

MINUTES OF EA COORDINATION MEETING

Half Mile Rapids and Big Eddy Hydroelectric Projects

Date: Tuesday, January 18th, 2011, 10:00

Meeting Location: MNR Pembroke District Office in Pembroke, Ontario and via Teleconference Call

Prepared By: Karen Fortin

Attendees:

MNR Pembroke District:

- Joanna Samson, Water Resources Coordinator (JS)
- Trevor Griffin, District Manager (A) (TG)
- Ken McWatters, Resource Liaison Specialist (KM)
- Lauren Trute, Species at Risk Biologist (LT)
- Gillianne Marshall, Planning Intern
- Tom Giesler, Senior Lands and Water Tech (TG)
- Amy Cameron, Planning Ecologist (AC) (afternoon)
- Tania Baker, Area Biologist (afternoon) (TB)
- Karen Handford, PIM Supervisor (afternoon)
- Henry Haemel, Southern Region Sr. Project Engineer (HH) (afternoon)

Ontario Parks

- Brad Steinberg, Algonquin Park Management Biologist (BS)

Fisheries and Oceans Canada

- Mark Scott, Fish Habitat Biologist (MS)

Department of National Defence

- Michelle Perry, Base Environment Officer (MP)

Ontario Ministry of Transportation

- Alain Nadeau, Regional Coordinator, Operational Services (AN)

Town of Petawawa

- Karen Cronier, Planning Technician (KC)

County of Renfrew

- Nathan Kuiack, Public Works Technician

Via Teleconference

Ministry of the Environment

- Vicki Mitchell, Environmental/EA Coordinator (VM)
- Laura Manning (LM)

Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure

- Helen Kwan, Senior Project Advisor REFO (HK)

INAC

- Brian Grey, Senior Officer, DWPA (BG)
- Christopher Morton, Water Resources Analyst (CM)

Transport Canada

- Lisa McDonald, Environmental Officer (LM)

Natural Resources Canada

- Caitlin Scott, Junior Policy Analyst (CS)

Environment Canada

- Mike Shaw, Environmental Assessment Officer (MSh)

	<p>Parks Canada</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Blackburn, Archaeological Resource Management Analyst (KB) <p>Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amy Liu, Project Manager (AL) <p>Canadian Transportation Agency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Woodward, Senior Environmental Officer (JW) <p>Xeneca Power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edmond Laratta (EL) • Mike Vance (MV) • Dean Assinewe, Aboriginal Relations Liaison <p>Ontario Resource Management Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kristi Beatty (KB) • Bruce Wheaton (BW) <p>OEL-HydroSys Inc. (Environmental Approvals Consultants):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tami Sugarman, Environmental Approvals Senior Advisor • Karen Fortin, Environmental Approvals Coordinator
Regrets	Brenda Blimkie, Town of Laurentian Hills, Chairman of the Planning Committee
Attachments	Project Description Half Mile Rapids Generating Station (document issued in advance of meeting)
<p>The following Meeting Minutes were recorded by Karen Fortin of OEL-HydroSys Inc. The notes reflect the understanding of discussions held during the meeting. Based on comments received from the Draft distribution, these minutes have been adopted and are considered accurate.</p>	

Item	Item Description	Action by
1.0	<p>Introductions</p> <p>Meeting objective (TS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to initiate the discussion surrounding information that has been distributed to regulators for both Half Mile Rapids and Big Eddy projects; • to identify applicable legislation and permitting requirements early in process; • to identify any gaps in data analysis; • to open dialogue (explanation that dialogue with certain ministries and agencies, i.e. MNR, DFO has already been initiated) and ensure that all agencies that must be consulted are contacted and verify the points of contact for each agency <p>Explanation of environmental assessment process for each site (TS). Half Mile will be conducted under a federal screening only because all works are to be completed on federal Crown land. Big Eddy will be screened under the provincial Class EA for Waterpower and will also be screened federally due to certain law list triggers, including the <i>Fisheries Act</i> and the <i>Navigable Water Protection Act</i> (NWPA).</p>	

