the following link and pasting it into your browser:

<http://sendfiles.aecom.com/message.aspx?msgId=1e0e426f-d7af-4a22-a577-bf77c37564bf&u=Jessica.MacKayWard%40aecom.com>

There are a couple of things I'd like to point out:

\* We have updated our interior forest calculations for both the woodlands evaluation and the relevant SWH types, to reflect direction from MNR regarding treatment of gaps <20m in these calculations. Please note that we have used distances from forest edge of 100 m for woodlands and 200 m for SWH, as per direction received from MNR (this results in different areas; I wanted to point that out in relation to the comments comparing the SWH assessments to the woodlands assessments with respect to interior forest areas).

\* We've included some comments in the attached file for explanation (e.g. reason why a row was deleted from the table).

Please note that we have not included the revised EIS in the attached document as there is one item outstanding (mitigation for amphibian corridors). We will provide the EIS (revised as per your email below) on Monday.

Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions or require additional information.

Thank you,

Jessica

Jessica MacKay Ward, Ph.D.

Ecologist

AECOM

300 Town Centre Blvd, Suite 300, Markham, ON, L3R 5Z6

Tel: 905-477-8400 ext. 225

Fax: 905-477-1456

Jessica.MacKayWard@aecom.com

From: Cameron, Amy (MNR) [mailto:Amy.Cameron@ontario.ca]  
Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2012 9:46 PM  
To: MacKay Ward, Jessica  
Cc: Bird, Thomas; Rose, Marc; Kamstra, James; Beal, Jim (MNR)  
Subject: RE: Bluewater NHA - Revisions to EIS  
Importance: High

Jessica,

I have gone through the following documents:

1. Construction Plan Report
2. EEMP section of the Design and Operations Report
3. EIS report that included John Boos' original SWH comments

Here are your next steps to wrap up the EIS to meet the regulation requirements:

1. In the Construction Plan Report I inserted changes as "tracked changes". Just accept the changes and it is complete. In the EIS report I created a section called "Construction Plan Report" - paste the information from the Construction Plan Report into this new section of the EIS.
  2. In the EEMP section of the Design and Operations Report I inserted changes as "tracked changes". Accept the changes. There is one comment you need to address (need a row for Rare Vegetation Community RVC-01 in the table). In the EIS report I created a section called "Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan" - paste the information in the EEMP into this new section of the EIS.
  3. I revised and retracted some of MNR's comments when we originally commented on the EIS. I've also inserted tracked changes.
- Once you address these comments and accept the tracked changes the EIS will meet the regulation requirements (just double check the significant natural features carried forward from EOS are the same as those currently listed in the EIS).

Hope this helps to speed things along for you. EIS shouldn't take long to revise now.

Amy

---

From: MacKay Ward, Jessica [mailto:Jessica.MacKayWard@aecom.com]  
Sent: March 21, 2012 11:03 AM  
To: Cameron, Amy (MNR); Beal, Jim (MNR)  
Cc: Boos, John (MNR); Bird, Thomas; Rose, Marc; Kamstra, James  
Subject: RE: Bluewater NHA - Revisions to EIS  
Importance: High

Hi Amy,

Thank you for this. We have now completed assessments of our own that generally align with what you suggested. I will send you the complete text of our species-by-species assessments today.

In regard to EIS, we believe that our EEMP, as described in the attached Construction Plan Report (Section 3.2) and Operations Report (Section 6.2), addresses some of the outstanding information, particularly with respect to performance objective and contingency measures. We are currently looking at how to most efficiently incorporate this information into the NHA and will provide a/some suggestion(s) later today. In the meantime, could you please confirm whether the performance objectives and contingency measures in the attached reports are acceptable to MNR?

Many thanks,

Jessica

Jessica MacKay Ward, Ph.D.

Ecologist

AECOM

300 Town Centre Blvd, Suite 300, Markham, ON, L3R 5Z6

Tel: 905-477-8400 ext. 225

Fax: 905-477-1456

Jessica.MacKayWard@aecom.com

From: Cameron, Amy (MNR) [mailto:Amy.Cameron@ontario.ca]  
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2012 3:15 PM  
To: MacKay Ward, Jessica; Beal, Jim (MNR)  
Cc: Boos, John (MNR); Bird, Thomas; Rose, Marc; Kamstra, James  
Subject: RE: Bluewater NHA - Revisions to Table 3.2  
Importance: High

Jessica,

The table is good - just need to deal with the historical records and not dismiss them completely where bloom times may have been missed, etc.

