

CONESTOGO WIND, LP

Conestogo Wind Energy Centre

Revised Consultation Report

O c t o b e r 1 2 , 2 0 1 1

Table of Contents

1. Public Notices.....	1
1.1 Notice of Project Commencement and Public Meeting #1	1
1.2 Notice of Public Meeting #2	1
1.3 Notice of Proposal for Renewable Energy Approval	2
1.4 Notice of Change and Additional Public Meeting	3
1.5 Notice of Project Change	3
1.6 Distribution of Documents for Review	4
2. Agency Consultation	4
2.1 MNR Review	6
2.2 MTC Review	6
3. Aboriginal Consultation.....	7
4. Municipal Consultation.....	8
4.1 Consultation Summary.....	8
4.2 Consultation Form.....	9
5. Public Consultation.....	12
5.1 Summary of Comments	12
5.1.1 Initial Public Meeting, March 7, 2007	12
5.1.2 Public Meeting #1, December 2, 2009.....	18
5.1.3 Public Meeting #2, November 30, 2010	25
5.1.4 Public Meeting, March 18, 2011	38
5.2 Letters and Reports Received	44
5.2.1 Concerns Raised by Direct Correspondence with NextEra Energy Canada.....	44
5.2.2 Letter	45
5.2.3 Report	46
6. Consideration of Public, Municipal and Aboriginal Input	46
6.1 Alterations to the Proposal to Engage in the Project	46
6.2 Alterations to the Required REA Reports	48

1. Public Notices

1.1 Notice of Project Commencement and Public Meeting #1

The Conestogo Wind Farm project began in 2007 with a larger study area than is now being considered for the project. A Notice of Study Commencement and Public Information Centre #1 was originally published in the East Luther Grand Valley Star – Vidette on February 22, 2007 and in the Wellington Advertiser on February 23, 2007. The Initial Public Meeting was held on March 7, 2007 at the Arthur Community Centre. This notice was published and the meeting held by FPLE Canadian Wind, ULC, which was renamed NextEra Energy Canada, ULC on May 28, 2009.

In 2007, renewable energy projects were permitted under the Environmental Assessment process, not the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) process. This applied to the Conestogo Wind Energy Centre. With the release of O.Reg. 359/09 on September 23, 2009 and the refining of the project area, NextEra Energy Canada met with the Director of Approvals at the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) where it was recommended that an additional meeting be held to “re-introduce” the project. As it was not technically Public Meeting #1, it was not bound to the 30 day advance notice. A revised “Notice Of Proposal And Notice Of Public Meeting #1” was published on November 20, 2009 (as noted in Table 1) and the meeting was held on December 2, 2009 at the Moorefield Community Centre.

Notices were made available on the proponent’s website (<http://www.CanadianWindProposals.com>) and were also hand distributed to all residences located in the “Study Area” as shown in Figure 1, Appendix A. Additional mailings were completed to non-resident landowners and the mailing list has been included in Appendix I. Copies of the notice were sent to the clerks of Mapleton Township and Wellington County, the MOE District Manager (Guelph District) and the Director of Approvals (MOE). The notice contained information on the project location, the proposed size of the project, the proponents, the process and a key map of the original project area. A copy of the Project Description Report was made available at this meeting and a copy was posted on the proponent’s website (<http://www.CanadianWindProposals.com>).

A copy of the notices, lists of attendees, blank comment sheets and presentation boards are included in Appendix I.

1.2 Notice of Public Meeting #2

The notice of Public Consultation and Public Meeting #2 was published in the local newspapers (as detailed below) and distributed to all landowners within 120 m of the project location as shown in Figure 2, Appendix A, as well as any others who had requested that they be added to the mailing list. Additional mailings were completed to non-resident landowners and the mailing list has been included in Appendix I. Copies of the notice were sent to the clerks of Mapleton Township and Wellington County, the MOE District Manager (Guelph District) and the Director of Approvals (MOE). Notices were also made available on the proponent’s website (<http://www.CanadianWindProposals.com>)

In order to conform to the requirements of O.Reg. 359/09, the notice contained information on the project location, the proposed size of the project, the proponents, the process and a key map of the study area. Also included in this notice was the location, time and date of Public Meeting #2 and where the project reports were available for public review (both hard copy and electronic versions), dates of the review period and where comments could be forwarded to. A copy of the notice, public mailing list, list of attendees, blank comment sheets and presentation boards are included in Appendix I.

