379 Ronka Road
Worthington, ON
P0M 3H0
(705) 866-1677

LindaH@OntarioRiversAlliance.ca
OntarioRiversAlliance.ca

28 September 2011

The Honourable John Wilkinson
Minister of the Environment
77 Wellesley Street West
11th Floor, Ferguson Block
Toronto, ON
M7A 2T5
minister.moe@ontario.ca

Dear Minister Wilkinson:

**Re: Part II Order Request**
**Class Environmental Assessment Report for the**
**Proposed Serpent River, Four Slide Falls GS**

The Ontario Rivers Alliance (ORA) is an organization with a focus on healthy river ecosystems throughout the Province, and represents some 30 organizations across Ontario, and we are responding to Xeneca's Class Environmental Report and its supporting documentation, for the proposed Four Slide Falls, on the Serpent River.

**Recommendation**

It is the position of the ORA that hydro-electric generation, in the form Xeneca is suggesting at Four Slides, will have unacceptable environmental impacts, and does not contribute in any way to *"the betterment of the people of the whole or any part of Ontario by providing for the protection, conservation and wise management in Ontario of the environment."*[1] The ER is very lacking in several extremely important areas, such as inadequate public and First Nation consultation, incomplete field studies, and proper considerations for the effects of climate change. After carefully reviewing the information as presented, the cumulative effects of this proposal would unnecessarily place the people of the Serpent River Community at risk, as well as the fish populations of Picors Lake and McCarthy Lake, and create a zone of influence that would have devastating effects on the entire riverine ecosystem, both upstream and downstream of Four Slide Falls. In light of this, and in response to our concerns listed in detail below, ORA is requesting a Part II Order be issued to elevate this proposal to an Individual Environmental Assessment.

[1] Environmental Assessment Act (EAA), R.S.O. 1990, c E.18

The very short comment period that has been allowed the public and stakeholders has not made it possible to review the ER and all its supporting documentation in sufficient detail; however, below you will find ORA's comments on several areas of concern:

## 1. Cumulative Effects

When considering the cumulative effects, we must consider all past, present and future impacts:

I. Camp Lake Serpent River GS
II. Serpent River First Nation GS, both located downstream,
III. Proposed McCarthy Chute GS; and
IV. 40 years of uranium mining and tailings deposits.

**A modified run-of-river operation** means water flow will be held back for up to 48 hours, and exposed to from 16 to 30 hours of solar absorption during the low flow winter and summer months, resulting in:

### a. Elevated Methyl mercury Levels

i. The ER states, "Surface water – inundation area at Four Slide Falls site may alter water quality (methylmercury) in reservoir and in turn, the water flowing downstream into McCarthy Lake".[2]
ii. In this area there are trout lakes upstream and downstream of the proposed Four Slide Falls GS. Serpent River First Nation depend upon the protein of fish in their diet, and increased mercury will be a future health hazard to this community, other local stakeholders, and anglers.
iii. The village of Serpent River's municipal water intake is located downstream of the two proposed dam sites.
iv. The proposed inundation area would increase from 18 hectares to 165 hectares. The ER states, "woody debris will be removed", but "roots of trees will remain". This report makes no mention of soils being removed from the inundation area.
v. Methylmercury production is a well-known by-product of hydroelectric impoundments, and is known to radically increase in fish populations – i.e.
   - According to Environment Canada, increased methylation of mercury[3] is a well-known problem caused by water held in holding ponds for peaking purposes.
   - Newly formed reservoirs are at a greater risk of organic methylmercury production than natural lakes. Studies of new reservoirs show significant increases in organic methylmercury in fish inhabiting reservoirs as compared to fish in the surrounding area.[4]
   - In studies of the James Bay region of northern Québec, organic methylmercury in all species of fish increased six times after impoundment (damming of river or lake water in reservoirs).[5]

[2] Four Slide Falls ER, P-128 – Residual Effects
[3] Environment Canada. 2001. Threats to Sources of Drinking Water and Aquatic Ecosystem Health in Canada, National Water Research Institute, Burlington, Ontario. NWRI Scientific Assessment Report Series No. 1. 72p – P-69
[4] Hopkins, S. (June 14, 1999). "A White Paper on Mercury," in New Mexico Environmental Department. Retrieved April 7, 2000
[5] Noel, F., Rondecui, E., & Sbeghen, J. (1998). "Communication of Risks: Organization of a Methylmercury Campaign in the Cree Communities of James Bay, Northern Québec, Canada," in R. Fortune & G. Coaway, Eds. Circumpolar Health 96. Anchorage: American Society for Circumpolar Health.

