TOWN OF PETAWAWA

1111 Victoria Street, Petawawa, Ontario K8H 2E6 • Telephone: 613-687-5536 / Fax: 613-687-5973
mayor@petawawa.ca www.petawawa.ca

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
Bob Sweet

February 15, 2011

VIA REGULAR MAIL

Xeneca Power Development Inc.
5160 Yonge Street
Suite 520
Toronto, Ontario
M2N 6L9

Attention: Mr. Mark Holmes, Vice President Corporate Affairs

Dear Mr. Holmes:

RE: Big Eddy Waterpower Development
Public Concern

Public concern over the proposed waterpower development on the Petawawa River at Big Eddy has been substantial since the Project Description was released in November and the Notice of Commencement was published in December. Council has been the recipient of a considerable amount of correspondence on the matter. Some of these letters have been copied to our MP and MPP as well as Xeneca. However, we have also received many letters addressed only to Council. Due to privacy concerns and the advice of our solicitor, these letters cannot be released to anyone who may take action without the authors' express permission. Accordingly, we are encouraging individuals to write directly to our MP, MPP and Xeneca. Council feels that this is extremely important as many of the letters are from concerned residents who wish to be considered stakeholders throughout the Class Environmental Assessment process.

Council has also received a request from a concerned community group asking that a series of questions be forwarded by the Town to Xeneca. I have attached the questions to this letter for your response. These questions are clearly important to the community and answers will help clarify some of the uncertainties associated with the project. I understand that you may have received some of the same questions in an email from Mr.

Alan Hepburn on February 3rd; nevertheless Council has determined that we too would like to receive a response from Xeneca.

In particular, I am troubled by Xeneca's lack of communication with the Town since the release of the project description. Given that at your presentation to Council, we voiced our concerns about the possibility of a concrete dam structure being constructed as well as our written correspondence to Xeneca confirming our standpoint, Council was dismayed to learn of the modified project description secondhand. As Council, we must represent the concerns of all the residents of Petawawa. We are a primary stakeholder in this project and your company's proposed plans will have the largest direct impact on the residents in which we represent. As such, it is tremendously important that you keep Council informed and up-to-date on the proposed project. Our residents deserve to have all the information necessary to develop an informed opinion

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Bob Sweet

Bob Sweet
Mayor

c.c. Cheryl Gallant, Member of Parliament
John Yakabuski, Member of Provincial Parliament
Lt. Col. Keith Rudderham, Base Commander
Alan Hepburn, Black Bay Ratepayers Association President
Trevor Griffin, Ministry of Natural Resources District Manager, Pembroke

Encl.

RS/sl

Questions from Black Bay Ratepayers Association
(received via email on January 28, 2011)

1) When will Xeneca publish their "Schedule of consultation events" per section 6.2 of the Class EA? Specifically, what is the current scheduled date for the Notice of Completion?

2) What documents, if any, will be released to the public between now and the Notice of Completion, and when will they be released?

3) On what basis was the Notice of Commencement revised (Dec 24 Daily Observer) to change the status of the waterway from "unmanaged" to "managed"?

4) We note that the Project Description is undated, and does not include a revision history. Nor is there any indication of the author, reviewer, or approver. This is typical of the other Xeneca documents we have seen. Please confirm that future documents will be subject to revision control, and will identify the individuals accountable for their production. As it stands, an earlier document (the WSS document) is claimed by Xeneca to be "out-of-date", yet there is no indication of what document has replaced it. Time has been wasted reviewing this document. Please confirm that the Project Overview is current.

   As an observation, we have no way of determining the qualifications of the individuals involved in the production of Xeneca documents. For a project of this magnitude, whose documents are going to be read and reviewed by a broad range of recipients, we would expect that documentation production would be compliant with some national Quality Control standard, which would require inclusion of the kind of information just mentioned.

5) Please provide a copy of the safety requirements that apply to this project, bearing in mind that the area downstream, starting 700 metres from the powerhouse is heavily used for recreation.

