



April 1, 2010

Save the Bala Falls
Attn: Mitchell Shnier
Lower Links Road
Toronto, ON
M2P 1H5
Mitchell_shnier@ieec.org

Re: North Bala Falls Small Hydro Project – Response to Elevation Request dated November 26, 2009.

Dear Save the Bala Falls and Mr. Shnier:

The following is in response to the request for elevation of our Environmental Screening Report that you submitted to the MOE Director of the EAAB and our consultant Hatch. Responses are provided to the issues listed in the order they appeared in your “technical” letter. SREL will defer to the appropriate agencies to address the issues listed in your “policy” letter.

Your comments are quoted and italicized, with SREL responses as follows:

“To Report 1: Methods to effectively deal with the reality that ill-advised youth jump from the railway bridge, as this existing activity would become life-threateningly dangerous.”

Persons on occasion jump from the existing railway bridge into the North Channel upstream of the North Bala Dam. This is an illegal act. Swift River has no jurisdiction over the use of the railway bridge. Swift River does not condone the illegal activity, and is not prepared to do anything which may be construed as encouragement.

“To Report 2: The maximum safe water speeds for the various in-water recreation activities and what would be the water speeds along each of the safety booms.” and

“To Report 3: Rescue procedures and responsibilities required for people hanging onto each of the upstream safety booms, and for boats held against the safety booms.” and

“To Report 4: The steps and time required to get the power station shut down.” and

“To Report 5: Document how water speeds comparable to those during spring runoff would be safe during the parts of the main summer recreation period.” and

“To Report 6: What would the water speed be along the safety boom. Could one push their boat/canoe/kayak along the safety boom by hand.” and

2300 Yonge Street
Suite 801, P.O. Box 2300
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4
Phone: 1-866-578-BALA (2252)

“To Report 7: How would the feeling of imminent danger affect using the town docks for visits to buy goods and services in Bala. And how would this affect the nearby businesses who’s customers travel by boat.”

It is recognized that there will be an increased risk posed by increased flows and velocities related to the project. Areas where velocities and flows will be consistently high during operation include upstream in the vicinity of the intake and downstream in the immediate vicinity of the tailrace. These high velocity areas will be restricted by safety booms, signage and/or fencing. On the upstream (intake) side of the facility, velocities upstream of the boom will allow boating to continue as is presently the case. All activities related to the annual regatta will be able to proceed as they presently do. The conditions at the town docks will not be significantly different from current conditions with respect to embarking and disembarking. Transport Canada is the governmental agency responsible for assessing suitability of areas for boating.

Transport Canada has reviewed completed study reports and noted that the upstream Town Docks will be able to be used during the project operation in the same way as it presently is. Transport Canada has also noted that the Regatta activities may be conducted in their present form following the building of the project. Transport Canada has communicated this directly to the regatta organizers.

Areas downstream of the facility outside of the zone restricted by the safety boom will not be negatively affected and present uses will be unaffected by the project. Transport Canada has noted that the area south of the tailrace will allow easier small vessel handling following the construction of the facility. This is because the flow from the tailrace will eliminate the swirling (circular) flow which presently occurs in that area during high flows. The removal of this swirling water will allow easier handling of small vessels in that zone.

The area downstream of the North Bala Falls is presently signed as a “no swimming” zone due to its proximity to the dam. This area will be unaffected by project operation and it is expected that the area will continue to be signed as a “no swimming” area.

Potential impact on public safety and the mitigation measures described above are documented in the environmental screening report. Note that Transport Canada’s comments were received subsequent to the release of the environmental screening report.

The final design of the safety booms will be subject to approval by Transport Canada. Current designs in the ESR are considered to be preliminary. Given your comment, this issue will be given consideration during future discussions with Transport Canada and our designers to investigate standard design configurations that could improve on the self-rescue aspects of the boom.

“To Report 8: The rationale for requesting the Best Management Zone during the summer months.” and

“To Report 9: Respond to their obligations and provide the rationale for the proposed changes to the Muskoka River Water Management Plan.”

The MNR is responsible for ensuring that water levels and flows are managed appropriately. There is an existing Muskoka River Water Management Plan (MRWMP). This water management plan will be adhered to during operation of the facility. MNR has conducted

extensive review of the proposed facility management and made contributions toward its final version. The proposed facility will be operated to maintain Muskoka Lake levels and flows and levels through the Moon River (Bala Reach) in accordance with the MRWMP. There will be no increase in the water levels as a result of the plant operation. MNR will be responsible for ensuring compliance of the operator, as they presently do for the other operators within the watershed.