Table 1: Publication of Public Notices

Notice	Date Published	Location of Notice
Initial Public Meeting (Held March 7, 2007 at the Arthur	East Luther Grand Valley Star – Vidette	February 22, 2007

Community Centre)	Wellington Advertiser	February 23, 2007
Public Meeting #1 (Held December 2, 2009 at the Moorefield Community Centre)	November 20, 2009	The Arthur Enterprise News
	November 20, 2009	The Wellington Advertiser
Public Meeting #2 (Held November 30, 2010 at Drayton Community Centre)	September 17, 2010 November 26, 2010	The Arthur Enterprise News
	September 16, 2010 November 25, 2010	The Wellington Advertiser
	September 15, 2010 November 24, 2010	The Mount Forest Confederate
	September 15, 2010 November 24, 2010	The Minto Express

1.3 Notice of Proposal for Renewable Energy Approval

A Notice of Proposal for Renewable Energy Approval was published to inform the public that the MOE had deemed the Conestogo Wind Energy Centre REA application complete. This notice was published in the local newspapers (as detailed in Table 2) and distributed to all landowners within 120 m of the project location as well as any others who had requested that they be added to the mailing list. Additional mailings were completed to non-resident landowners and the mailing list has been included in Appendix I of the Consultation Report, December 15, 2010.

The notice contained information on the project location, the proposed size of the project, the proponents, the process and a key map of the study area. Also included in this notice was the location where the Final REA Documents could be viewed and how comments could be submitted through the Environmental Registry.

Copies of the Final REA Documents submitted to the MOE on December 17, 2010 were sent to the Township of Mapleton offices and the Drayton Branch library on February 16, 2011 to be made available for public review as well as being posted on the proponent's website, www.CanadianWindProposals.com. The details regarding where the public could access the Final REA Documents were included on the Notice referred to above.

Table 2: Publication of Proposal for Renewable Energy Approval

Notice	Date Published	Location of Notice
Public meeting (Held March 18, 2011 at the Alma Community Centre)	February 23, 2011	The Arthur Enterprise News
	February 25, 2011	The Wellington Advertiser
	February 23, 2011	The Mount Forest Confederate
	February 23, 2011	The Minto Express
	February 23, 2011	Turtle Island News

1.4 Notice of Change and Additional Public Meeting

On March 4, 2011 the MOE confirmed that because the project design had changed since the public consultation period, additional consultation activities should be undertaken to describe the extent of the changes and receive further public input.

The Notice Of Change To A Proposal For A Renewable Energy Project (the “Notice”) was published in the local newspapers (as detailed in Table 3) and distributed to all landowners within 120 m of the project location as well as any others who had requested that they be added to the mailing list. Additional mailings were completed to non-resident landowners and the mailing list has been included in Appendix I of the Consultation Report, December 15, 2010.

The notice contained information on the project location, the proposed size of the project, the proponents, the process and a key map of the study area showing changes to the facility layout that occurred between the November 30th, 2010 meeting and the filing of the REA application on December 17, 2010. Also included in this notice was the location, time and date of a drop-in format public meeting and how comments could be submitted to both NextEra Energy Canada, ULC and the MOE. A copy of the Notice, list of attendees and presentation boards are included in Appendix I.

Table 3: Publication of Public Notices

Notice	Date Published	Location of Notice
Public meeting (Held March 18, 2011 at the Alma Community Centre)	March 9, 2011	The Arthur Enterprise News
	March 16, 2011	
	March 11, 2011	The Wellington Advertiser
	March 18, 2011	
	March 9, 2011	The Mount Forest Confederate
	March 16, 2011	
	March 9, 2011	The Minto Express
	March 16, 2011	
	March 9, 2011	Turtle Island News
	March 16, 2011	

1.5 Notice of Project Change

On August 31, 2011 the MOE confirmed that because the project design had changed since the public consultation period, additional consultation activities should be undertaken to describe the extent of the changes and receive further public input.

The Notice Of Change To A Proposal For A Renewable Energy Project (the “Notice”) was published in the local newspapers (as detailed in Table 3a) and distributed to all landowners within 120 m of the project location as well as any others who had requested that they be added to the mailing list. Additional mailings were completed to non-resident landowners and the mailing list has been included in Appendix I of the Consultation Report, December 15, 2010.

The notice contained information on the project location, the proposed size of the project, the proponents, the process and a key map of the study area showing changes to the facility layout that occurred after the March 18, 2011 drop-in format public meeting.

Table 3a: Publication of Public Notices

Notice	Date Published	Location of Notice
Project Changes	September 21, 2011	The Arthur Enterprise News
	September 28, 2011	
	September 22, 2011	The Wellington Advertiser
	September 29, 2011	
	September 21, 2011	The Mount Forest Confederate
	September 28, 2011	
	September 21, 2011	The Minto Express
	September 28, 2011	
	September 21, 2011	Turtle Island News
	September 28, 2011	

Copies of the complete REA document package including all of the revised REA documents noting the project changes we sent to the clerks of the Township of Mapleton and Wellington County on September 22, 2011.

1.6 Distribution of Documents for Review

Prior to the final public meeting (held November 30, 2010) the Draft Renewable Energy Approval Documents for Consultation were made available for public review for at least 60 days, as required by O.Reg. 359/09. These were made available on the proponent's website (<http://www.CanadianWindProposals.com>) on September 17, 2010 and were also made available for review at Mapleton Township municipal offices as detailed below.

Table 4: Distribution of Documents for Review

Location	Delivery Date
Mapleton Township municipal offices, 7275 Sideroad 16, Box 160, Drayton, Ontario, N0G 1P0	September 17, 2010

All project components are proposed to be located in Mapleton Township.