6) Since Mr. Mark Holmes has committed to the Mayor of Petawawa on several occasions in the past that there will be no kind of concrete dam in the Petawawa River, and since such a structure is clearly described in Xeneca's Project Description (e.g. 2.1.1 "the conceptual development incorporates the use of a concrete weir and an earthen dam", will Xeneca undertake to provide written, signed assurance that such a structure is not now contemplated, and remove all reference to such a structure from their project documentation.

   If, on the other hand, a dam is going to be part of the project, as seems clear from the PD, will Xeneca remove any implications that there will not be a dam at this site (e.g. 2.2.1 "There is no realistic capacity for storing water at this site")? These conflicting references are causing a lot of public confusion locally in Petawawa.

7) Please provide the minimum residual flow value to be committed to for this project so we have time to carry out our own analysis of the consequences of this number. Waiting until the Notice of Completion is published does not provide adequate time to carry out an assessment of all the effects of this critical parameter.

8) Will Xeneca revise the entry in Table 5.1 of the PD with respect to aesthetics? The only person who could possibly regard a dried up river bed as being aesthetically positive is someone to whom it represents effective control of lost revenue.

9) Please confirm that the "Operational Zone of Influence", which according to the PD is currently "unknown", is the area of the river that will be affected once the plant is operational. If the operational zone of influence truly is unknown, how can an environmental assessment even start?

10) Is it Xeneca's intent to operate the Big Eddy plant using a modified peaking strategy, as stated in their Project Overview document? This conflicts with section 2.2.1 of the PD, which states "The proposed development would be operated as a run-of-the-river facility with no provisions for peaking". In section 2.1.5 of the PD, it is stated that "construction will feature a broad overflow weir topped by a control structure (i.e. Obermeyer or similar pneumatically operated dam)". Such a control structure is clearly a "provision for peaking". Will Xeneca state unequivocally whether the project is designed to facilitate operation in peaking mode, or not?

11) If peaking is intended, what daily maximum and minimum flow limits are is Xeneca prepared to commit to in writing? (It is, of course, understood that if river flow is less than the committed residual flow, then there is nothing that can be done).

12) If peaking will not be employed, why does the design employ Obermeyer gates, since a simple, manually adjustable sluice gate would appear to offer a cheaper, more reliable design solution for continuous operation? Will Xeneca remove these gates from the design? This would reduce the concern that Xeneca, or some other future owner, could switch to a peaking strategy once the plant is in operation.

13) Why is there no mention of downstream public safety effects in Table 5.1 of the PD?

14) What is the calculated failure frequency of the level control structure (in engineering terms, this is the Mean Time Between Failures, or MTBF)?

15) If this frequency exceeds the safety requirements, what approach is proposed to raise the overall safety of the installation to meet these requirements?

16) Will Xeneca commit in writing to not commence construction if either peaking flows or predicted level control structure accident frequency require the use of barriers to restrict access to the river downstream of the dam (other than barriers in the immediate vicinity of the dam, inlet channel, and powerhouse structures)?

17) Why are daily flow and headpond level variations not listed in the Project Description as a threat to aquatic wildlife to be examined in the EA? Will they be added?

18) Since no solution is available to permit sturgeon to bypass the dam, what mitigating features are proposed to make this project environmentally acceptable in this specific instance?

19) Please provide a map identifying the maximum area of inundation under 100 year flood conditions. Please confirm that this calculation includes a conservative

allowance for obstructions caused by ice dams, slush, tree trunks and other water-borne debris that may be trapped in the area of the dam structure.

20) Will Xeneca provide a list of all non-financial documentation to be produced by the project, together with a schedule for same, so that stakeholders can know what is available?

21) Since the only long-term economic advantage to the community appears to be the percentage of revenue which has apparently been offered to the town, but is not mentioned in section 1.1.4 of the PD, will Xeneca quantify this benefit?

22) Please provide the analysis that shows that the possible erosive effects of the tailrace on the south bank of the river, and particularly the south foundations of the Petawawa Blvd. bridge, have been assessed, given that the bulk of the river flow will no be entering the river bed at about 90 degrees to its natural path.

23) Please provide the analysis that shows that the structure of the relatively fragile dam and level control structure (relative to a well-engineered concrete dam, that is) have been engineered to withstand the effects of peak river flow, ice, debris, slush, etc.