<p>Under the terms of the FIT contract, the facility would be officially commissioned in April 2015, plant start-up would therefore need to be initiated late 2014 (EL). TS noted that it was key for agencies and ministries to identify any key issues or requirements early on to ensure that resolution was completed in a timely manner.</p> <p>Request to move biological data discussion to further in agenda (TS). Agenda accepted.</p> <p><u>Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Protocol</u></p> <p>Resource Liaison Officer for the Ministry of Natural Resources, Ken McWatters identified a tri-partite "Consultation Interim Measures Agreement" between the province, the federal government and the Algonquins of Ontario. He explained that the consultation process required that all information for both proposed waterpower developments on the Petawawa River be directed to the Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Office. KM advised that it is important that the proponent work with him, respecting the established protocol, failing to do so may result in delays. KM clarified that the land claim extends to both proposed project sites. KM stated that under the provincial Crown, the consultation process has yet to be formally initiated. He added that the consultation office is extremely busy with the land claim and that the proponent was strongly advised to be clear and accurate in any information provided to the Office. TS noted that certain details (i.e. final engineering design) would only be finalized after the EA; KM acknowledged this. He confirmed that the Ministry will require the proponent be at any meeting with the Consultation Office and that the MNR would be involved with all consultation until the Ministry is asked to withdraw by the Consultation Office. KM also identified that additional groups may come forward and ask to be included in the consultation process (ie. Metis and Quebec Aboriginal groups) and that Xeneca should be prepared for this.</p> <p>It was confirmed by Xeneca (EL) that the Algonquins of Ontario were provide a copy of the project description. Xeneca advised that the Stage 1 (desktop) archaeological assessment reports for both sites are expected to finalized and distributed by early February. KM advised that Algonquins are not likely to begin consultation process until Stage 1, and possibly Stage 2, assessments are complete.</p> <p>MNR (JS) clarified that it is the duty of the Crown to ensure that the Aboriginal consultation process is properly completed by the proponent and that no work permits and approvals would be issued by MNR until satisfied that the appropriate level of consultation was applied to the undertaking (Big Eddy).</p> <p>MOE (VM) noted that if a Part II Order request (bump up) is received, the MOE will examine whether the appropriate level of consultation was completed.</p> <p>INAC's BG clarified that his office was not the point of contact for any matters related to Aboriginal consultation and that contact should be made</p>	<p>Xeneca's Aboriginal Liaison Coordinator to contact KM for further discussion; and to provide summary of all contact with Algonquins of Ontario to date</p> <p>Xeneca to forward Stage 1 AA to Consultation Office and MNR when ready.</p> <p>OEL to contact INAC to identify federal Aboriginal consultation lead. (OEL), KM and INAC to discuss</p>
---	--

	with INAC's Toronto office for clarification.	potential harmonization of Federal and Provincial consultation to avoid duplication of efforts.
2.0	<p>Federal Screening under the CEAA</p> <p>Michelle Perry with CFB Petawawa is the FEAC for this undertaking, because land ownership for the Half Mile project falls under the Department of National Defence. TS noted that there have been earlier discussions and meetings between key agencies for the proposed undertaking prior to this EA Coordination meeting, including DFO and MNR. TS emphasized importance of having co-operation between Xeneca and agencies in order to meet FIT schedules.</p> <p>INAC's Bryan Grey explained why the Half Mile project was subject to the <i>Dominion Water Power Act</i> (DWPA), administered by INAC's Northern Region and why Big Eddy is not. Because of the age of the legislation (1913) INAC must interpret the <i>Act</i> with flexibility for application to the environmental assessment process. The Priority Permit issued under the DWPA recognizes that the proponent is the first in line with regards to developing the site; it does not guarantee development rights. The permit is issued yearly; a renewal for the Half Mile site will be required in February 2011; INAC acknowledged that they had received a renewal request from the proponent.</p> <p>Under the DWPA an Interim Licence would be issued to the proponent by the Minister of Indian Affairs only after a successful EA outcome. The Interim Licence would cover the construction of the project. A Final Licence would be issued for the commissioning of the generating station for a period of thirty years. BG explained that INAC would approve all final engineering drawings for the waterpower project but noted that the office of the Agency does not have an engineering department (no new dams have been constructed on federal waterways since 1920). He stated that Xeneca will likely be responsible for the cost of a third party review of all engineering details. MNR (JS) would not have a role in reviewing engineering for Half Mile but may have an interest in any flooding associated with the undertaking. BG confirmed that the detailed engineering for the project will form part of the formal application for approval.</p> <p>BG noted that certain requirements for advertising will be required to be met (and paid for) by proponent subsequent to the approval of the EA, including Canada Gazette and possibly local publications. The proponent was referred to Section 4 of the DWPA for the requirements for notification, adding that their office would work with the proponent on these subsequent to the successful outcome of the EA. TS inquired whether this could be combined with NWPA Gazette requirements; LM stated that this will have to be verified with the Navigable Waters Protection group located in Sarnia, Ontario. LM added that the submission of the NWPA application for the</p>	<p>MNR engineering to confirm what if any role in project design for Half Mile.</p> <p>Xeneca to file NPWA application for the project.</p> <p>BG to provide a copy of the Canada Gazette advertising requirements to Xeneca.</p>