2. Agency Consultation

The table below summarizes the dates that consultation was initiated with the various agencies

Table 5: KEY AGENCY CONSULTATIONS

AGENCY	DATE	ITEM
Ministry of Environment	February 20, 2007	Notice of Commencement sent to

AGENCY	DATE	ITEM
		MOE
	February 27, 2007	Acknowledgement of receipt of Notice of Commencement from MOE
	November 4, 2009	Meeting with MOE (Approvals Branch) to have a "Pre-submission Consultation Meeting"
	November 24, 2010	Meeting to give the Minister's Office and Ministry staff to provide an overview of the project prior to the last public meeting.
Ministry of Natural Resources	February 1, 2007	Submitted Avian work plan for comments
	June 12, 2007	Submitted Bat Desktop Study for review
	July 5, 2007	Received letter from MNR agreeing with Bat Study conclusions and methodology
	July 30, 2007	Bat Field Monitoring protocol submitted
	March 7, 2008	Bat Monitoring report submitted to MNR
	April 7, 2008	Conference call between MNR, GENIVAR and NextEra Energy Canada to discuss bat monitoring report
	May 5, 2010	Met with MNR to discuss methodology and requirements for the Natural Heritage Study
	November 24, 2010	Met with MNR to review responses to MNR comments on Natural Heritage Report
	September 6, 2011	Discussed proposed layout changes with MNR. Agreed upon additional fieldwork to obtain information necessary to revise the NHA
Grand River Conservation Authority	September 26, 2006	First meeting to introduce FPLE (Now NextEra Canada) and the project
	June 11, 2010	Met with GRCA to re-introduce the project and solicit feedback on project
	August 26, 2011	3 permits were received from the GRCA
Environment Canada – Canadian Wildlife Service	February 1, 2007	Sent copy of Avian Work Plan requesting approval
	April 24, 2007	Response from Environment Canada stating they were satisfied with the work plan

2.1 MNR Review

On August 14, 2010 the following documents were submitted to the MNR for review to ensure compliance with the Natural Heritage requirements of O.Reg. 359/09:

- *Records Review and Natural Heritage Evaluation Ontario Regulation 359/09* (July 2010)
- *Preliminary Bat Likelihood Assessment Study Report Environmental Screening Study* (June 2007)
- *Bat Monitoring at the Proposed Conestogo Wind Farm in Wellington County, Ontario* (Fall 2007)
- *Conestogo Wind Farm Bat Monitoring Report and Environmental Impact Study* (July 2010)

GENIVAR received a request for additional information from the MNR on August 18, 2010 and made the following change, submitted on September 15, 2010:

- The *Records Review and Natural Heritage Evaluation Ontario Regulation 359/09* (July 2010) report was been updated to include an Evaluation of Significance section and Environmental Impact Study, where appropriate; and
- Information on the proposed Environmental Effect Monitoring Plan (EEMP) has been included. The EEMP is included in Section 3 of the *Draft Design and Operations Report* (September 2010) with additional detail on post-construction avian and bat monitoring contained in the document entitled "*Conestogo Wind Farm Post Construction Follow-up Plan*".

A detailed review was supplied to NextEra Energy Canada on November 10, 2010 identifying areas of the report where clarifications and additional information was required. On November 22, GENIVAR supplied the following documents to the MNR.

- *Records Review and Natural Heritage Evaluation Ontario Regulation 359/09* (September 2010)
- *Preliminary Bat Likelihood Assessment Study Report Environmental Screening Study* (June 2007)
- *Conestogo Wind Farm Bat Monitoring Report and Environmental Impact Study* (July 2010)
- *Draft Design and Operations Report* (September 2010)
- *Draft Construction Plan Report* (September 2010)
- *Conestogo Wind Farm Post Construction Follow-up Plan* (November 2010)
- *Bobolinks at the Conestogo Wind Farm* (October 2010)
- *Approval and Permitting Requirements Document (APRD)*

Final confirmation from the MNR is imminent. Copies of the correspondence can be found in Appendix I

A Natural Heritage Assessment (NHA) Addendum report addressing the proposed layout changes was sent to the MOE on September 15, 2011 for review. Comments on this report were received on September 26, 2011. These comments were then addressed in a final NHA Addendum report issued to the MNR on September 28, 2011. A confirmation letter was received from the MNR on October 3, 2011.

2.2 MTC Review

The "*Addendum Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Background Research and Property Inspection) NextEra Energy Canada Conestogo Wind Farm Project, Wellington County, Ontario*", July 5, 2010, report was submitted to the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC) for review on July 5, 2010. The MTC issued a letter of acceptance on August 4, 2010 agreeing with the findings and recommendations of the report. The recommendations included the need to complete a Stage 2 survey on all lands to be disturbed by access roads; turbine work sites, off-road crane paths, and buried electrical lines prior to construction. . These activities are currently in progress. A copy of the acceptance letter is included in Appendix I. As

indicated by the Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure letter dated June 14, 2010 a full Stage 2 archaeological assessment will not be required as part of the REA submission for this project. A copy of this letter is also included in Appendix I.