I do not want to create another set of complicated text or mapping revision for you. Instead I'm proposing a path forward that is hopefully quick and easy to complete. Although this is not typically the way we like to see the reports written, the end result will be the same in terms of the applied mitigation because you are not planning to build within the habitats.

Here is what I propose:

1. Accept the text that I've added in the table (attached)
2. To avoid doing additional EOS surveys, treat the ELC communities where the following species could occur as significant: American Gromwell (FOD7), Eastern Green-violet (FOD7), Harbinger of Spring (FOD6, FOD7, FOD8, FOD9), Slim-flowered Muhly (SDT1, FOD5, FOD9). (FYI: To cover off the mapping requirement in the Regulation I've included text in Table 3.2 that says refer to the ELC map for the locations of the generalized candidate habitat).
3. In the EOS report under the SWH section make sure you state that "The following ELC communities are treated as significant for the following generalized candidate significant wildlife habitats (species of conservation concern): Gromwell (FOD7), Eastern Green-violet (FOD7), Harbinger of Spring (FOD6, FOD7, FOD8, FOD9), Slim-flowered Muhly (SDT1, FOD5, FOD9)."
4. In the EIS report, make sure there is a section specifically for generalized candidate significant wildlife habitat. Indicate that "No construction activities are proposed within the habitat for these species and no infrastructure will be located within the habitat; therefore, because the habitat is being avoided no additional mitigation is required as no negative environmental impacts are anticipated."

Hope this helps. Let me know if you have questions.

Amy

---

From: MacKay Ward, Jessica [mailto:Jessica.MacKayWard@aecom.com]  
Sent: March 19, 2012 6:50 PM  
To: Cameron, Amy (MNR); Beal, Jim (MNR)  
Cc: Boos, John (MNR); Bird, Thomas; Rose, Marc; Kamstra, James  
Subject: Bluewater NHA - Revisions to Table 3.2  
Importance: High

Hi Amy,

As discussed, please find attached a revised version of Table 3.2 for the Bluewater NHA, wherein we have made an effort to address all comments pertaining to this table. Please confirm that these revisions are acceptable to MNR.

With respect to species of conservation concern not carried forward to evaluation of significance because the records are considered historical and/or the species is very unlikely to occur within the study area, we will be providing species-specific rationales based on consultation with experts at NHIC in the results section of our report (rather than in the attached table, which appears in the Methods section of our report). We will send the species-specific assessments to you once all of the assessments have been completed - I will make every effort to get that to you tomorrow.

Many thanks,

Jessica

Jessica MacKay Ward, Ph.D.

Ecologist

AECOM

300 Town Centre Blvd, Suite 300, Markham, ON, L3R 5Z6

Tel: 905-477-8400 ext. 225

Fax: 905-477-1456

Jessica.MacKayWard@aecom.com



## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Beal, Jim (MNR) <jim.beal@ontario.ca>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 29, 2012 7:44 AM  
**To:** Bird, Thomas  
**Cc:** Hagman, Ian (MNR); Cameron, Amy (MNR); Cotnam, Erin (MNR); Santos, Narren (ENE); Guido, Sandra (ENE); MacKay Ward, Jessica; Nix, April (MNR); Harkins, Erin (MNR)  
**Subject:** Bluewater NHA confirmation Letter  
**Attachments:** NHAConfirmationLetter\_Nextera\_Bluewater\_March28,2012.pdf

Hi Tom;

Attached you will find our confirmation letter for the Bluewater wind project. If you have any questions please give me a call.

