

CONTACT RECORD



Stantec

NAME(S): Ralph Pugliese
-> Planning Dept.
TELEPHONE: 360-1998
RE: development

PROJECT NO.: 0114
REPRESENTING: MCR
DATE/TIME: Aug 10 / 5pm
RECORDED BY: M. Kozak

CALL RECEIVED

CALL PLACED

MEETING

NOTES:

Ralph called to inform me that the only future development within the CEA study area is a potential housing development along the lake between Hwy 4 & Port Rd. This Amendment will be heard by council in Nov. Could result in approx. 80 lots being created.

NO.	FOLLOW-UP TASK	TIMING	BY	DONE

CONTACT RECORD



Stantec

NAME(S): Ron Anderson

PROJECT NO.: 0114

REPRESENTING: MCK

TELEPHONE: 519 351 1228 x 2032

DATE/TIME: Aug 11 / 3:15 pm

RE: Cumulative Effects

RECORDED BY: KOZAK

CALL RECEIVED

CALL PLACED

MEETING

NOTES:

Ron stated that he is unaware of any future development within the agricultural area of the study area. Most development along waterfront is all that is planned. Wind farms will be the only development within the area, but none have been planned/approved as of yet.

NO.	FOLLOW-UP TASK	TIMING	BY	DONE

CONTACT RECORD



Stantec

NAME(S): Jake ~~Hardoff~~ Noordhof
district planner
 TELEPHONE: 519-773-4750
 RE: status of project

PROJECT NO.: 0114
 REPRESENTING: MNR - Aylmer District
 DATE/TIME: Sept 14/06
 RECORDED BY: M. KOZAK

CALL RECEIVED

CALL PLACED

MEETING

NOTES:

Requested info on the status of the project and when the MNR will receive a copy for review. Notified Jake that a draft will be submitted approx end of Sept to MOE and then formal submission to MOE in October.

NO.	FOLLOW-UP TASK	TIMING	BY	DONE

Municipality of Chatham-Kent Wind Towers Questions, Concerns, and Problems

By Randy J. Robinson , R.R. #1 Hwy #3, Wheatley, Ontario N0P 2P0 ph 519 825 7728

It is my opinion that the wind project as planned by Kruger should not be allowed by the council in its current state and the proposed by-law is too weak in many aspects. I have spoken with many people and used the internet for researching the good and bad of Wind Towers.

Previous projects elsewhere were allowed based on the enthusiastic words of the developer and the people who get paid to promote and carry the project through. Afterwards however, once the negative impacts of the project were felt, moratoriums were put in place by local governments, laws were changed to protect people and property, and lawsuits were filed by harmed or aggravated parties. Too often the excitement generated by the developers overshadows the unconsidered and undisclosed negative impacts to people and their property. Hopefully there are not deliberate misrepresentations.

Large scale Wind/Electrical Generation projects, like other large scale industrial, or large landfill projects, need special pre-cautions and consideration especially in areas close to residential property owners or other non-benefitting or non-compensated landowners who may actually have direct negative economic and practical impacts, especially when the decision making company does not live in the area.

KRUGER'S SECRETIVE AGREEMENTS are not registered on the public lands registry office unlike oil & gas leases for example. Chatham Kent should not invite a company with undisclosed or hidden agendas to do business here.

KRUGER could easily become Chatham Kent largest landowner because Kruger has right of first refusal to buy all of the land/property when it goes for sale. Kruger will be able to create a resource and land monopoly.

Kruger **PROHIBITS** landowners from discussing the terms of their agreement, or any modified terms, or potential agreement with others.

These agreements are so intensely one sided that Kruger restrict these agreements from the public at large or to anyone unless they feel that person is going to sign one.

COMPENSATION for IMMEDIATE and FUTURE NEGATIVE IMPACTS
A Compensatory guarantee policy and by-law must be made to protect landowners and home owners for immediate and future negative impact and property loss.

REDUCED PROPERTY VALUES has occurred in many other areas of wind tower development areas for as far away as 2 miles for the tower site. The closer you are, the more your property devalues. This means reduced tax revenue for C-K.

MONEY TO THE FEW - NEGATIVE IMPACTS TO MANY

Only a few people throughout CK will be receiving money from Kruger. Some of the people who will be having money paid to them by Kruger do not even live close to the Wind Tower Project and will not feel, see or hear the negative impacts felt by many others.