The “*Initial Heritage Assessment Report: Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes*” report was submitted to the MTC on August 12, 2010. A response was received on September 14, 2010 requesting additional information and studies be completed. These studies were then completed and a revised report “*Detailed Heritage Assessment Report: Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes Conestogo Wind Energy Centre Wellington County, Ontario*” was submitted to the MTC on November 9, 2010. Final confirmation was received from the MTC on November 30, 2010. A copy of the Letter is found in Appendix I.

The MTC was contacted on September 14, 2011 to discuss potential impacts of the proposed layout on Built Heritage features. A letter discussing the proposed changes and potential impacts was sent to the MTC for review on September 16, 2011. An e-mail received from the MTC on September 19, 2011 was received stating that “*Since the changes do not require revisions to the existing recommendations regarding heritage resources that may or will be impacted by the proposed project, there is no need to issue a revised MTC written comments letter*”.

3. Aboriginal Consultation

Aboriginal consultation has been a priority with NextEra Energy Canada and many activities have been undertaken in order to meet the requirements to consult. These activities are included in a separate report entitled “*ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION REPORT FOR: PROPOSED CONESTOGO WIND ENERGY CENTRE*” included in the REA submission. Aboriginal consultation activities which have been undertaken since the *Consultation Update Report, March 28, 2011* was published are summarized below.

As explained in the March 28 and July 20, 2011 updates to MOE, NextEra Energy Canada, ULC (“NEEC”) has continued to work with Aboriginal communities since submission of the December 10, 2010 Aboriginal Consultation Report.

Progress that has occurred since the July 20, 2011 update to MOE is as follows.

On September 16, 2011, NEEC provided an information update to all interested communities that explained the Project site plan layout change. To date, no comments have been received.

NEEC met with Saugeen Ojibway Nations (“SON”) Environment Office and SON’s natural heritage specialist in early August. The meeting was held to discuss SON’s draft review of the Project’s natural heritage report. NEEC’s natural heritage consultant is drafting responses to the report, and the intention is to use it as a means of working towards a consensus about potential impacts and mitigations. This information will be submitted to the SON Consultation Team as part of the continuing dialogue with SON.

As previously reported, NEEC also received a third party expert review of the Conestogo natural heritage report from Six Nations of the Grand River. The report did not raise any significant concerns but did seek additional information on the public consultation report (which had not been posted at the time of the expert’s review) and process. NEEC has ensured Six nation’s expert and Six Nations staff have access to this report. A meeting is scheduled with Six Nations consultation team and their expert later in October to address any outstanding questions.

Communication about the Project is also being made through the Haudenosaunee Development Institute (“HDI”). HDI’s third party expert has completed a review of the project REA reports and additional technical information. A meeting is planned with HDI for mid-October and further information may be available at that time.

No other comments on the Project have been received from other Aboriginal communities.

NEEC will continue to implement the approach described in section 5 “Going Foreword: Communications and Approach” of the December 10, 2010 Aboriginal Consultation report for the Project, which includes a commitment for ongoing communications.

4. Municipal Consultation

NextEra Energy Canada is actively engaging in consultation with the local municipalities of Mapleton Township, the Township of Wellington North and the County of Wellington. As the project will be entirely located in Mapleton Township, the majority of discussions have been with Mapleton Township. These consultations have been in the form of meetings with township staff and a formal presentation to council. A “Renewable Energy Approval Consultation Form: municipalities, local authorities” (MOE) form was distributed (details provided in Section 4.2 below) to the clerk of Mapleton Township more than 90 days prior to the final public meeting.

4.1 Consultation Summary

Table 6: Summary of Municipal Consultations

Municipality & Consultation Date	Discussion Summary
Township of Mapleton (staff meeting) – August 11, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of project under new REA process • Outlining of steps moving forward with the new project area • Staff relayed information regarding future public road work projects in the area
Township of Wellington North (staff meeting) – December 8, 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed project background and potential that project infrastructure may be located within Wellington North
Township of Mapleton (staff meeting) – September 9, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plain language summary for Council/Public – to be forwarded to Municipality no later than Sept 20th • Examples of agreements & protocols to be forwarded to Municipality including but not limited to (Driveway Access / Road Use / Emergency Response / Community Commitments) • NextEra Energy Canada to review how actual taxation will work (i.e. Assessment Roll No) • No major concerns from public works / engineering over road use or improvements but will require detailed engineering drawings to fully address matters • Advised to move forward with detailed engineering work with respect to water crossings for Conservation Authority • General feeling that taxation does not reflect impact to community and are very interested in discussing community commitments • Staff would assist NextEra Energy Canada by looking into suitability of office and/or warehouse