Thanks

***Jim Beal***

Renewable Energy Provincial Field Program Coordinator  
Regional Operations Division  
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources  
300 Water Street, 4th Floor, South Tower

Tel: 705-755-3203  
Fax: 705-755-3292

E-mail [jim.beal@ontario.ca](mailto:jim.beal@ontario.ca)

**Ministry of Transportation**

Engineering Office  
Corridor Management Section  
West Region

659 Exeter Road  
London, Ontario N6E 1L3  
Telephone: (519) 873-4597  
Facsimile: (519) 873-4228

**Ministère des Transports**

Bureau du génie  
Section de gestion des couloirs routiers  
Région de l'Ouest

659, chemin Exeter  
London (Ontario) N6E 1L3  
Téléphone: (519) 873-4597  
Télécopieur: (519) 873-4228



July 29, 2010

AECOM  
300 Town Centre Boulevard, Suite 300  
Markham, Ontario,  
L3R 5Z6

via email only  
[Julia.Cushing@aecom.com](mailto:Julia.Cushing@aecom.com)

Attn: Julia Cushing, Environmental Planner

RE: NextEra Energy  
Bluewater, Goshen and Jericho Wind Energy Centre Proposals

---

The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) have reviewed the Draft Project Description Report (the report) for the above-noted Wind Energy Centre Proposals. In addition to the Oversize / Overwidth Permit requirements of MTO noted the Section 6 of the report, the following outlines MTO's general permit requirements established in the *Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act (PTHIA)*, and several project specific requirements / recommendations.

**General Requirements****Building and Land Use Permits**

When developing sites next to a provincial highway, a Building and Land Use Permit may be required from the MTO. In general, buildings and other structures associated with wind farms must be set back from the highway property line a minimum of 14 m. In the case of wind turbines, the set-back is increased to the height of the mast plus the length of a propeller blade. Please refer to the Project Specific Requirements noted at the end of this letter for the limits of MTO permit control.

**Entrance Permits**

Existing and proposed access connections to the provincial highway shall require an Entrance Permit which will stipulate the access design, conditions of use, and current ownership. Entrance permits are non-transferable; therefore, new land owners will be required to obtain new Entrance Permits. Where access to a property can be obtained via a municipal road, a new entrance to the provincial highway will not be permitted. Certain visibility and safety concerns must be addressed before an Entrance Permit will be issue. In addition to the above-noted Entrance Permit, a Temporary Entrance Permit may be required for the construction phase, which according to the report would require an 11m wide access road.

**Sign Permits**

Signs, not limited to temporary construction signs and development signs which are visible from the provincial highway may require a MTO Sign Permit. The type, size, and location of all signs shall be approved by MTO prior to their installation.

### Encroachment Permits

MTO Encroachment Permits are required for any construction within the provincial highway right-of-way.

The parallel installation of cables, fibre optics, and hydro poles will not be permitted within the highway right-of-way. Parallel installations shall be setback 14m from the highway right-of-way. MTO may permit a perpendicular crossing of a highway (aerial or buried), the location of which is subject to MTO review and approval. MTO will not permit any open cuts in the highway; all cables shall be bored, and will require MTO review and approval not limited to engineering drawings and geotechnical investigations.

Minor modifications to a provincial highway for equipment transportation, is subject to MTO review and approval and will require a MTO Encroachment Permit. Construction of improvements shall be the responsibility of the proponent (financially and otherwise). Typically, modifications to the provincial highway will require the proponent to prepare contract drawings, tender, and construct the improvements. Improvements shall be constructed in accordance with MTO design standards, and shall follow the Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities. A legal agreement secured by a Letter of Credit will also be required.

### **Project Specific Requirements**

#### Bluewater Wind Energy Centre – Huron County

- Highway 4 and Highway 8 may be impacted by the Bluewater Wind Energy Centre.
- Ensure that any reference to London Road is changed to Highway 4.
- MTO Building and Land Use permits are required for all new developments located within 45m of our highway right-of-way and located within a 180m radius of the centreline intersection of Highway 4 and any municipal road.

#### Goshen Wind Energy Centre – Huron County

- Highway 21 north of Grand Bend is adjacent to the west limit of the Goshen Wind Energy Centre.
- Ensure that any reference to Lakeshore Road is changed to Highway 21;
- MTO Building and Land Use permits are required for all new developments located within 45m of our highway right-of-way and located within a 395m radius of the centreline intersection of Highway 401 and any municipal road.

#### Jerico Wind Energy Centre – Lambton County

- Highway 401 and Highway 21 may be affected by the Jerico Wind Energy Centre;
- Ensure that any reference to Lakeshore Road is changed to Highway 21;
- MTO Building and Land Use permits are required for all new developments located within 45m of our highway right-of-way and located within a 395m radius of the centreline intersection of Highway 401 and any municipal road;
- Access to Highway 401 shall not be permitted;
- MTO Building and Land Use permits are required for all new developments located within 45m of our highway right-of-way and located within a 395m radius of the centreline intersection of Highway 21 and any municipal road.