- The disproportionate presence of mercury in reservoirs is attributed to two factors. First, the percentage of biological activity increases five to ten times in reservoir systems due to the biochemical and physical changes in the soil caused by the flooding, and this accelerated activity increases the number of organisms that can produce organic methylmercury.[6]
- Second, carbon levels increase due to newly submerged and decaying vegetation. This in turn increases microbial activity. Though carbon levels decline over time, thereby lowering methylmercury production, any adjustment of the reservoir's water level can increase the percentage of carbon once again.[7]
- Hydro-Québec claims that the methylmercury concentrations in fish will return to natural levels in 30 years, but some scientists estimate that the decline in certain species could take up to 100 years.
- In Quebec, reservoirs constructed on La Grande river were studied over the period 1978-82.[8] These authors compared mercury in fish for pre-impoundment with post-impoundment conditions. At all sites, mercury was consistently higher in the piscivorous pike and walleye. For all fish species there was a correlation between age and mercury, or between length and mercury, but a great deal of variability existed in the data. After impoundment, mercury in fish increased: for example, walleye year 2 (2 X) and year 4 (3.5 X), and for whitefish in year 2 (3 X) and in year 4 (5.5 x).
- Environment Canada states, “Levels of mercury, unlike PCBS and DDT, have increased in the past 20 years in fish eating birds and mammals. A striking example is the twofold increase from 1975 to 1995 observed in mercury in the thick billed murre eggs in the Canadian high artic.”[9]
- Increased mercury levels in fish tissue are a known health hazard, particularly to pregnant women and their unborn children.

**Note:**

1) Xeneca has not indicated in this report how local stakeholders and First Nation communities who rely on this water for drinking will be protected.
2) Xeneca has not indicated in this report how local stakeholders and First Nation communities who rely on fish from the Serpent River for their sustenance will be protected.
3) Xeneca must do core sampling to identify mercury levels that exist today in the inundation zone, so a baseline is established.
4) Xeneca must undertake a scientific study, based on probable mercury loading at the site, to
    a. Extrapolate the future mercury methylation rates, and their potential effects on the local fish community; and
    b. Determine the anticipated long-term health threats to First Nation and local stakeholders over the 40 year contract of this proposed facility.

[6] Tremblay, A. (1999). "Bioaccumulation of Methylmercury in Invertebrates from Boreal Hydroelectric Reservoirs," in M. Lucotte, Ed. Mercury on the Biogeochemical Cycle. Berlin: Springer.
[7] Hopkins, S. (June 14, 1999) – see above.
[8] Boucher, R. & Schetagne, R. (1983) Repercussions de la Mise en Eau des Reservoirs de La Grande 2 et Opinaca sur la Concentration de Mercure dans les Poissons. Societe d'Energie de la Baie James, Montreal.
[9] Environment Canada, Braune et al. 2001

**b) Warming of water in the head pond**

i. Xeneca says very little in its ER about warming of water in the head pond, however, it does report "the creation and storage of water within the headpond may also impact on Lake trout habitat found within McCarthy Lake downstream through changes to water quality (primarily dissolved oxygen) and temperature"; and

ii. Xeneca goes on to say "a current study indicates that any temperature change in the Serpent River is small and is unlikely to impact on Lake Trout habitat in McCarthy Lake. Lake Trout occupy the cooler bottom water of the lake for the majority of their life cycle and incoming water from the Serpent River is circulated only into the upper, warmer layer of the lake."[10]

iii. During the summer season when water levels and flow rates are at their lowest, is when water will sit the longest in the headpond, and because flow rates are slower it will take longer to fill, which would mean a greater potential for warming from solar absorption for from 16 to 30 hours out of a possible 48 hours. Xeneca dismisses this residual effect stating that "water will only be held in the holding pond for a few hours".