Municipality & Consultation Date	Discussion Summary
	space for project operations office and spare parts storage
Township of Mapleton (Council Presentation) – September 28, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of project and company background • Council reminded NextEra Energy Canada that they supported a moratorium on wind farms until Province undertook health studies • Council raised concerns over health / stray voltage / dirty electricity / emf (electromagnetic field)
Township of Mapleton (staff meeting) – Dec 1, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NextEra Energy Canada emphasized to Mapleton staff that the Municipal Consultation Form is their opportunity to formally comment on the project to the regulatory authority and requested this be emphasized to Council. • NextEra Energy Canada to send contact information and version of Municipal Consultation Form from the approved Kent Breeze Wind Farms project in Chatham-Kent to Mapleton Staff • NextEra Energy Canada to follow-up with MOE regarding timeframes for municipal consultation form (i.e. can Mapleton submit form after REA submitted by NextEra Energy Canada) • NextEra Energy Canada to provide list of 3rd party consultants in attendance at the Open House • Organize a series of conference calls with Mapleton Public Works dept and NextEra Energy Canada's Electrical & Construction / Operations as necessary based on review of REA package • Mapleton to provide a list of possible locations for a 'storefront' location in Drayton, with Moorefield as an alternative • NextEra Energy Canada to provide a draft road use agreement
County of Wellington, March 22, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met with County staff to provide a project update
Township of Mapleton, June 29, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met with Township staff to discuss the transmission line and project next steps
County of Wellington, August 5, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter issued to the County of Wellington responding to concerns raised in their February 25, 2011 letter
Township of Mapleton, September 21, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met with township staff to discuss construction site plans and road user agreement

4.2 Consultation Form

A “Renewable Energy Approval Consultation Form: municipalities, local authorities” (MOE) form was distributed to the Clerk of Mapleton Township as noted in the table below. Included with the consultation form was a copy of the Draft Renewable Energy Approval Documents for Consultation.

Table 7: Municipal Consultation Form Distribution

Recipient of Consultation Form	Date of receipt of Form	Included Documents	Date of Receipt of Documents
Patty Sinnamon, CAO, Clerk, Mapleton Township	August 26, 2010	Draft REA Documents, August 24, 2010	August 26, 2010
Donna Bryce, County Clerk, Wellington	August 26, 2010	Draft REA Documents, August 24, 2010	August 26, 2010

Mapleton Township submitted the completed MCF to the MOE on July 8 2011 rather than providing it directly to NextEra Energy Canada. A copy of the MCF has been included in Appendix I.

The County of Wellington has declined to fill out the form. However, (as mentioned above) a letter dated February 25, 2011 from the County's legal counsel, Garrod Pickford, indicated that NextEra Energy Canada should consult with county staff in regards to several specific items. These include:

- Commercial Entry Permit requirements on Wellington Road 12;
 - If Wellington Road 12 is required to be used, all applicable permits will be secured.
- Winter maintenance issues arising from construction activities;
 - There are no anticipated construction activities associated with County infrastructure that would require winter maintenance
- Minimizing and mitigating construction impacts, including minimizing tree loss and replanting requirements;
 - There are no anticipated construction impacts associated with County infrastructure, and in particular, no anticipated tree loss. NextEra Energy Canada understands the importance of trees in the County of Wellington and, in particular, the Township of Mapleton, and has made every effort to avoid tree loss.
- Consultation requirements with local municipalities for underground utilities, use of municipal roads, fire services or other issues/disturbances related to municipal services;
 - Consultation is ongoing with the Township of Mapleton. There will be an emergency action plan with respect to construction activities that will be shared and developed with the local emergency response agencies. As well, once a site manager is hired for the Conestogo Wind Energy Centre, an emergency response plan will be developed with the County Emergency Response Coordinator to ensure it is consistent and satisfies the needs of all parties.
- Lack of detail on mitigation of noise and visual impacts related to the proposed transformer station
 - The transformer station was relocated towards the back of the property upon which it was sited in the draft documents – change B) in the Notice. The location is such that it is not anticipated to be readily visible from the main road, the 16th Line. The noise specifications of the transformer were provided by the manufacturer and were included in the Noise Assessment Report (Appendix F, Final REA Documents submitted to the MOE on December 17th, 2010).
- Municipal consent requirements for use of the right-of-way on Wellington Road 12
 - There is no intention to use Wellington Road 12 for any project infrastructure at this time.

A copy of the letter received from Garrod Pickford is included in Appendix I. These responses were shared with County of Wellington Planning Department staff on March 22, 2011.

5. Public Consultation

5.1 Summary of Comments

Through the public consultation process numerous comments were received from the public. The comments from each of the public meetings are summarized below. For all public meetings, Initial Public Meeting, Public Meeting #1 and #2, there were often multiple comments received pertaining to certain topics such as health, property values, etc. The summary presents all types of comments received but does not contain each instance where there were multiple comments. Refer to the comment sheets in Appendix I, to see the original comments. Responses and References are included to demonstrate whether and how the comments were considered and/or addressed in the Final REA submission.