Early in the Environmental / Water Management process, MNR suggested that SREL incorporate a Best Management Zone (BMZ) into the amendment for this project. It should be noted that there are certain times during the year when natural variability in the lake levels are such that maintenance of a particular level would be virtually impossible. Therefore, this BMZ has been limited to certain months of the year only.

MNR will determine the nature of the amendment required as well as what additional activities may be required. These decisions will be made by MNR following the EA process.

“To Report 10: Confirmation that the proposed power station would be operated in a true run-of-river mode, with no intermittent operation.”

It is proposed to operate the project as “run-of-river”, not in a peaking/ponding mode.

“To Report 11: Complete detail on the operating plan for the power station, as it has a major impact on public safety.”

The proposed operating plan for the project is as follows: The hydrology, including flows, water levels and hydraulics, has been described in detail in Section 6.2.2. To summarize, the project will use between 14 and 96 m³/s of water during operations, depending on the actual flow in the river. A minimum of 1 m³/s will be passed over each the north and south dams (2 m³/s over the south during summer months), and 4 m³/s will be provided to the Burgess Generating Station in Mill Creek. The plant will run at a steady state throughout the days, fluctuating only when flows in the river fluctuate. This plan will be supplemented following completion of detailed design and equipment selection. The final “complete and detailed” operating plan will be done following commissioning of the plant. Note that this plan will need to be reviewed and approved by MNR prior to any commercial operations. The development of this plan will incorporate coordination with MNR operations for the Go Home Lake Dam and Ontario Power Generation (OPG) operations of the downstream Ragged Rapids and Big Eddy hydroelectric projects.

“To Report 12: An upstream safety boom design, approved by Transport Canada, that facilitates self-rescue, and would not create navigational difficulties for users of the town dock.”

Final boom design will be submitted to Transport Canada for review and approval as part of the required application for approval under the Navigational Water Protection Act. This will be completed after the environmental screening process is complete.

“To Report 13: The methods to adequately deal with the currently-known new dangers need to be determined and approved as part of the environmental assessment process, not at some later detailed design stage.”

As stated in the ESR, fencing will be required around the intake structure. Given the concerns with aesthetics on the west side of Muskoka Road 169 (downstream end of project) it is proposed

that a combination of architecturally designed handrails and landscaping will be used to keep the public from the restricted, unsafe areas. These details will be sorted out during the detailed design stage with input from a public advisory committee.

“To Report 14: It needs to be determined whether the fast water exiting the proposed power station would make recreational activities at the base of the north falls more dangerous.”

Please see response to “Report 7”.

“To Report 15: Determine the acceptable (to Transport Canada and any other authorities and organizations) exact location for the downstream safety boom.”

Please see response to “Report 7”.

“To Report 16: Whether the public will have access to the shoreline and water in the area between the proposed power station and the north falls.”

Access to shoreline along the intake channel will be restricted between the North Dam and the upstream navigational safety boom. This is to prevent the accidental entry of persons into the high velocity waters of the intake channel. Shoreline in the immediate vicinity of the tailrace (approximately 25m) will also be restricted for safety reasons. However, there will be unrestricted access to the shoreline between the North Falls and the facility and also to the shoreline between the facility and the South Bala Dam. There will be steps provided to allow easier access to the area between the North Bala Dam and the facility. Access to the shoreline between facility and the Bala South Dam will be walking down the slope from Highway 169. Shoreline access restrictions including clear diagrams are included in the environmental screening report.

“To Report 17: A safe (for both portager and canoe) portage route between Lake Muskoka and the Moon River.”

Transport Canada is the responsible agency who makes decisions on impacts to navigation, including portages. During project construction and operation, the traditional portage will not be available. Alternate portage routes include using the Town Docks or Divers Point and crossing Highway 169 before returning to the water on the Moon River side, either to the south of the facility or by going to the downstream Town Docks on the Moon River. Transport Canada has reviewed the project and has determined that these alternate portage routes are acceptable.

“To Report 18: Determine, describe, and provide views of the proposed power station, water intake, and driveway retaining wall, showing the minimum safety fencing required.” and

“To Report 19: Elevation side-view drawings of all sides of the proposed power station, including any fencing required.” and

“To Report 20: Renderings, to scale, of the water intake as viewed from the town dock, and from the intersection of Muskoka Road 169 and Bala Falls Road.” and

“To Report 21: Detailed descriptions and sketches of what could be done to restore the natural beauty, Muskoka bedrock, and mature trees of this focus of tourism.” and

“To Report 22: Complete renderings of the proposed facilities.”