The decommissioning of each facility may also require permits from the MTO. MTO should be contacted during the decommissioning stage to see which permits, if any, are required.

Additional information including standard permit conditions, permit application forms, current fee structure may be viewed using the following link:

<http://www.mto.gov.on.ca/english/engineering/management/corridor/index.shtml>

Please keep us informed as you move through the Renewable Energy Approval (RDA) process. Should you require any clarification to the above, please do not hesitate to call.

Regards,



John Morrisey  
Corridor Management Planner  
Planning and Design Section  
Southwestern Region, London

- c. S. McInnis, Head - Corridor Management Section
- I. Smyth, Corridor Management Planner - Corridor Management Section
- S. Barnabie, Corridor Management Officer - Corridor Management Section
- J. Pegelo, Corridor Management Officer – Corridor Management Section
- J. Graham-Harkness, Regional Contracts and Operations Engineer – Contracts & Operations Office

Reference: [www.canadianwindproposals.com](http://www.canadianwindproposals.com).

February 13, 2012

Project No. 10-1151-0201-2000-2100-R01

Archaeology Reports  
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport  
Programs and Services Branch  
401 Bay St, Suite 1700  
Toronto, ON M7A 0A7

**Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment**

**NextEra Energy Canada ULC, Bluewater Wind Energy Centre, Various Lots and Concessions,  
Geographic Townships of Stanley, Hay and Tuckersmith, Huron County, Ontario**

To whom it may concern,

Please find below information provided in support of this project report package:

**Licensee Information:**

Mr. Jim Wilson (P001) Golder Associates Ltd.  
309 Extger Road, Unit # 1  
London, Ontario, Canada N6L 1C1  
Tel: (519) 652-0099 extension 4252 Fax: (519) 652-6299  
Jim\_Wilson@golder.com

**Project Information:**

PIF Number: P001-609-2010  
FIT Number: FIT- FJI7S7X



### **Proponent Information:**

Mr. Marc Rose  
AECOM Canada Ltd.  
300 Town Centre Boulevard, Suite 300  
Markham, ON L3R 5Z6  
Tel: (905) 477-8400 ext. 388 Fax: (905) 477-1456  
marc.rose@aecom.com

### **Approval Authority Information:**

Mansoor Mahmood, Director  
Section 47.5, *Environmental Protection Act*  
Environmental Approvals Branch  
Ministry of the Environment  
2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A  
Toronto, Ontario M4V 1L5  
Phone: 416-314-4051 Fax: 314-8452  
Mansoor.Mahmood@ontario.ca

### **Regulatory Process:**

The *Green Energy Act* (2009) enabled legislation governing project assessments and approvals to be altered to allow for a more streamlined Renewable Energy Approval (REA) process. Under Section 22 (1) of the REA, an archaeological assessment must be conducted if the proponent concludes that engaging in the project may have an impact on archaeological resources. Currently, Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the Environmental Protection Act governs the REA process for renewable energy projects such as wind, anaerobic digestions, solar, and thermal treatment facilities.

### **Reporting Information:**

Related Stage 1 reporting: PIF #P001-609-2010  
Stage 2 reporting: PIF #P218-040-2011, P319-017-2012

This Stage 1 archaeological assessment was conducted by Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) on behalf of AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) for NextEra Energy Canada, ULC's proposed Bluewater Wind Energy Centre. The study area is located on various lots and concessions in the Geographic Townships of Stanley, Hay and Tuckersmith, Huron County, Ontario. This report follows Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's 1993 *Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines*. This original report is submitted February 13, 2012.

## Supplementary Documentation:

1. Development Mapping
2. Expedited Review Letter and Supporting Documentation

I the undersigned hereby declare that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this report and submitted in support of this report is complete and accurate in every way, and I am aware of the penalties against providing false information under section 69 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Sincerely,

**GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD.**



James A. Wilson, M.A.  
Principal, Senior Archaeologist

JAW/JAW/jm

n:\active\2010\1151\10-1151-0201 nextera -3 wind farms archaeology - on\reports\final\stage 1 reports\bluewater\p001-609-2010\_13feb2012\_rc\_\_st2\_necbluewater.docx

## Mirabelli, Maria

---

**From:** Rivard, Meaghan <Meaghan\_Rivard@golder.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 19, 2012 12:18 PM  
**To:** 'Young, Penny (MTC)'  
**Cc:** Hatcher, Laura (MTC); Andraea, Christopher; Muir, Jeffrey; Wilson, Jim; Carson, Stacey  
**Subject:** RE: Bluewater Heritage Assessment - Appendix A Mock-Up

**Importance:** High

Hi Penny,

Please find below a link the revised Bluewater report. Further to your written comments and our subsequent discussions, we are submitting a digital copy only. Pending MTCS acceptance, hard copies will be issued.