5.1.1 Initial Public Meeting, March 7, 2007

Table 8: Issues Raised at the Initial Public Meeting

Specific Issues from the Initial Public Meeting (from Public Meeting, March 7, 2007)	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Many participants were interested to learn who FPL Energy was and the number of turbines that they have installed and operate 	<i>Initial PIC Display Boards, Appendix I</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was general interest in the Environmental Screening process and additional public consultation activities and project specific studies 	<i>Initial PIC Display Boards, Appendix I</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants were interested in the technical aspects of the wind turbines and operational issues at a pre-design level 	<i>Initial PIC Display Boards, Appendix I</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants were interested in how to construct and operate their own wind turbines 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants were interested in where the turbines and the access roads would be located and more specific information 	<i>Layout is now available, Appendix A</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants wanted to know the number of turbines and how their spacing was determined 	<i>Layout is now available, Appendix A</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several participants questioned how close the wind turbines would be located to the roads and residences and whether it was the municipality that determined this 	<i>Revised Design and Operations Report, Figures 2-4, Appendix A</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants expressed concern if a turbine is placed on a neighbouring property and they have a visual impact, how this is dealt with 	<i>Response Plan, Section 4, Revised Design and Operations Report</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants expressed concern that they felt they were losing control of the land 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants expressed concern over potential noise impacts and wanted greater setbacks between residences and turbines 	<i>Noise Study Report, Appendix F</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants wanted to know what effects turbines would have on property taxes and how this is covered off if there is an increase 	Wind Energy Study – Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario (<i>Wind Energy Study – Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-</i>

Specific Issues from the Initial Public Meeting (from Public Meeting, March 7, 2007)	Reference
	<i>Kent, Ontario (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/PropertyValuesConsultingReportFebruary42010.pdf)) The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/ems/reports/lbnl-2829e.pdf</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants identified a grass airstrip that is used by a small local gliding club 	<i>Project not located near airstrip</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants identified concern over impacts on the view shed and lights blinking and how these will be addressed in the study 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants were interested in studies that would be done to assess the potential impact to bats and bird migrations (in particular geese) that move between Luther Marsh and Bellwood Lake 	<i>Avian Report, Appendix C</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One participant wanted to know about power backup and indicated that Germany has battery backup power and whether this was a possibility here 	<i>Project will not have battery back-up</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Many participants wanted to know whether the wind turbines would operate 24-7 or if it would be a seasonal operation and what would happen during high winds 	<i>Revised Design and Operations Report</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants raised concerns over EMF, low frequency vibrations and infra sonic sound and how they will be addressed in the study 	<i>Consultation Report, Table 13</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Ontario Federation of Agriculture indicated an interest in the placement of turbines on farm properties and the continued farming of these lands. 	<i>Revised Design and Operations Report, Figures 2-4, Appendix A</i>

Table 9: Summary of Written Comments Received From the Initial Public Meeting

Written Comments Received (from Initial Public Meeting, March 7, 2007 and emails)	Response	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Heavily populated area which may conflict with wind turbines and Landowners need more say in location of wind turbines on farm properties ▪ Potential tornado area ▪ Setbacks should be established for barns & livestock, not just residences ▪ No project benefits, instead potential detrimental effect on property values ▪ Question cost effectiveness of building & transporting turbines over other forms of energy ▪ Aware of study done on neurological damage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Setbacks from residents, environmental features, roads, etc. are required which often affect siting of turbines on properties</i> ▪ <i>Setbacks are determined by municipal and provincial governments</i> ▪ <i>Generally property values have not been lowered in other areas</i> ▪ <i>Potential economic impacts (positive and negative) will be evaluated as part of the environmental assessment process</i> ▪ <i>The Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health has</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Guide Provincial approvals for Renewable Energy Projects, MOE (http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/en/business/green-energy/docs/REP_Guide.pdf)</i> • <i>Wind Energy Study – Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario</i>

Written Comments Received (from Initial Public Meeting, March 7, 2007 and emails)	Response	Reference
<p>caused by low frequency vibration emitted from windmills – has anyone determined how far away these vibrations can be detected?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More useful if each representative at the PIC was knowledgeable in all areas 	<p><i>stated that the scientific evidence available to date does not demonstrate a direct causal link between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects.</i></p>	<p>(http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/PropertyValuesConsultingReportFebruary42010.pdf)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States:</i> http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/ems/reports/lbnl-2829e.pdf • http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohltc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-between.html • <i>Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review</i> (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental conditions in the area include Alma wetland complex & headwaters of Carroll Creek, reforestation occurring in the area and birds & waterfowl migrate through the area ▪ Interested to learn impact on property values and a setback of 350m would still be too close ▪ Concerned that night lights will impact the night 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Environmental assessment process will identify and incorporate environmental conditions in the area</i> ▪ <i>Generally property values have not been lowered in other areas and setbacks from residents will be</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Natural Heritage Report, Appendix B</i> • <i>Post-Construction Bird and Bat Monitoring Plan, Appendix H</i>