<p>undertaking confirm the requirement for the NWP as it applies to the project, and would initiate the environmental assessment of the undertaking by TC's EA office. She confirmed that a copy of the project description had been forwarded to the NWP office. LM advised the proponent to contact the NWP group to discuss the requirements for documentation needed for the NWP application, and to submit the application as soon as possible.</p> <p>OEL (TS) requested that all agencies identify role in undertaking, legislative and permitting requirements, and key issues which they will need to see addressed in the EA document.</p> <p>NRCan (CS) identified the agency is available to provide expert advice with respect to hydrogeology and acid rock drainage for both sites. The agency can provide other expertise on an as needed basis and prefers to answer specific questions, not provide general information.</p> <p>Parks Canada (KB) identified that it would provide expert advice for the management of any archaeological resources on federal land. OEL (KF) inquired as to the requirement for a marine archaeological assessment. KB responded that it will depend on the findings of the Stage 1 report.</p> <p>Environment Canada (MSh) advisory role, concerns centre around water quality, migratory birds, <i>Species at Risk Act</i> (clear information on which species at risk may be impacted by project) and toxics. Under Section 36(3) of the <i>Fisheries Act</i> – deleterious substances with regards to the construction of the dam, alkali leachate from the concrete will also need to be addressed. EC also expressed an interest in a discussion on air quality and climate changes as within the environmental report.</p> <p>MOE (VM) identified that the Ministry has particular concerns about the large area of shoreline inundation associated with this undertaking and its' potential to impact surface water quality. MOE also noted that the presence of any sewage outfalls and septic systems in proximity to the Petawawa River may already contribute to surface water quality concerns and a change in flow regime may further change surface water quality. MOE added that the locations of any discharges from these systems would have to be located and addressed in the environmental report. and wondered whether this was also a concern for EC. MSh replied that the potential for the introduction of methyl mercury was a concern for the agency. VM added that she will have to consult with MOE's Northern Region prior to addressing mitigation measures for the contaminant. EC confirmed they will require low level (i.e. high accuracy) analysis for methyl mercury in water. BS from Algonquin Park added that the baseline for mercury in the Petawawa River is high as a result of historic logging activities. ORMG (KB) stated that baseline water quality studies had been performed in summer 2010, but that no sediment or terrestrial contaminant sampling had been performed.</p> <p>DND (MP) added that there are additional issues with regards to water</p>	<p>Proponent to submit NWP application to Transport Canada</p> <p>Xeneca to provide Stage 1 to Parks Canada when completed.</p> <p>OEL to provide baseline water quality data obtained during 2010 field season to EC and MOE to identify data gaps in advance of upcoming field season.</p> <p>Further discussion will be required between MOE, EC, DND and project team to understand UXO requirements.</p> <p>DND to confirm level of clearance for construction and any field investigations.</p>
---	--

	<p>quality and unexploded ordinances (UXO). MP explained that the military base has been present since the early 1900s, ammunition has been used on base and remains present both on land and in water. MP noted that certain additional water quality parameters may be required for baseline assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TS asked DND to clarify how the issue of UXOs would have to be addressed during construction. MP said that this has yet to be clarified but that Xeneca had been advised of the complexities involved in dealing with UXOs in the past. ORMB (KB) detailed that for all surface work a Level 1 clearance (visual) would be required; level 2 clearance extends to a depth of 12-18" and that level 3 clearance is required for any intrusive work to a depth of 3 feet, and for work in water. This work is completed by specialized sub-consultants, not by DND and that the cost would be borne by the proponent (MP). This will also be a requirement for the Big Eddy project where certain project components (i.e. power line) cross DND land. 	
3.0	<p>Field investigations and technical reports</p> <p>MNR (JS) inquired as to water temperature changes from waterpower projects. Xeneca (MV) clarified that these types of projects are not a significant source of heat input into waterways.</p> <p>MTO (AN) identified a bridge located at Paquette Road and Highway 17 (between Xeneca's two proposed projects on the Petawawa) and was seeking assurance that the inundation associated with the projects would not affect MTO property. Xeneca (MV) responded that the inundation upstream of Big Eddy is localized and will not exceed seasonal flooding regime. MV commented that (static) modeling for the project put the inundation at a distance approximately ½ way to the bridge site.</p> <p>It was noted that the identified inundation values cited in PDs were measured along the river and not as the crow flies; in the case of the Big Eddy site, the measurement follows the large semicircular path of the river in that area.</p>	<p>MTO to forward land survey of bridge to proponent. Xeneca legal to contact MTO for further discussion.</p> <p>Proponent to provide</p>