If at all possible Golder would like to request that the review be completed for tomorrow, March 20, 2012, to meet internal deadlines with the client. If you have any questions about that deadline, please call Jeff Muir at 905-567-6100 extension 1531 or [jeffrey\\_muir@golder.com](mailto:jeffrey_muir@golder.com).

Thank you for your feedback throughout this process, it has been very much appreciated. Any further comments, questions, or clarification, if necessary, may be addressed to Chris Andraea.

Best,  
Meaghan

File(s) will be available for download until **18 April 2012**:

File: [1011510201-3100-R02 Mar 19 12 Nextera Heritage Bluewater.pdf](#), 13,738.26 KB

Attachment link(s) within this email have been sent via Golder Associates Secure File Transfer (SFT). To retrieve the attachment(s), please click on the link(s).

---

**Meaghan Nelligan-Rivard (M.A.)** | Cultural Heritage Specialist | **Golder Associates Ltd.**  
309 Exeter Road, Unit #1, London, Ontario, Canada N6L 1C1  
**T:** +1 (519) 652 0099 | **F:** +1 (519) 652 6299 | **C:** +1 (519) 902 0686 | **E:** [Meaghan\\_Rivard@golder.com](mailto:Meaghan_Rivard@golder.com) |  
[www.golder.com](http://www.golder.com)

### **Work Safe, Home Safe**

*This email transmission is confidential and may contain proprietary information for the exclusive use of the intended recipient. Any use, distribution or copying of this transmission, other than by the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies. Electronic media is susceptible to unauthorized modification, deterioration, and incompatibility. Accordingly, the electronic media version of any work product may not be relied upon.*

Golder, Golder Associates and the GA globe design are trademarks of Golder Associates Corporation.

**Please consider the environment before printing this email.**



---

**From:** Young, Penny (MTC) [mailto:Penny.Young@ontario.ca]  
**Sent:** March 15, 2012 4:28 PM  
**To:** Rivard, Meaghan  
**Cc:** Andreae, Christopher; Muir, Jeffrey; Hatcher, Laura (MTC)  
**Subject:** RE: Bluewater Heritage Assessment - Appendix A Mock-Up

Dear Meaghan,

Thanks so much for the meeting on Monday and for modifying Appendix A. I have attached your Inventory Mock-up with comments embedded, for your review. In addition to those comments, I would suggest that the this template is used for the evaluation of the cultural heritage landscape.

I trust that this is of assistance and please let me know if there is anything else I can provide.

Sincerely,  
Penny

Penny Young | **Heritage Planner**  
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport  
Culture Division | Programs and Services Branch | Culture Services Unit

401 Bay Street, Suite 1700  
Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7

[Penny.Young@Ontario.ca](mailto:Penny.Young@Ontario.ca) | Tel. 416.212.4019 | Fax. 416.314.7175

---

**From:** Rivard, Meaghan [mailto:Meaghan\_Rivard@golder.com]  
**Sent:** March 14, 2012 10:57 AM  
**To:** Young, Penny (MTC)  
**Cc:** Andreae, Christopher; Muir, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** Bluewater Heritage Assessment - Appendix A Mock-Up  
**Importance:** High

Hi Penny,

I hope this email finds you very well.

Further to our conversation on Monday, please see attached our Inventory Mock-up. Your feedback would be very much appreciated. As I believe we discussed Monday, time is of the essence which means that as soon as we have agreement on the format/content I'll endeavor to get the revised report to you as soon as possible.

Thanks for taking a look at this Penny and for the discussion on Monday – both are very much appreciated. I should be around my desk all day so please don't hesitate to call with any comments, questions, suggestions, etc.