iv. It is well known that impoundments, warmer waters, and stagnation, combined with flood events, all lead to a concentration of more waterborne pathogens and algal toxins.

v. MNR Lake Trout lakes policy[11] has strict guidelines to be adhered to, and Xeneca has consistently ignored both MNR staff and MNR policy in their ER.

vi. The ER states, "surface water inundation area of Four Slide Falls site may alter water quality (dissolved oxygen) in reservoir and in turn, the water flowing downstream into McCarthy Lake".[12] Warmer water temperatures would have a deleterious effect on both Pecors Lake and McCarthy Lake lake trout, as lake trout health and survival is very sensitive to water temperature.[13]

**Note:** 1) Xeneca continues to ignore the recommendations and position of MNR staff, and applies unreasonable pressure tactics to achieve its goals?

2) Xeneca does not mention which study is referred to when reporting that any temperature change in the Serpent River is small and unlikely to impact on Lake Trout habitat in McCarthy Lake?

3) Xeneca must undertake a study to

a. Determine the effects this thermal regime will have on Pecors Lake and McCarthy Lake fish populations, or the impact of construction/operation of this facility on the ability of the up- and downstream reaches to support sensitive coldwater species; and

b. Identify the expected impacts to local stakeholders and aboriginal communities with this anticipated increase in pathogens and algal toxins?

**c) Lowering of Dissolved Oxygen Levels**

Another residual effect listed in Xeneca's ER, is "reduced dissolved oxygen levels from head pond filling"[14]. The balance of water temperature and dissolved oxygen is critical

[10] Four Slide Falls ER – P-119 – Rainbow and Lake Trout
[11] MNR - Fisheries Management Zone 10: Lake Trout Operational Objectives and Management Strategies
[12] Four Slide Falls ER, P-128 – Residual Effects
[13] Effects of Hypoxia on Scope-for-activity and power capacity of lake trout (Salvelinus namaycush), Evans 2007
[14] Four Slide Falls, ER, P-128 – Residual Effects

for the capacity of lake trout to perform critical daily life support activities, and for the protection of the hypolimnetic habit of juvenile lake trout, and the criterion of 7 mg. L -1 is recommended.[15]

**d) Uranium Mining**

According to the ER, uranium mining has occurred in the Elliot Lake area over the past 40 years, with 11 decommissioned mine operations and a number of tailing management areas which have negatively affected the Serpent River water quality. The ER also notes that "for the June event, **pH** exceeded its PWQO at SW1 while the blind field duplicate (DUP) at SW3 exceeded its PWQO for zinc. For the August event, **chromium, copper and zinc** exceeded their PWQOs for SW1**, chromium and zinc** exceeded their PWQOs for SW3, and **chromium** exceeded its PWQO for SW4"[16].

It is well documented that suspended particles of suspended sediment and silt is a common negative impact resulting from peaking operations, and is reported under Residual Adverse Effects as "Not Significant".

**Note:** ORA requests a study be conducted to determine how these suspended heavy metal sediments will impact the Serpent River Public Water Intake, and the McCarthy Lake trout populations, as well as those people who rely on this drinking water, and fish, for their diet?

**d) Residual Adverse Effects**

The ER states that "additional assessment of effects will be undertaken subsequent to the 2011 field investigations, and further discussion is planned between the EA team and interested parties."[17]

Xeneca has listed numerous potential effects in the ER, and of the 36 listed, only <u>two</u> were judged as "significant", six were "positive", and the other 28 were deemed "not significant", meaning that they are not likely to cause unacceptable harm to environmental quality, productive capacity of the effected environment, or the socio-economic and cultural attributes of the area.