The artist’s rendering depicts the concept of how the site will be treated after construction is completed. It illustrates that the powerhouse will be buried, hatch openings will be covered in decking and the tailgate will be masked behind a false wall. This rendering also indicates that the area will contain walkways, viewing platforms at the road and water, and an access driveway. Native plantings are also shown that will be used to naturalize the area and create a public park area. The final smaller details will be sorted out during detailed design with input from a public advisory committee.

No chain link fencing is expected to be used on the west side of Muskoka Road 169.

“To Report 23: The impact on tourism, and on the local economy as a result of the loss of publically-accessible shoreline.”

Please see response to “Report 16”

“To Report 24: The water speeds along the upstream safety boom, both at the surface and at depths used by scuba divers.” and

“To Report 25: An update to Figure 6.5 to show areas unsafe for in-water recreational activities, such as scuba diving.”

While water speeds upstream of the safety boom should not be significantly changed than from the current conditions, scuba diving adjacent to the upstream safety boom is not recommended as the diver could inadvertently wander inside the restricted/unsafe zone. However, Lake Muskoka is a very large lake with many other safe locations for scuba diving.

“To Report 26: Examining each regatta participant and race official activity, and the in-water locations of these to itemize and assess any added risk for each.” and

“To Report 27: The impact on tourism, and therefore on the local economy as a result of the loss of this in-water recreational area.”

Please see response to “Report 7”

“To Report 28: A process to provide information to, and to interactively communicate with, the public and those knowledgeable in this issue to determine what level of scenic flow would be required at the north falls and for the south channel, so that the Bala Falls and south channel would continue to be a tourist draw.”

There will be reduced average flows over both the North and South Bala Falls following the construction of the project. Year-round flows over the North Falls will be comparable to those typically seen during the drier portions of summer. Flows over the south falls will be lower at all periods than typically seen during the year. Flows of 1m³/s have been proposed over the North and South Falls throughout the year with an increase to 2m³/s proposed at the South channel during the summer tourist (viewing) period. The existing Muskoka River Water Management Plan stipulates a summer minimum of 1m³/s at each of the two dams. This stipulated minimum summer flow is the basis for SREL’s proposed flows at the two dams. SREL is proposing that a group be established to discuss/propose aesthetic flows for the summer tourist season. The final

decision on flows will be made by the MNR and, if different from the existing minimum flow requirements in the water management plan, will need to be included in an amendment to the plan. The proposed flows as described above are noted in the environmental screening report.

“To Report 29: How the proposed project can be justified in light of the District Municipality of Muskoka’s Official Plan”

It should be noted that both the District of Muskoka and the Township of Muskoka Lakes have passed resolutions in support of leasing this parcel of land to SREL for the project.

“To Report 30: The extent of the shadow from the proposed power station, at various times of the day, and for various months of the year.”

Note that the proposed project will not project above the height of the existing Muskoka Road 169. Therefore, any additional shadow caused by the proposed buried project will be minimal. In addition, the public have requested that mature trees be planted in the area adjacent to the project, to shield the roadway. These trees would add to the shadow effect if they are to be effective in shielding the view of the road.

“To Report 31: An alternative method to provide a rental boat service in Bala.” and

“To Report 32: An economic impact study to examine and report on the long-term effects on the area’s businesses due to the issues such as those detailed above.” and

“To Report 33: Whether these businesses could survive the construction period (including considering that the construction period could be extended, so this period could be more than one summer).” and

“To Report 35: Whether these businesses could survive in the longer-term.” and

“To Report 36: The longer-term impact on the residence’s property value.”

“To Report 37: Contingency plans if construction is delayed into a second summer.”

Swift River is of the opinion that the project will have an overall positive impact on the local economy through the injection of significant capital. However, as a formal economic impact study was not undertaken, Swift River is currently in dialogue with economic specialists in an effort to ascertain if such a study would provide meaningful information. If so, a decision will be made as to whether a study will be undertaken.

It is understood that traffic delays associated with construction and road closures could potentially affect businesses in the area. Swift River is presently in talks with the Township of Muskoka Lakes with a view to developing measures which will alleviate possible impacts. Further talks are planned with the business community to develop a cooperative approach to handling potential issues.