<p>MNR (JS) identified that the Ministry will want to see how the zone of inundation was calculated. MV identified that extensive hydraulic modelling (HECRAS) is underway and that once complete, this information (including methodology, modelling assumptions and results) will be forwarded to the agencies and ministries. EC (MSh) identified that the Agency will have an interest in changes to the flooding regime. MOE (VM) identified that the Ministry also has an interest in flow regime changes, and septic and outfall systems discharging to the waterway as changes to the flow regime may impact existing surface water quality. INAC (BG) identified that detailed hydrology is a key part of the formal application for the undertaking. TS suggested that the proponent consider providing any draft technical reports to agencies/ministries for review and that reviewers identify any concerns they may have with field investigation and technical report methodologies to the proponent once draft reports are provided.</p> <p>Discussion of the role of Health Canada. HC is not a regulatory agency, but will provide advice on an as needed basis.</p> <p>TS inquired as to whether there were any known plans for other projects in the vicinity of the Half Mile site. MTO identified future plans for 4-laning Highway 17 but that the schedule was unknown.</p> <p>Access to the project site was discussed, DND identified that the proponent was made aware of access earlier on and that the base would prefer all access to the project site be through Paquette Road. MTO confirmed that no new access to the highway would be approved.</p> <p>Brad Steinberg from Algonquin Park expressed concerns that the proposed area of inundation for Half Mile may affect the park. BS requested clarification on area of inundation, adding any flooding within the park boundary would be a show stopper. BS stated that the project description did not specify how the area of inundation had been measured. Xeneca (MV) responded that the area of inundation would extend to the rapids just downstream of the Orange Road Bridge, ending at the base of the rapid at Wiley Creek. This information will be clarified in the hydrology reports to be submitted to agencies.</p> <p>BS stated that both Lake sturgeon and American eel have been recorded in Algonquin Park and that fish passage for these SAR would be required. DFO's Mark Scott added that fish passage (for both proposed developments) was also a requirement under the federal agency and that it would fall under authorization under the Fisheries Act. BS noted that traditional knowledge suggests sturgeon spawning sites on the Petawawa River within the park.</p> <p>BS added that this section of the Petawawa within the park is a unique setting with little personal exploitation; he confirmed an Aboriginal fishery for personal consumption within the park. A brief discussion was had surrounding public use of Petawawa within DND lands.</p> <p>BS noted that a special permit for any field studies within the park would be</p>	<p>technical reports to regulators as they become available.</p> <p>Proponent to better identify access to project site on mapping.</p> <p>BS to provide ORMG with info on TK on sturgeon spawning</p> <p>OEL to verify with TC's NWP group to determine whether any sections of the Petawawa are classified as non navigable.</p> <p>All future mapping to show Algonquin Park boundaries and provide more</p>
---	--

	<p>required and that these required 60 days to process. He added that no formal request has been issued to his office for habitat information. MNR (LT) also noted that an ESA collector's permit will be required for studies as well.</p> <p>DFO (MS) referenced a letter issued to Xeneca December 21, 2010 detailing DFO concerns and requirements for the Half Mile site (appended to minutes). MS added that DFO concerns and requirements will also be applied to the Big Eddy project. The letter lists several requirements that must be met by the proponent in order for DFO to complete their review of the undertakings, sign off on the EA, and ultimately issue a Fisheries Act authorization. Without that added information such a process cannot be completed. DFO (MS) added that detailed information on impacts or alterations to fish habitat and proposed fish passage measures will be required by the agency.</p> <p>OEL (TS) responded that a focus meeting would be scheduled with MNR/DFO/Ontario Parks once the draft operating strategy, hydrology, biology and other baseline studies were made available.</p>	<p>detailed mapping of inundation area between Half Mile and Algonquin Park.</p> <p>ORMG to file formal request for habitat information to Algonquin Park.</p>
6.0	<p>Project Classification under Class EA for Waterpower</p> <p>OEL (TS) requested a discussion concerning the classification of the project as being on a managed/unmanaged waterway. The project has been described in the project description as being on an unmanaged waterway but that a consensus with the regulators was required.</p> <p>Xeneca (EL) interjected that Xeneca has received direction from the OWA that the Petawawa is considered a managed watercourse and the project would proceed according to the process for new projects on a managed waterway. However, he wished to clarify that Xeneca was willing to submit the ER report for draft agency review and that Xeneca was not attempting to avoid consultation requirements.</p> <p>MNR (JS) responded that the Ministry considers the Petawawa as being an unmanaged waterway as no structure exists that regulates flows or levels on the river. MOE (VM) added that the MOE would defer to MNR District office on the classification of the waterway. Both ministries noted the heightened public scrutiny of the proposed projects, and that it would be to the advantage of the proponent to follow the more rigorous process for projects on unmanaged waterways.</p> <p>OEL (TS) clarified that the Waterpower Class EA was presently undergoing review and that waterway definitions was one of the areas being reviewed. MOE (VM) added that if Part II Order requests are received, it will be up to MOE to review whether Xeneca followed the correct process. If MOE determines that the correct process was not followed, Xeneca would need to complete the appropriate steps and this would delay the project. TS stated that given the ministry position of the Petawawa as an unmanaged waterway, OEL would confer with Xeneca and proceed with the appropriate planning process.</p>	<p>OEL and Xeneca to re-examine Petawawa River classification and to respond to MOE regarding the Notice to Inspect</p>

