

May 21, 2020

BEL 217153

Mr. Matt Coffey, MCIP, RPP
Planning Coordinator, Approvals
The Corporation of Prince Edward County
332 Picton Main Street
Picton, ON K0K 2T0

**Re: Response to Peer Review of Environmental Impact Study, Pebble Beach East
Campground, Prince Edward County, Ontario**

Dear Mr. Coffey:

Thank you for sharing with us the April 21, 2020 Michalski Nielsen Associates Limited (MNAL) peer review of the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) prepared by Beacon Environmental Limited (Beacon) in support of an Official Plan Amendment application for the Pebble Beach East Campground on behalf of Fourward Holdings Inc.'s Quinte's Isle Campark.

We appreciate the detailed review and many constructive comments and recommendations provided. As the comments and recommendations required revisions to the EIS through provision of supplementary information, we have updated the EIS report and appended it to this letter.

We find the ten recommendations provided in the Peer Review to be reasonable and acceptable. To facilitate the follow up review, we have included below a summary of how the updated EIS has accommodated the recommendations. The original Peer Review recommendations are presented in italics and followed by our responses.

Recommendation #1: Appendix B to the EIS should be updated to include global ranking status and native versus non-native status, to ensure consistency with the description of that appendix in the body of the report.

Appendix B of the updated EIS has been revised to include global ranking status and native versus non-native status.

Recommendation #2: Please include additional detail on the findings of the bat survey work that was undertaken, and how such work impacted on project design and other mitigation measures.

The updated EIS report has been revised to include more detail regarding the bat survey work, including which species were recorded and how the project design was influenced by the findings and additional mitigation measure that will be implemented. Please refer to Sections 3.2.3.3, 5, and 6 of the updated EIS.

Recommendation #3: Please provide summary information on additional SAR species which have the potential to be found on or adjacent to the subject property. This could be accomplished by the inclusion of a SAR screening table, listing all species of potential relevance, a description of their habitat requirements, discussion of whether portions of the subject property or adjacent lands provide any potential habitat for those species and, if potential habitat is present, recommended measures to mitigate against any adverse impacts.

A SAR Screening Table has been added to the updated EIS, and the findings are carried throughout the report, including a discussion of the screening exercise, recommended mitigation measures, and compliance with applicable legislation and policies. Please refer to the new Appendix E for the SAR Screening Table, and report Sections 3.3, 4.3, 6 and 7 for these updates.

Recommendation #4: Please include some discussion of the nearshore fishery of adjacent Lake Ontario, and any associated fish habitat opportunities associated with Soup Harbour PSW.

Section 3.2.4 of the updated EIS has been revised to include a discussion of the nearshore fishery of the adjacent Lake Ontario and Soup Harbour PSW.

Recommendation #5: Please include a more complete description of Soup Harbour PSW, to better describe how that wetland's features and functions give rise to its identification as a provincially significant feature.

Section 4.3.3 of the updated EIS has been revised to include additional discussion of the significance of the Soup Harbour PSW. Additionally, we have included in Appendix A the MNRF summary sheet from the Soup Harbour PSW wetland data record.

Recommendation #6: Please include discussion of other potential candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat. Several other categories of potentially relevant Significant Wildlife Habitat are listed in this peer review.

Additional discussion regarding candidate SWH on the subject property and within the study area has been included in the updated EIS, and the resulting mitigation recommendations and policy compliance has been noted. Please refer to report Sections 4.3.5, 6 and 7 for these updates.

Recommendation #7: Please clarify whether lands within 30 m of Lake Ontario, 30 m of Soup Harbour PSW, and 15 m of the small internal wetlands (with the exception of the intended road) are to be preserved/re-naturalized as buffers, and not simply act as setbacks. Any intended works or uses within those lands should be clearly specified.

The EIS has been updated to clearly state that the lands within 30 m of Lake Ontario and the Soup Harbour PSW, along with the land within 15 m of the wetlands on the subject property will be treated as a buffer and will be naturalized, with the exception for the proposed internal road. Please refer to report Sections 4.2.2, 4.5, 6.1 and 8, as well as Table 8 and 9.

Recommendation #8: Please provide greater detail and specificity on the proposed mitigation measures, to ensure these provide concrete instructions to guide the Site Plan process. In doing so, expand on those recommendations relating to Significant wildlife Habitat and SAR, as may be appropriate, based on the additional requested analysis of SAR habitat and Significant Wildlife Habitat.

The updated EIS includes a new section (Section 61) that summarizes the various mitigation measures recommended in the report. By consolidating the recommendations, it should help ensure that they are implemented through the Site Plan process.

Recommendation #9: Please update the discussion in Section 7 of the EIS regarding policy conformity with respect to Significant Wildlife Habitat and SAR, as may be necessary, on the basis of the additional analysis we have recommended on those two matters.

The policy conformity section of the updated EIS considers the result of the additional SAR and SWH analysis. Please refer to Section 7.

Recommendation #10: Please include a recommendation in the EIS that Beacon Environmental review the later Site Plan details to ensure these are fully consistent with the direction of the EIS recommendations and provide sign-off to the County to that effect.

The conclusion and recommendations section of the updated EIS (Section 8) has been revised to include a statement confirming that the latest Site Plan and supporting technical studies reflect key recommendations presented in the EIS and find them consistent with applicable polices. It should be noted that some of the recommendations relate to best management practices such as erosion and sediment controls, timing of vegetation clearing, naturalization plantings and will be confirmed though conditions of approval at the detailed design stage.

We trust that these responses satisfy the recommendations provided by MNAL. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned for further discussion if required.

Prepared by:
Beacon Environmental



Ken Ursic, B.Sc., M.Sc.
Principal, Senior Ecologist