Written Comments Received (from Initial Public Meeting, March 7, 2007 and emails)	Response	Reference
<p>sky & tranquility of the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned with daytime noise, bird kills and ground wildlife corridors ▪ Would prefer that local residents benefit by cheaper power ▪ Found the PIC to be useful and informative 	<p><i>based on municipal and provincial requirements</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Lighting of turbines will be minimized but must meet Transport Canada requirements</i> ▪ <i>Noise, birds and wildlife impacts are some of the potential impacts that will be evaluated during next steps in the evaluation process</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identified area as a migratory route for birds from the Luther Marsh ▪ Township of East Luther notices were amiss and preference is for separate PICs ▪ Would like a copy of Bill 51 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Numerous bird studies are being undertaken during different times of the year and in different locations throughout the project area</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Avian Report, Appendix C</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No benefits of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Renewable energy projects and additional energy sources provide clean, emissions-free energy and can reduce the potential for power outages</i> 	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visuals could have been more in-depth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Purpose of PIC #1 was to provide general information about wind and the project, more project specific boards will be provided at PIC #2</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>PIC 2 Display Boards, Appendix I</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Studies should take into account future areas for reforestation as the county is establishing wildlife corridors ▪ Unsure how land values and rural peace will be affected ▪ Concerned about light pollution from strobe lights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Reforestation is only one issue that will be identified and assessed</i> ▪ <i>Wind farms have been located in rural areas with minimal impact on land values</i> ▪ <i>Lighting of turbines will be minimized but must meet Transport Canada requirements</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Natural Heritage Report, Appendix B</i> • <i>Wind Energy Study – Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/PropertyValuesConsultingReportFebruary42010.pdf)</i> • <i>The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/ems/reports/lbnl-2829e.pdf</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suitable existing conditions identified ▪ Thorough screening process with concern given for the environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No response required</i> 	

Written Comments Received (from Initial Public Meeting, March 7, 2007 and emails)	Response	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Glad to have wind turbines coming to the area ▪ Wind energy has great benefits to Ontario ▪ PIC was a great idea to identify concerns 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Want information comparing cost of wind power versus other forms of energy development ▪ Project benefits include reduced taxes and improved dependability of electricity supply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Justification for the project (including renewable energy versus non-renewable) is part of environmental assessment process</i> 	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to ensure FPL Energy has code of ethics that would include respecting neighbouring properties ▪ No benefits to project, should be located in low populated areas with 1000m between turbines and residents ▪ Would prefer presentation format at PIC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>NextEra Energy Resources (FPL Energy) has developed wind farms in various communities and works with residents and communities to understand issues and minimize impacts</i> ▪ <i>Wind farms are proposed in southern Ontario where demand is higher and greater number of transmission lines exist</i> ▪ <i>Previous experience has shown that the Open House format is a more effective way of distributing information to the public.</i> 	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about noise levels, setbacks not large enough and property value decreasing ▪ Information provided was vague ▪ No benefits from the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>These are some of the potential impacts that will be further identified and assessed</i> ▪ <i>Purpose of PIC #1 was to provide general information about wind and the project, more project specific boards will be provided at PIC #2</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Noise Study Report, Appendix F</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project should study the flyway between Bellwood Lake and Luther Marsh ▪ No benefits to the project ▪ Limited information provided at PIC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Numerous bird studies are being undertaken during various times of the year and in different locations throughout the project area</i> ▪ <i>Purpose of PIC #1 was to provide general information about wind and the project, more project specific boards will be provided at PIC #2</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Avian Report, Appendix C</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Logical process being followed ▪ No concerns/comments over project or information gathered ▪ Benefits of cash injected into farming community, increased tax income for municipality and good for the environment ▪ Appreciated PIC and opportunity to ask questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No response required</i> 	<p>N/A</p>

Written Comments Received (from Initial Public Meeting, March 7, 2007 and emails)	Response	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Make use of the wind 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No response required</i> 	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More information required on pros and cons ▪ No benefit to project since the hydro bill won't be affected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Purpose of PIC #1 was to provide general information about wind and the project, more project specific boards will be provided at PIC #2</i> 	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good wind area with potential and few environmental issues ▪ No significant environmental impacts if project were to proceed ▪ Contact GRCA regarding EIS prepared by MTO for Highway 6 redesign ▪ Project benefit may be local power attracting more manufacturing to the area ▪ Overall PIC had knowledgeable people and well received 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Discussions have been held with GRCA, will review previous projects completed in the area to obtain/confirm information</i> 	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing conditions are rural character, including low industrial noise and clear view of night skies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Existing conditions will be discussed in the EA Report</i> 	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that aviation lighting of turbines causes light pollution from flashing/strobe lights ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Discussions will be held with Transport Canada to determine lighting requirements for the turbines and this will be incorporated into the report</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Revised Design and Operations Report</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of life for residents is reduced by light pollution and reduced visibility of night sky 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Siting of turbines away from residents, where possible, may reduce risk of impacts to visibility of the night sky</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Revised Design and Operations Report</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project's benefit is that it will provide clean renewable energy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>None required</i> 	<p>N/A</p>