Best,  
Meaghan

---

**Meaghan Nelligan-Rivard (M.A.)** | Cultural Heritage Specialist | **Golder Associates Ltd.**  
309 Exeter Road, Unit #1, London, Ontario, Canada N6L 1C1  
**T:** +1 (519) 652 0099 | **F:** +1 (519) 652 6299 | **C:** +1 (519) 902 0686 | **E:** [Meaghan\\_Rivard@golder.com](mailto:Meaghan_Rivard@golder.com) |  
[www.golder.com](http://www.golder.com)

## **Work Safe, Home Safe**

*This email transmission is confidential and may contain proprietary information for the exclusive use of the intended recipient. Any use, distribution or copying of this transmission, other than by the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies. Electronic media is susceptible to unauthorized modification, deterioration, and incompatibility. Accordingly, the electronic media version of any work product may not be relied upon.*

Golder, Golder Associates and the GA globe design are trademarks of Golder Associates Corporation.

**Please consider the environment before printing this email.**

March 23, 2012

Project No. 10-1151-0201-2000-2100-L01

Archaeology Reports  
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport  
Programs and Services Branch  
401 Bay St, Suite 1700  
Toronto, ON M7A 0A7

**Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment**

**NextEra Energy Canada ULC, Bluewater Wind Energy Centre, Various Lots and Concessions,  
Geographic Townships of Stanley, Hay and Tuckersmith, Huron County, Ontario**

To whom it may concern,

Please find below information provided in support of this project report package:

**Licensee Information:**

Dr. Scott Martin (P218) Golder Associates Ltd.  
110 Hannover Drive, Building A, Suite 203  
St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada, L2W 1A4  
Tel: (905) 688 8217 extension 6118 Fax: (905) 688 4227  
Scott\_Martin@golder.com

Ms. Irena Jurakic (P319) Golder Associates Ltd.  
2390 Argentia Road  
Mississauga, ON L5N 5Z7  
Tel: (905) 567-6100 extension 1534 Fax: (905) 567-6561  
Irena\_Jurakic@golder.com

**Project Information:**

PIF Number: P218-040-2011, P319-017-2012  
FIT Number: FIT- FJI7S7X



### **Proponent Information:**

Mr. Marc Rose  
AECOM Canada Ltd.  
300 Town Centre Boulevard, Suite 300  
Markham, ON L3R 5Z6  
Tel: (905) 477-8400 ext. 388 Fax: (905) 477-1456  
marc.rose@aecom.com

### **Approval Authority Information:**

Mansoor Mahmood, Director  
Section 47.5, *Environmental Protection Act*  
Environmental Approvals Branch  
Ministry of the Environment  
2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A  
Toronto, Ontario M4V 1L5  
Phone: 416-314-4051 Fax: 314-8452  
Mansoor.Mahmood@ontario.ca

### **Regulatory Process:**

The *Green Energy Act* (2009) enabled legislation governing project assessments and approvals to be altered to allow for a more streamlined Renewable Energy Approval (REA) process. Under Section 22 (1) of the REA, an archaeological assessment must be conducted if the proponent concludes that engaging in the project may have an impact on archaeological resources. Currently, Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the Environmental Protection Act governs the REA process for renewable energy projects such as wind, anaerobic digestions, solar, and thermal treatment facilities.

### **Reporting Information:**

Related Stage 1 reporting: PIF #P001-609-2010  
Stage 2 reporting: PIF #P218-040-2011, P319-017-2012

This Stage 2 archaeological assessment was conducted by Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) on behalf of AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) for NextEra Energy Canada, ULC's proposed Bluewater Wind Energy Centre. The study area is located on various lots and concessions in the Geographic Townships of Stanley, Hay and Tuckersmith, Huron County, Ontario. This report follows Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. This revised report is submitted March 23, 2012.

## Supplementary Documentation:

1. Supplementary Documentation Package: Supplement A – Figures; Supplement B - UTM Coordinates; Supplement C – Aboriginal Engagement
2. Expedited Review Letter

I the undersigned hereby declare that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this report and submitted in support of this report is complete and accurate in every way, and I am aware of the penalties against providing false information under section 69 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Sincerely,

### **GOLDER ASSOCIATES LTD.**



Irena Jurakic, M.A.  
Material Culture Analyst



Scott Martin, Ph.D.  
Project Archaeologist



James A. Wilson, M.A.  
Principal, Senior Archaeologist

IJ/JAW/ij