**Note:**
1) Xeneca places no significance on loss of habitat, decreased dissolved oxygen levels, methylmercury production, increased phosphorus levels, or on fish injury or impingement?
2) Xeneca consistently downplays and minimizes facts and impacts by referring to them as small and not significant, i.e. "temporary storage would occur during nighttime hours when additional solar absorption is limited"[18], when in fact it water could be held for up to 48 hours, thereby exposing water to from 15 to 30 hours of solar absorption when water flow is low. So what other important facts might have been glossed over and minimized in this ER.
3) ORA requests independent and unbiased studies be undertaken to ensure the significance, or non-significance, of all the potential negative effects in the ER.

[15] Effects of Hypoxia on Scope-for-activity and power capacity of lake trout (Salvelinus namaycush), Evans 2007
[16] Annex IV, P-4, Surface Water Quality Report
[17] Four Slide Falls ER, P-98, 5.1 - Identified Potential Effects
[18] Four Slide Falls ER, P-109, Water Temperature

**e)** **Climate Change** and other weather related affects Xeneca mentions "among the many predictions offered, there includes a doubling in the frequency of extreme rain events and increasing costs to providing community services in Canada during the 21st Century"[19], but Xeneca conveniently forgot to mention an expectation of extreme drought conditions can also be expected.

**Note:** Xeneca has not taken into account the fact that our river water levels over the past few years have seen record lows throughout the summer months?

**f)** **Variable Flow and Rapid Flow Changes** presents obvious problems with turbulence, sedimentation, erosion, and drying of shoreline. "Modified run of river will also produce downstream variability in water depth, flow velocity and wetted perimeter until the river reaches a lake or a confluence with a major tributary."[20]

**g)** **Erosion and Sedimentation** are a major concern with any peaking operation.

**h)** **Clearing for new Transmission Lines and Access Road/s** creates corridors for run-off of rain-water and snow melt, and brings more sedimentation and debris into the ecosystem.

The ER indicates there would be 14.7 km of new transmission line of which 56.1% is along existing road corridor, and the remaining would forge a new corridor on Crown land, with 4 existing river crossings and 4 new river crossings.

**Note:** ORA requests that Xeneca provide plans for protecting the river ecosystem from run-off and sedimentation being introduced through these transmission line corridors.

## 2. Contempt of Process

**a)** **Site Release & Applicant of Record:**

MNR and MOE representatives both made clear recommendations in writing to Xeneca, on several occasions, to wait until the Site Release process was completed before formally commencing with the Waterpower Class EA process. MNR and MOE staff made a valiant attempt to follow their policy and procedure, and their legal obligation to the public, by protesting Xeneca commencing the EA process, and attempting to protect the environment and natural resources; however, Xeneca pressed on in spite of their warnings.

i. Xeneca has not yet been awarded Site Release at Four Slide Falls because
   a. "Xeneca has not completed all required steps in the Site Release process. Namely, the required public notification has not been published";
   b. "MNR is concerned with the potential fluctuation of levels in Pecors Lake. As discussed above, Pecors Lake is a designated naturally reproducing lake trout lake, and the Site Release Policy prohibits the release of any site that will use a designated lake trout lake as a reservoir"; and
   c. "MNR will not issue permits/approvals for a site without Applicant of Record status. As previously communicated to Xeneca, any environmental assessment work undertaken before Site Release is completely at the proponent's risk".[21]

[19] Four Slide Falls ER, P125, 5.4.7 – Climate Changes and Other Weather Related Effects
[20] Four Slide Falls ER, P-16, Negative Impacts
[21] Appendix C-P-76 to 81, 2011, May 18 – MNR memo to Xeneca

ii. It is mentioned time and again in Appendix C that Xeneca's timelines are tight and must meet the deadlines.

iii. Pressure tactics were applied by Xeneca in their letter dated 27 May 2011, from P. Gillette to Richard Linley, MNR, where two MNR staff were reported, "This is most obvious at the Serpent River sites, but Fishery Management Plans seem to be issued in a negative manner at all our FIT sites. The two key individuals raising these issues are Sandra Dosser and Greg Deyne".[22]

**Note:** Xeneca's timelines and interests must not take precedence over policy, procedure, provincial regulations, the public, and most of all the health and well-being of the community, the environment, and the riverine ecosystem.