HEALTH IMPACTS have been reported in many areas from

- NOISE
- SHADOW FLICKER
- STROBE EFFECT
- LOW FREQUENCY

VIEW SCAPE - artificial movements - Always taking your eye, catching your attention. Hypnotic effects and dizziness

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Flightways will be disturbed - no tall trees or forests allowed – no Reforestation Projects allowed

SET-BACK REQUIREMENTS –

The proposed set back by-laws are insufficient and do not protect residential areas, airstrips, unleased landowner, etc.

THEFT of WINDRIGHTS – to Kruger's wonderful economic windfall.

It is just on whose property the tower is located, . The question is **WHOSE WIND RESOURCES ARE BEING UTILIZED** to power the rotors and turbine generators.

There must be set backs put in place from property/wind resource owners who have not assigned their wind rights to anyone yet. A landowner may wish to go with another company or utilize his/her own wind resources. But if Kruger builds too close (and 400' is far too close based on Kruger's and other's technical information) then Kruger is literally stealing another persons wind resource.

This tantamount to **EXPROPRIATION** without **COMPENSATION**

COMPENSATION RADIUS and FINANCIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Kruger needs to thoroughly research both of the above and bring forth their proposal.

SUMMARY

Chatham Kent needs to develop their policies and rules for wind resources so that it will allow Kruger and any other potential competitor, developer, and landowner, a fair and equal opportunity. **PARAMOUNT CONSIDERATION** must always favour the current investors in this municipality who are Chatham-Kent's current taxpayers and citizens.

Randy J. Robinson

Date: September 15, 2006

Stantec Consulting Ltd.
361 Southgate Drive
Guelph ON N1G 3M5
Tel: (519) 836-6050 Fax: (519) 836-2493
stantec.com



Stantec

October 11, 2006
File: 160960114

Mr. Randy J. Robinson
R.R. # 1 Hwy #3
Wheatley, ON N0P 2P0

Attention: Randy J. Robinson

Dear Mr. Robinson:

Reference: KEPA Wind Farm

We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence dated September 15th, attached to your completed September 7th questionnaire made available pursuant to Kruger Energy Port Alma Limited Partnership's ("KEPA") second Public Open House held at Merlin community hall on September 7th, 2006.

First of all, we would like to thank you for having taken the time to express your opinions and concerns regarding the KEPA Wind Power Project. We recognize that, based on your current understandings, you are of the "opinion that the wind project as planned by Kruger should not be allowed by the Council in its current state...". Also, in terms of location, we understand that you are located approximately 4 kilometers west of our project site and within the study area.

In an effort to address your concerns, we welcome the opportunity to provide you the following answers and at the same time, it allows us the opportunity to share our findings with you.

This response will deal exclusively with your concerns in the context of the Environmental Assessment process. Before going into details, we would like to point out though that the majority of the points that you raise on both your Public Open House questionnaire and in your said letter were addressed on the information banners and boards posted around the room at this last Public Open House session, and that other comments that we have received are generally positive.

Stantec

October 11, 2006
Randy J. Robinson
Page 2 of 5

Reference: KEPA Wind Farm

The potential effects, mitigation measures, and net effects associated with the Project will be disclosed through the Environmental Screening Report ("ESR"), which has been prepared according to and is consistent with the Ministry of the Environment's ("MOE") Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Electricity Projects, (also the federal requirements). Topics such as viewscape, environmental noise, wildlife habitat, migratory birds, public health and safety, and agricultural resources are assessed within the report. The assessment includes a description of the existing environment, potential impacts during construction and operation, mitigation measures, net effects and the significance of the net effects. Stakeholders, such as yourself, will have an opportunity to view and comment on the ESR during the Ministry of the Environment's Public Review Period. This review period will be advertised in local newspapers.

Please find below some more detailed information on the specific items which you raise as issues and concerns. Again, each of these is addressed extensively in the ESR that will be made available to the public in the coming months.

Property Values

Within the wind energy industry, as with any infrastructure industry (e.g., pipelines, electrical lines, and power stations), there is continuing dialogue over the effect that industrial scale wind turbines may or may not have on property values within the view shed. To assist in addressing this question, a comprehensive literature review was undertaken as part of the ESR. One Ontario study was identified as part of the literature review and additional studies have been completed in Australia, Denmark, the UK, and the USA.