<p>6.0</p>	<p>Municipal and Public Concerns</p> <p>Town of Petawawa (KC) stated that there had been two public gatherings the previous evening, including a presentation made to council outlining the public concerns and objections to the proposed projects. These concerns were focused on issues of public safety, continued access to the waterway (kayaking, swimming, etc) and ecological concerns (SAR and fisheries). KC inquired if there was any information available concerning what would be undertaken to address public safety at the Big Eddy site. OEL (TS) responded that the proponent would defer to the public safety requirements under the NWPA and best management practices, and that these issues will be addressed in the EA. TS added that the NWPA may require that waterway access be restricted at structures and that consultation would be required with recreational and commercial waterway users.</p>	<p>OEL to consult with NWPA on safety issues and mitigation planning requirements</p>
<p>7.0</p>	<p>Operations, Facility Design and Private lands</p> <p>Town of Petawawa (KC) asked about changes to water levels for the Big Eddy project. OEL (TS) responded that Xeneca is developing hydrological modeling and an operating strategy through consultation with regulators which will respect environmental and socio-economic waterway uses. Xeneca (EL) clarified that the Big Eddy project would be operated as a run-of-river (ROR) facility with no peaking. <i>Note: modified peaking is proposed for the Half Mile Rapids facility.</i> MNR (HH) interjected that, while the proponent may consider the Big Eddy as ROR, the proposed construction of a weir and a small increase in upstream water level is not consistent with the definition of ROR facility. It was added that some First Nations may also disagree with Xeneca's definition of ROR.</p> <p>DFO requested clarification as to how Xeneca arrived at a gross surveyed head of 9m. MV replied that at Big Eddy, the proposed weir will increase the head by approximately 1.5m; the remaining 7.5m reflects the river profile and elevation difference between the intake and the tailrace location.</p> <p>MNR and DFO requested an explanation of the specifics of the design of the proposed facility. Xeneca (MV) clarified that the construction of the earthen weir would be for the main concrete weir abutments and that the specifications would be dependent on site conditions, and pending further analysis.</p> <p>MNR raised a concern that the proposed weir location as shown in the project description may extend onto private property and inquired if landowner agreements had been secured. Xeneca (MV) noted that he was unable to provide a conclusive answer and that he would defer the matter to Xeneca's legal division and provide an answer following the meeting. Acknowledged that land ownership agreements would be required for any potential impacts to private and municipal property. MNR (JS) noted that the Applicant of Record is contingent upon the required agreements with private landowners and the municipality.</p>	<p>Xeneca to advise MNR as to progress of landowner agreements</p>