**b) Field Studies Ongoing:**

The MOE and MNR expressed concerns with respect to the timing of the completion of the EA since studies and investigations were ongoing, and wouldn't be completed before the Environmental Report (ER) was submitted, and would not be addressed in the document; and thus there would remain a requirement for public consultation to present the findings of these post EA investigations.

**Note:** Xeneca issued their Environmental Report and Notice of Completion while field studies are still ongoing and incomplete. No responsible decisions can be made until all information is known.

**c) Public Consultation:**

A Public Information Centre was held in Elliot Lake on December 1, 2010 (Xeneca's Notice displays 2011, rather than 2010), and yet Xeneca states in its ER that

I. "The preliminary assessment of the distribution line and access roads study area includes the proposed route based on layouts dated January 26th, 2011 as well as an additional 250 m area on either side"; and

II. "The initial location of the proposed Four Slide Falls generating station was located approximately 1.5 km upstream of its current location. In early 2011, Xeneca identified the larger natural feature at the current location which has resulted in a shift in the project site and study area. Additionally, the downstream extent of the variable flow reach has been extended from what was initially determined and now encompasses the entire channel downstream of the Four Slide Falls to the river outlet at McCarthy Lake 4 km downstream due to the proposed modified run-of-river operating strategy."[23]

**Note:** This is a totally different proposal than the one presented to the public and First Nations in December of 2010, and no PICs were scheduled to consult and inform the public and First Nations of these significant changes to Xeneca's plans for the Four Slide Falls GS.

## 3. Mitigation

The 29 meter head and 130 foot dried up bypassed stretch of river presents an impassable barrier for fish. Mitigation measures for fish passage have not even been addressed in this ER.

**Note:** If this proposal were to go forward the ORA strongly requests:

1) Fish ladders and/or resting areas for safe upstream and downstream passage;
2) Fish friendly turbines; and
3) That a portage for canoers be provided.

[22] Appendix C, P-91, 2011, May 27 – Patrick Gillette to Richard Linley, MNR
[23] Four Slide Falls Environmental Report, P-43

## 4. Public Safety

Xeneca has identified hikers, snowmobilers, angler, and ice fishing activities. Public safety issues could arise due to variability in flows and the rate of change in flow levels in the Variable Flow Reach. Local anglers wanted to know how ice fishing would be impacted by this project, and Xeneca responded that "the effects of the project on ice fishing would be determined through field investigations and the provision of mitigation measures."[24]

**Note:**
1) Xeneca must not fast track the ER and Notice of Completion when public safety has not yet been properly addressed and researched.
2) Xeneca must provide information on what provisions it will provide to protect local stakeholders from poor ice conditions above and below the dam.
3) This dam is slated for a 29 meter head. Xeneca must provide detailed information as to what safety protocol it will put into place to protect stakeholders in case of dam failure or collapse.

## 5. Decommissioning of Dam

Both MNR and MOE have requested that the ER address what will be planned for this facility at the time of decommissioning, or in the case of abandonment, but no plans have been set out in this ER.

ORA is requesting that Xeneca lodge funds in escrow for dam decommissioning, so that if for some reason the generating station is no longer viable and must be removed, the funds will be there to take care of it. There is a very good likelihood this could happen due to climate change, the possibility of a withdrawal of the FIT program, or perhaps major damage to the dam caused from ice and/or flooding.

## 6. Modified Run-of-River

Initially this proposal was for a run-of-river dam to be located 1.5 km upstream of its current location, however, "in early 2011, Xeneca identified the larger natural feature at the current location which has resulted in a shift in the project site and study area. Additionally the downstream extent of the variable flow reach has been extended from what was initially determined and now encompasses the entire channel downstream of the Four Slide Falls to the river outlet at McCarthy Lake, 4 km downstream due to the proposed modified run-of-river operating strategy."[25] Now there would be a 29 metre head, a 165 hectare holding pond, and operated as a modified peaking operation.