The Ontario study involved a review by an independent appraiser of property transactions in the Melancthon Township (Dufferin County), where Canadian Hydro Developers Inc. recently constructed a wind plant. The review was divided into two geographic areas: property transactions within the wind turbine siting area and property transactions outside the turbine siting area.

This review indicated that:

- Averaged asking price was similar in the wind plant area
- Averaged sale price was higher in the wind plant area
- Averaged difference between asking price and sale price was lower within the wind plant area (positive position)
- Majority of properties sold were small acreages (i.e., of the known acreages – two acreages were not known – 17 of 27 properties were 20 acres or less).

Reference: KEPA Wind Farm

Based on the studies mentioned above, it has been concluded that wind plants have no known material adverse effect on property values within the view shed, and in a few cases, property values increased.

Viewscape

It is generally understood that the physiography and land-use of an area largely contributes to the visual characteristics of the given landscape. Within the KEPA Project's study area, the visual characteristics are composed of a generally flat to gently undulating landscape primarily made up of agricultural fields.

The turbines are designed to rotate into the prevailing wind direction at any given time. Accordingly, the turbines should be oriented west-south-west for most of the time. Thus, the turbines will be most visible (i.e., full frontal view) to receptors in this geographic zone. To soften the look of the turbines, their towers made out of rolled steel (i.e., they are not steel lattice towers) will be painted white / light grey. The nacelle and blades will also be white / light grey in colouring. White / light grey colouring was selected since it is generally understood that this colouring blends with the environment in comparison to other colours such as pure white.

Additionally, taking into account the height of the turbines (80 m), there will be a change to the aesthetic characteristics of the viewscape. Individual perceptions and opinions tend to be subjective and vary on the "type" of change to the viewscape, including:

- Acceptable change
- Detracting change
- Indifference
- Detracting change evolving to indifference.

In an effort to reduce potential effects during the operational period, as a general rule, reducing the amount of land disturbed during the construction phase reduces the extent of visual impact. Techniques that help reduce surface disturbance, which have been employed as part of the Project, include:

- Using underground power lines on private properties.
- Placing several underground utilities within the same trench
- Establishing limits of disturbance that reflect the minimum area required for construction
- Planning projects so that they utilize existing infrastructure whenever possible
- Requiring restoration of disturbed areas no longer required after construction has been completed.

Reference: KEPA Wind Farm

Environmental Impacts

The predicted environmental impacts have been thoroughly assessed in the ESR process including the impacts on migratory birds and habitats. One of the key criteria for the siting of turbines was ensuring that the Project is not within a migratory bird path. Furthermore, turbines will be located in agricultural fields. No tall trees or woodlots are affected by the proposed turbine locations and no known reforestation projects for these agricultural lands have been identified.

Setback Requirements

The Project has been designed with setbacks that are more rigorous than those required by the Municipality of Chatham-Kent. One such example is that no turbines are located within 125 m of roads, while the Municipality of Chatham-Kent by-law calls for a rotor blade length plus 10 meters, which in this case represents 45 meters + 10 meters for a total of 55 meters.

Health Impacts

Public safety has been, and will continue to be, incorporated into the Project design. Health impacts are addressed in the ESR including the potential for shadow flicker, Electric and Magnetic Fields, icelfall and throw, catastrophic failure and environmental noise. Many of the perceived safety concerns related to Project operation are mitigated through the built-in safety measures and standard procedures for wind turbine operation and maintenance and control systems.

With respect to noise impacts, a noise assessment concluded that the noise impact from the Project would not exceed the most restrictive night time noise limits that apply for areas with acoustic designation of Class 3 (Rural) as defined by the MOE. The Project has been designed to not exceed 40 dBA at the closest receptor (residence). 40 dBA is roughly equal to 1/4th the sound level of a normal conversation.

Finally, and for your information, by its very nature a contract is a private agreement amongst parties. As it is a better standard in the Wind Industry, KEPA signs private agreements with private landowners in the Chatham-Kent community. Once executed, and in its discretion, formal detailed notices of these agreements are then publicly registered on the landowner's land titles.