	<p>coordinate their Aboriginal Consultation requirements with the provincial requirements allowing for more comprehensive consultation program with less duplication of effort. CEAA agreed with this approach and would attempt to coordinate the efforts of the RA's.</p> <p>OEL/Xeneca indicated that the date for the PIC for the Half Mile and Big Eddy projects has not been finalised and will likely be scheduled for late February or early March after the hydrology and initial DOP has been established for the sites. There is the potential that multiple PICs will be required to properly address public concerns regarding impacts to public access and safety, tourism and flows. MNR (JS) recommends that the proposed operating plans should be finalized prior to the PIC and presented to the public at the PIC for public review. These operating plans should be submitted to MNR for review prior to the PIC.</p>	<p>Aboriginal Resource Liaison to work with OEL to coordinate Aboriginal consultation planning requirements</p>
10.0	<p>Ministry of the Environment</p> <p>MOE (VM) has provided a written response to the NOC to Xeneca and after reviewing the Bid Eddy PD has identified their concerns as they relate to emissions to air, including noise, and inundation, including the identification of outfalls into the river and impacts to wells and septic systems nearby. OEL (TS) confirmed that the proponent was aware of these issues and will complete the necessary investigations to assess possible effects of the project. The municipality will also be contacted with regard to municipal building permits. DND added that the base has outfalls on the Petawawa. A discussion was had about provincial permits on federal land with regards to the Half Mile Rapids project. VM replied that the proponent would be encouraged to secure the same provincial permits for those laws of general application, for example Permits to Take Water and a Certificate of Approval for Air.</p>	<p>EA to address MOE identified concerns; project permitting requirements to be identified in the environmental report</p> <p>Proponent to consult with DND, MOE and municipality to determine intake and outflow information, well and septic location information and building permit requirements</p>
11.0	<p>Canadian Transportation Agency</p> <p>CTA (JW) indicated that the agency may be a responsible authority in accordance with the <i>Canadian Transportation Act</i> if any part of the Big Eddy works intersects with a federally regulated railway. It was noted by JE that the ownership of the Ottawa Valley Railway remains unclear.</p>	<p>Xeneca legal to verify OVR ownership and advise CTA.</p>
12.0	<p>Ministry of Natural Resources</p> <p>MNR has prepared written comments regarding the information provided in the PDs and will provide those to the proponent. MNR emphasized need to see baseline environmental and hydrological reports as soon as possible.</p>	<p>ERs to examine and identify cumulative</p>

	<p>The MNR is particularly interested in making sure that both the Big Eddy and Half Mile projects meet all permitting requirements as well as the requirements of their site release. Issues with land owner agreements may affect approvals under the LRIA and AOR status. They added that they would like to see the cumulative impacts of both projects (including fisheries, water levels and flows) addressed in each environmental report.</p> <p>The MNR also expects the ER to address the requirements of water management planning, including a Dam Operation Plan, hydrology, fish passage and minimum ecological flows. The specifics of these elements will also be dependant of the forthcoming SAR information.</p> <p>MNR (LT) noted that Species at Risk permit applications will be required for the construction of the Big Eddy dam and that processing time for these permits can take approximately one year with proper studies performed (exact times dependant on the species and the impact). LT further emphasized MNR cannot make comments on SAR because data has not been received from proponent. This data is needed as soon as possible. MNR legal is still investigating the application of the ESA to the Half Mile project. LT noted that the project will likely require a "C" permit, showing overall benefit to the species and the habitat. It was noted that approvals under the <i>Endangered Species Act</i> must be secured prior to the issuing of any approvals under the LRIA.</p> <p>MNR (HH) would like to see methodology and results of hydrological analysis and modeling completed to date and the results confirmed by at least two statistical methods. All modeling should be completed considering the condition where the dam gates are fully open and fully closed and should include a discussion of potential impacts to geomorphology, flow regime, in-stream velocities upstream and downstream of the facility, the downstream waterway and upstream and downstream sedimentation. MNR is uncomfortable with the use of the term ROR for the Big Eddy project and would like to ensure that it is further defined and explained moving forward. MNR (HH) also recommends consulting with railway as soon as possible to determine their timelines and approvals requirements if applicable.</p>	<p>impacts between the Half Mile and Big Eddy projects</p> <p>ER to include/address water management planning requirements</p> <p>Xeneca to address requirements in hydrological modeling/report ing.</p> <p>ER to include further discussion on ROR systems.</p>
13.0	<p>Connection and Transmission ROW</p> <p>OEL/Xeneca outlined that the connection points were determined in the FIT application/ contracting process based on where there was connection capacity. The transmission routes identified in the PDs reflect Xeneca's current thinking on the best and most efficient routes to connect the projects. It is Xeneca's intention to follow previously disturbed areas where possible.</p> <p>MNR/DND indicated that a biological assessment, including ground truthing would be required to establish existing terrestrial conditions and identify potential impacts. DND identified that a UXO escort may be required to complete studies.</p>	<p>DND to determine requirements for ground truthing studies. Proponent to complete required studies in the spring.</p>
14.0	Meeting was adjourned at 16:30	