It was pointed out by MNR that "based upon the limited data currently provided in the project description report, it appears that the Four Slide Falls site has been designed to rely upon un-natural head and what could be conceived as un-natural flow conditions. MNR is concerned that the extensive area of inundation proposed for this site may significantly alter the water chemistry and quality within the reservoir, and in turn, the water flowing downstream into McCarthy Lake."[26]

[24] Four Slide Falls ER, P-14 – Stakeholder Consultation
[25] Four Slide Falls ER, P-43 – 2.9.1 – Study Area and Scoping of Natural Heritage Investigations
[26] Appendix C – P77, 2011, May 18 - MNR to Xeneca

**Note:** 1) Xeneca totally transformed this proposal as recently as January of this year, so ORA seriously questions the integrity of design, zone of influence, and the designation of significance of impacts of residual effects.

2) Xeneca must clearly demonstrate that there will be "no impact" from the Four Slide Falls GS Operating strategy on the designated Lake Trout lakes - Pecors Lake and McCarthy Lake.

3) ORA submits that Xeneca has gone to extreme and un-natural lengths to squeeze out every last drop of flow at the expense of the health and well-being of stakeholders, the riverine ecosystem, and the downstream environment.

## 7. Intermittent Operations and Flow

The Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act (LRIA) specifies "generally two-thirds of the stream-flow at any time should be maintained downstream, unless conditions warrant otherwise."[27], and MNR has stated they are abiding by the LRIA guidelines of a minimum of Q80.

a. An environmental flow of 1.0 m3/s and 0.5 m3/s during the fall and winter is not acceptable.

b. Compensatory flow (between tailrace and dam) of 0.2 is of no use to any aquatic life in that stretch of river.

**Note:** ORA requests that Xeneca adhere to the LRIA guidelines of leaving a minimum of two-thirds of the stream-flow in the river at all times.

## 8. Four Slide Falls and McCarthy Chute

a. The Class Environmental Assessment Act, states, "two or more generation facilities that function together as an integrated system for generating electricity shall be deemed to be a single generation facility for the purpose of this regulation."[28]

b. Xeneca noted, "The downstream extent of the variable flow reach has been extended from what was initially determined and now encompasses the entire channel downstream of the Four Slide Falls to the river outlet at McCarthy Lake 4 km downstream due to the proposed modified run-of-river operating strategy."[29]

**Note:** ORA requests that Four Slide Falls and McCarthy Chute proposals be addressed under one Environmental Assessment, as these two dams would be operated as one unit, and would have a very significant negative cumulative impact on the downstream riverine ecosystems.

## Summary:

The CEAA, 4.(2) states, "In the administration of this Act, the Government of Canada, the Minister, the Agency and all bodies to the provisions of this Act, including federal authorities and responsible authorities, shall exercise their powers in a manner that protects the environment and human health and applies the precautionary principle."

Four Slide GS Environmental Assessment Report is incomplete as there are still field studies to be completed, and public consultations that must take place, before approval should be granted. For the

[27] Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act, s 4.3.3(1)
[28] Class Environmental Assessment Act, O. Reg. 116/01, s1(3)
[29] Four Slide Falls ER, P-43, 2.9.1 - Study Area and Scoping of Natural Heritage Investigations

many reasons listed above, this type of "modified peaking run-of-river" hydro-electric dam is very harmful to a riverine ecosystem, both upstream and downstream; and when you have two or more dams on one river, the negative cumulative effects are only amplified, and must always be considered together as one.

In order to meet the intent and spirit of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act and the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act, ORA requests that the proposed Four Slide Falls GS, and McCarthy Chute GS, be considered under one Environmental Assessment Report, and that the pre-existing facilities, Camp Lake Serpent River GS and Serpent River First Nation GS, also be considered when addressing the cumulative effects.