The project as proposed and the continued use of the docks (in the intake approach channel) associated with Purk’s Place cannot co-exist. Resolution of this issue with Purk’s Place is, and will remain, a private matter between Purk’s Place and SREL. With respect to alternative boat rental locations: It is entirely possible that resolution to this issue could involve Purk’s Place and/or its docks being relocated to another suitable location and continue business. If this does

not occur, it is our understanding, based on discussions with Purk's Place, that there are indeed competitive companies in the area.

With respect to the Stone Church: discussions are also on going with the owner regarding any impacts to the business. SREL will ensure that access to this facility is maintained throughout the construction period.

“To Report 34: Whether the construction disruption to the residence would be acceptable.”

Based on discussions with the owner of the Stone Church, this building is not used as a residence, but instead a business.

“To Report 38: A graphical construction time-line showing activities of most interest to the public.”

SREL understands the importance of maintaining a reasonable traffic flow along Muskoka Road 169 (MR-169) during the tourist season. Therefore, a plan has been devised to minimize impacts on traffic during the 12-18 month construction period.

- It is proposed to start construction after the Cranberry Festival in October. Road work will be the first priority for construction to ensure it is done during the off-peak “winter” season.
- MR-169 will be reduced to one-lane, controlled either by flagman or temporary traffic light, for a period of two weeks while the contractor installs a bridge foundation on the opposite side of the road. This process will then be repeated for the other side of the road for an additional two week period (total of 4 weeks of one-lane road reductions during the winter).
- MR-169 will then be completely shut down for one night between the bridge over the north channel and Bala Falls Road, while the contractor installs a pre-fabricated, temporary Bailey Bridge atop of the new foundations.
- The following morning traffic will return to two-lanes while the contractor completes the excavation and construction activities under the road.
- Prior to the Victoria Day weekend, the road will again be closed for one night to remove the Bailey Bridge, followed by two, 2-week one-lane reductions to remove the temporary foundations. (total of 4 weeks of one-lane road reductions during the spring).
- By Victoria Day, traffic will be back on the natural road surface for the remainder of the project. The contractor will then continue the works located on either side of the road.

Therefore, in summary, Project construction activities will be timed to minimize impacts to key events such as the Cranberry Festival. The placement of a Bailey bridge will allow uninterrupted passage of vehicles to and from Bala, with the bridge being in place only for the winter season. Winter tourism (mainly snow-mobilers) will be accommodated by ensuring that the Bailey bridge will be constructed to allow safe snow mobile passage. The Bailey bridge will be removed prior to the May 24 (Victoria Day) weekend, so there will be no potential traffic delays occurring during the summer tourist season. The falls will not be closed to public access during construction. However, access to the North Bala falls during construction will be only from the north side during the tourist season (summer). The construction of the viewing deck atop the facility, upon completion, will provide a place for tourists to enjoy the scenery. Following the temporary impacts associated with construction, no negative impact on tourism is anticipated.

A detailed construction schedule will not be available until after we have completed detailed design and have chosen a contractor.

“To Report 39: The planned use for the land at Diver’s Point during and after the proposed construction work (we understand this is owned by the Ministry of Natural Resources, and the proponent would have full use of the property).”

SREL has not made any plans for using the land at Diver’s Point for staging during construction of the project. It will be up to the Contractor to identify and acquire use of any staging areas required. During the Operations phase: It is currently proposed that this area will be included in the crown lease for the waterpower project. There are no plans to alter the existing use of this area during the operations phase. However, it has been discussed that it could possibly be used for additional parking to make up for the lost parking adjacent to Purk’s Place, but this has not yet been confirmed.

“To Report 40: Whether it is expected that any part of the Precambrian Shield parking lot would be used during construction, and if so, what would be located there.”

SREL has not made any plans for using the Shield Parking lot for staging during the project. It will be up to the Contractor to identify and acquire use of any staging areas required. That said, your concern has been noted and will be relayed to the Contractor prior to construction.

“To Report 41: Whether it is expected that any part of the Don’s Bakery parking lot would be used during construction, and if so, what would be located there.”

SREL has not made any plans for using the Don’s Bakery Parking lot for staging during construction of the project. It will be up to the Contractor to identify and acquire use of any staging areas required.

“To Report 42: The financial assurances required by the stakeholders to ensure all work will be completed as planned, and whether this would be acceptable to the proponent.”