Stantec

October 11, 2006
Randy J. Robinson
Page 5 of 5

Reference: KEPA Wind Farm

As the Project proceeds, we will notify stakeholders of consultation activities for the KEPA Wind Power Project. KEPA is complying with said above mentioned rigorous regulatory requirements and has always been transparent on potential impacts of its Project while being on the forefront of your community's objective to position the Municipality of Chatham-Kent as a modern and green municipality. If at any time stakeholders have any questions or comments, they can contact us at 519.836.6050 (call collect), or via email at kepawind@kruger.com.

Sincerely,

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.



David Wesenger
Senior Project Manager
Tel: (519) 836-6050
Fax: (519) 836-2493
dwesenger@stantec.com

Stantec Consulting Ltd.

361 Southgate Drive

Guelph ON N1G 3M5

Tel: (519) 836-6050 Fax: (519) 836-2493

stantec.com



Stantec

September 11, 2006

File: 160960114

3486 Talbot Trail

RR1 Wheatley

N0P 2P0

Attention: Mr. Lyle Dawson

Dear Mr. Dawson

Reference: Map of Port Alma Wind Power Project Proposed Turbines

Thank you for attending the public open house held September 7th at the Merlin Community Hall. As per our discussions throughout the evening, please find the enclosed map of the proposed turbine locations for the Port Alma Wind Power Project. As can be seen, the turbines are situated a fair distance away from your airstrips which you indicated as being located north of Talbot Trail (Hwy 3) and south of 2nd Concession. If you have any questions or request any further information, please don't hesitate to contact me directly at the number below.

Sincerely,

Stantec Consulting Ltd.

Mark Kozak

Environmental Scientist

Tel: 519 836 6050

Fax: 519 836 2493

mkozak@stantec.com

Attachment: Map of Study Area

Memo



Stantec

To: Dave Wesenger
Stantec Consulting Ltd.

From: Mark Kozak
Stantec Consulting Ltd.

File: 160960114

Date: October 16, 2006

Reference: Lyle Dawson Correspondence

The following is a description of the correspondence that has taken place between Stantec Consulting Ltd. and Mr. Lyle Dawson throughout the Project.

- Lyle notified Jeff Hankin at the first open house that locations of private airstrips were not included on the socio-economic map. This was to be corrected by Stantec.
- At the second open house, Lyle once again notified Stantec that his airstrips (2) were not included on the map along with a few other private airstrips in the area.
- After the second open house, upon request from Lyle, I sent him a map of the proposed turbine layout however the map did not include locations of airstrips.
- A message was left on my machine during the week of October 2nd by Lyle requesting a phone call from myself to discuss his concerns about turbines being located too close to his airstrips. He informed me that based on his measurement using a ruler that the closest turbine is approximately 900m away.
- I returned the phone call on October 13th to inform Lyle that the closest turbine was in fact 1533m away, not 900m. He requested I send him a map showing both the turbines and his airstrips.
- I sent him (Friday 13th) a map showing his airstrips and the turbines (Socio-Econ map from the ESR) along with a brief note saying that the closest turbine was 1533m away. I also informed him that if the map incorrectly displayed his airstrips to call me immediately and we would change our maps and re-measure the distances.

Stantec

October 16, 2006

Dave Wesenger

Page 2 of 2

- As of 12 noon on Monday the 16th, I have not received any further correspondence from Lyle.

Stantec Consulting Ltd.

Mark Kozak
Environmental Scientist
mkozak@stantec.com

May 4, 2006
RR#1
Chatham, Ontario
N9M 5J1

Attention: Wilson Kerr

Dear Wilson:

Reference: Port Alma Wind Power Project

Further to our phone conversation yesterday, please find attached two copies of the display boards from the April 19th open house. I have attached two copies of our project mapping as well.

In addition, I received your maps of the cemeteries in the study area today, and I would like to thank you very much for sending them. They were very helpful in updating our mapping and will save me another trip to the library. The new cemetery locations have been added to the project mapping, but not the display boards yet.

We hope you are able to attend the next Open House, and look forward to speaking with you again.

Kind regards,

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Jeff Hankin
Environmental Scientist
Tel: (519) 836-6050 ext 220
Fax: (519) 836-2493
jhankin@stantec.com

Attachment: Display Boards and Study Area Mapping