The cumulative effects of all facilities, water management practices, roads, transmission lines, diversions, as well as all resulting "Identified Residual Effects", must be considered with a precautionary approach in order to protect the well-being of the Serpent River community, the environment, and the riverine ecosystem; and to comply with the EAA and the CEAA. These types of proposals must not be fast tracked, or policy and procedure skipped - there is too much at stake!

The experience of the ORA and the public in our dealings with Xeneca has been challenging to say the least, and yet we have asked Xeneca to show their willingness to be cooperative by providing the ER reports in an unsecured format to aid in our commenting. However, not only have unsecured documents not been provided, but shortly after ORA informed Xeneca of our intent to comment on the Four Slide Falls GS ER, Xeneca demonstrated its unwillingness to cooperate by withdrawing a significant amount of information from the Serpent River ER. Appendix D and E were removed from Xeneca's website and replaced with reduced versions, where

- Appendix D, Public Consultation – Xeneca removed 78 pdf pages; and
- Appendix E, Aboriginal Consultation – Xeneca removed 38 pdf pages.

Profits should never be maximized at the expense of the health and well-being of the community, or the riverine ecosystem.

Consequently, ORA, after having carefully reviewed the Class Environmental Report and supporting documentation for the Proposed Serpent River Four Slide Falls Generating Station, is requesting a Part II Order be issued to elevate this proposal to an Individual Environmental Assessment.

ORA looks forward to your response!

Respectfully,

Linda Heron
Chair, Ontario Rivers Alliance

Cc: The Honourable Dalton McGuinty, Premier - DMcGuinty.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org
Cindy Batista, Project Coordinator, MOE - Cindy.Batista@ontario.ca
Patrick Gillette, Xeneca – Pgillette@xeneca.com
Mark Holmes, Xeneca – Mholmes@xeneca.com
Uwe Roeper, Xeneca - uroeper@xeneca.com

The Honourable Linda Jeffrey, MNR - ljeffrey.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org
Gord Miller, ECO – Commissioner@eco.on.ca
Chief Isadore Day, SRFN – iday.srfn@ontera.net
Chief Paul Eshkakogan, SFN – eshkakogan_paul@sagamok.ca
Robert Assinewe, SFN - assinewe_robert@sagamok.ca
Chief Douglas Daybutch, MFN – douglasdaybutch@mississaugi.com
Keith Sayers, MFN – keith@mississaugi.com
Gary Lipinski, MNO – garyl@metisnation.org
Melanie Paradis, MNO – melaniep@metisnation.org
Kathleen Migwanabi, WRFN - kathleenm@whitefishriver.ca
Theresa McClennaghan, CELA – Theresa@cela.ca
Amy Liu, CEAA – Amy.Liu@ceaa-acee.gc.ca
Dave Bell, CEAA – Dave.Bell@ceaa-acee.gc.ca
Laurie Brownlee, MOE - Laurie.Brownlee@ontario.ca
Ellen Cramm, MOE – Ellen.Cramm@ontario.ca
Alan Rowlinson, DFO – Alan.Rowlinson@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Jennifer Hughes, TC – Jennifer.Hughes@tc.gc.ca
Rob Dobos, EC – Rob.Dobos@ec.gc.ca
Michael Shaw, EC – Michael.Shaw@ec.gc.ca
Sheryl Lusk, EC – Sheryl.Lusk@ec.gc.ca
Ed Snucins, MNR – Ed.Snucins@ontario.ca
Sandra Dosser, MNR – Sandra.Dosser@ontario.ca
Greg Deyne, MNR – Greg.Deyne@ontario.ca
Jim Beale, MNR – Jim.Beale@ontario.ca
Bruce Richard, MNR – Bruce.Richard@ontario.ca
John Yakabuski, PC MPP – John.yakabuskico@pc.ola.org
France Gelinas, NDP, MPP - fgelinas-co@ndp.on.ca
Andrea Horwath, NDP, MPP - ahorwath-co@ndp.on.ca
Rick Bartolucci, Liberal, MPP - rbartolucci.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org