It is our understanding that the Provincial Government does not generally require such a thing for these types of projects. However, SREL are required to provide security to the Ontario Power Authority (OPA) under our Feed-In-Tariff (FIT) application and eventual FIT contract to ensure that we do proceed to Commercial Operation.

In addition, both the original MNR site release program and the recent OPA FIT application required verification of SREL’s financial capability to complete the project.

“To Report 43: Through discussion and information exchange with the District, to agree on an alternate path for the utility pipes which would need to be relocated as a result of this proposed project, and to document this.”

The utility pipes currently in the location of the proposed intake will need to be relocated by SREL. This process will require approval from the District of Muskoka. At this time, no discussions have occurred as to the details of this relocation have occurred. This will take place during the detailed design stage of the project.

“To Report 44: To work out with the District a cut-over plan and document this so the public can know the number and duration of disruption to their municipal water supply,

sewage service, and other impacts, such as a temporary impairment to fire fighting capability.”

SREL agrees that it will need to work out a plan with the District of Muskoka and possibly the Township of Muskoka Lakes with respect to any disruption of services associated with the relocation of the lines discussed above. Note that no significant disruptions are foreseen for this fairly standard process.

“To Report 45: The area (in addition to that between Purk’s Place and the Stone Church, in m2) expected to be needed for construction purposes and for what periods of time.”

It is anticipated that the area between Purk’s Place and the Stone Church will be required for construction purposes. The exact area, however, will have to be determined by the Contractor prior to construction, if required. SREL is, however, committed to maintaining safe passage through this area for snowmobiles in the winter as well as access to the Stone Church entrance year round.

“To Report 46: The speed limit to be required for the Bailey bridge.”

Our engineers have estimated that the speed limit to be required for the Bailey bridge will be 50 km/hr.

“To Report 47: A traffic study to show the maximum traffic queue lengths at the Bailey bridge, both by distance and waiting time.”

The proposed Bailey bridge will have two lanes of traffic as the existing road has. Therefore, no inordinate delays are anticipated. Also see the response for Report 38.

“To Report 48: How to configure the traffic signal lights to handle expected summer traffic loads, and to not surprise southbound drivers with stopped cars just around the sharp turn.” and

“To Report 49: A traffic study to show the maximum traffic queue lengths (including for Highway 38) at the proposed traffic signal light, both by distance and waiting time.”

The details of the proposed traffic signal lights and warnings will be worked out with the Municipality to ensure it meets all of the Municipality’s requirements. Typically signage indicating new traffic lights is used in these situations to provide notice to oncoming traffic of changes in conditions. If it is determined that an automated traffic signal will not handle the traffic volume, a flag person could be stationed at this location during the day.

“To Report 50: The detailed noise calculations, this time including all the noise sources.” and

“To Report 51: The detailed noise calculations, this time using the correct frequency spectra for all noise sources.” and

“To Report 52: The detailed noise calculations, this time including actual manufacturer’s data.” and

“To Report 53: The detailed noise calculations, this time considering the site to be a Class 3 area.”

“To Report 54: The noise levels at Purk’s Place and the Stone Church, given that they should be considered Class 3 areas.” and

“To Report 55: Noise calculations for points of reception on the lookout, and on the stairs beside the proposed power station.”

The Ministry of Environment is the government agency responsible for ensuring that noise levels are in compliance with provincial standards. A Certificate of Approval is issued by the MOE when the noise levels are satisfied. As part of this assessment, a noise study (acoustic assessment) has to be prepared. The MOE has reviewed the noise study completed for the facility and has found it to be satisfactory. This covers noise which will come from the operating facility. The MOE as part of its mandate will conduct noise audits on the facility to ensure compliance. As is noted repeatedly in the acoustic report, SREL is committed to undertaking any noise mitigation needed to ensure compliance with the noise thresholds at the receptors.

In addition, a more technical description of the noise calculations has been prepared and is attached to this letter.

In Ontario no approval is required for construction noise from the province. The noise during construction would have to comply with municipal bylaws. This will be the case during construction.

“To Report 56: A vibration analysis for points of reception on the lookout, and on the stairs beside the proposed power station.”

No vibration is expected to be experienced atop of the powerhouse.

“To Report 57: The results of discussions with the appropriate authorities to finalize the need for, location, and design of fish spawning compensation areas.” and

“To Report 58: Quantified and justified statistics on the number of fish which are expected to be entrained, and the impact of this loss to the Lake Muskoka fishery.” and

“To Report 59: Whether transferring more fish from Lake Muskoka to the Moon River would have an undesirable effect on the Moon River fishery.” and

“To Report 60: The effect on the fish habitat due to “spring runoff” water velocities in the north channel for six, rather than one, month of the year.” and

“To Report 61: On the expected increase in fish lost to turbine mortality and to the Moon River due to the different velocity characteristics of the proposed power station’s water intake compared to a dam.”

Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) is the federal agency responsible for fish habitat, while the MNR is the provincial agency responsible for fish community and fisheries. A Fisheries Act Authorization is issued by DFO when the impacts to fish habitat are adequately mitigated. A mitigation plan has been proposed. A Fisheries Act Authorization application will be filed with the DFO. This typically follows the submission of the environmental screening report. The DFO and MNR have reviewed the environmental screening report. They have provided comments and

these are being addressed by Swift River. Application for Fisheries Act authorization will be filed thereafter.

“To Report 62: On the methods to be implemented to ensure contaminants are not in the discharged cooling water.” and

“To Report 63: On the types of contaminants which could be in the wash sink water and the methods and efficiencies used to remove these.” And

“To Report 65: On the types of contaminants which could be in the main sump and the methods and efficiencies used to remove these.”

By regulation, the containment systems must have capacities larger than the volume of fluids contained in the transformer. In the unlikely event that there were to be leakage, these containment systems will prevent any spilled fluid from reaching to the water. Government agencies are responsible for ensuring that the equipment meets the correct standards for proper containment.

Cooling water is an extremely small fraction of the total water passing through the facility. Cooling water and other fluids are run through completely separate piping networks, so do not come into contact with each other.

As stated in Section 6.2.4.3 of the ESR:

- All waste fluids from the facility will be disposed of as per provincial waste management regulations. SREL must obtain a waste generator number and submit a Generator Waste Management Plan under the Environmental Protection act.
- A C of A for Industrial Wastewater Discharge under Section 5 of the OWRA will be required from the MOE for the operation of the oil-water separator.

These will be completed prior to commercial operations.

“To Report 64: On whether the District would permit this wash sink water to be treated within the proposed power station rather than by the municipal sewage treatment. And whether each of the lubricants and other liquids and materials used in the power station would be accepted for treatment by the District’s facility.” and

“To Report 66: On whether the District would permit the contents of the main sump to be treated within the proposed power station rather than by the municipal sewage treatment.”

These questions will need to be directed to the District of Muskoka after final detailed design is completed.

“To Report 67: On whether the water from the roof drains can be directly discharged into the Moon River.”

Since it is proposed that the powerhouse will be covered with topsoil and landscaped, it is currently assumed that any water falling on the “roof” of the powerhouse would either soak into the landscaping or run off to the river as it currently does. Final details of the site drainage will

be worked out during the detailed design phase of the project and any necessary permits will be acquired at that time.

“To Report 68: The business arrangement to be agreed to for use of shoreline and District lands.”

The details of obtaining a municipal lease and/or municipal official plans are outside the scope of the provincial or federal EA process. These details have not yet been discussed with the District. However, it should be noted that both the District of Muskoka and the Township of Muskoka Lakes have passed resolutions in support of leasing this parcel of land to SREL for the project.

“To Report 69: An evaluation of the best location for the proposed power station, not just an attempt at justifying the current site being proposed.”

The site release process undertaken by MNR was for the North Bala Dam location. Swift River applied for the available site. The south channel has never been offered by the MNR for development. There are feasibility issues with attempting to construct a viable generating facility, assuming it was available. This was made obvious following a preliminary high-level examination of the potential of the south channel for development. This examination was made not with the intent to develop the site, but rather in response to queries from the public on this issue.

“In summary, we don’t feel that the proponent has successfully worked with the community.”

The environmental screening process outlines the minimum requirements for public consultation. Specifically, the requirement is for the publication of a copy of the Notice of Commencement in the local newspaper(s). Swift River exceeded these requirements. All mandatory notices were published. In addition, two Public Information Centres (Open Houses) were held, a website and dedicated project phone line were set up and a number of press releases were made. Adequate notice for all public events was published in area newspapers. All public consultation requirements for the EA have been met and exceeded.

Regards,
Swift River Energy Limited

Karen McGhee

Karen McGhee, P.Eng.
Bala Falls Project Manager

c.c. Hatch Energy – Trion Clarke
EAAB Ministry of Environment – Kristina Rudzki