5.1.2 Public Meeting #1, December 2, 2009

Table 10: Issues Raised at Public Meeting #1

Specific Issues from Public Meeting #1 (from Public Meeting #1, Dec. 2, 2009)	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health concerns about wind turbines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohlrc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-between.html • <i>Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review</i> (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern about the impact of wind turbines on adjacent property values 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wind Energy Study – Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario</i> (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/PropertyValuesConsultingReportFebruary42010.pdf) • <i>The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States:</i> http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/ems/reports/lbnl-2829e.pdf
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People would prefer if the overhead collection lines were buried or not routed along 16th line 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consultation Report Section 6.1, Figures 2-4, Appendix A</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People would prefer if the overhead transmission lines were buried or not routed along 16th line and Sideroad 18 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consultation Report Section 6.1</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What impacts will the project have on dairy farms in the area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consultation Report, Table 13</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will the project increase stray voltage? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Revised Project Description Report, Section 2.2.6</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants wanted to know why the study area and the project had changed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consultation Report, Table 11</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants were interested in knowing about the new approval process and how the public will be able to object and/or provide input 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>PIC #1 Display Boards, Appendix I</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants wanted to see the turbine layout and where the access roads, substation and electrical lines would be. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Figures 2-4, Appendix A</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants wanted to know how the Municipality would be involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consultation Report, Section 4</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants were interested in whether turbines could be located 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consultation Report, Table 13</i>

Specific Issues from Public Meeting #1 (from Public Meeting #1, Dec. 2, 2009)	Reference
outside of the study area and if the project could be expanded at a future date	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants wanted to know what setbacks would be used and how close turbines could be to residences and roads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Revised Design and Operations Report, Section 1</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants wanted to know why wind turbines were being considered since they were not efficient and couldn't address energy needs year round 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://www.pembina.org/docs/re/web-eng-wind-factsheet.pdf
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants expressed concern if a turbine is placed on a neighbouring property and they have visual impact, how is this dealt with and how would they be compensated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Response Plan, Section 4, Revised Design and Operations Report</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants wanted to know how groundwater would be affected by the turbines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consultation Report, Table 11</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants wanted to know what lands were leased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Privileged information</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants wanted to know what happens at the end of the project or if the company is no longer around 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Decommissioning Plan Report</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants expressed concern over potential noise impacts and how this would be dealt with during the study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Noise Study Report, Appendix F</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants raised concern about low frequency vibrations and infrasound and how these would be addressed in the study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consultation Report, Table 13</i> • <i>Noise Study Report, Appendix F</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants identified concern over impacts from lights (blinking) and how these will be determined and then addressed in the study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Response Plan, Section 4, Revised Design and Operations Report</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants were interested in studies that would be done to assess the potential impact to bats and bird migrations that are present in the area and how existing wind farms have impacted birds and bats (e.g., migration and breeding) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Avian Report, Appendix C</i> • <i>Bat Studies, Appendix D</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants wanted to know whether the wind turbines would operate 24-7 and what would happen during high winds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Revised Design and Operations Report</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants indicated that they found the wind turbines to be visually displeasing and thought they would have a negative impact on the local environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>N/A</i>

Table 11: Summary of Written Comments Received From Public Meeting #1

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #1, Dec. 2, 2009 and emails)	Response	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why have you changed the boundaries? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The project was originally started prior to adoption of the Green Energy Act and the subsequent regulations. The project was put on hold until the regulations were completed and the REA process had been defined, which occurred in September 2009. The boundaries on the project have been refined from the broad study area to reflect the location of the turbines and the electrical lines.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does it affect our groundwater? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>There will be no impact on the groundwater since the excavation depth for the foundations is only about 3 m which is expected to be well above the local groundwater table. The foundations are constructed from concrete which is environmentally benign and does not leach contaminants</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Construction Plan Report for construction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the constant vibrations, what affect does it have on soil compaction? Our worm population? The eventual absorption of rain water? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Modern wind turbines produce extremely low levels of vibration as vibrations have the potential to damage the turbine components. The monitoring systems within the turbines will shut them down when excessive vibrations are detected to avoid potential damage. Thus it is unlikely that the operation of the turbines will have any noticeable effect on soil compaction, worm population or rain water adsorption from turbine operation</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you guarantee our quality of life will not change? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>We care about the communities in which our facilities are located. After all, our employees will live and work there. It's important to them, and our company, that we be good neighbours. From project development through operations, we engage landowners, community leaders and businesses. We seek to improve the quality of life and achieve mutual respect and trust.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mechanisms for addressing public complaints can be found in the Response Plan, Section 4, Revised Design and Operations Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What about our land values 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Several recent studies have demonstrated that proximity to a wind farm does not have a negative lasting impact on property values.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wind Energy Study – Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #1, Dec. 2, 2009 and emails)	Response	Reference
		<p>(http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/PropertyValuesConsultingReportFebruary42010.pdf)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/ems/reports/lbnl-2829e.pdf
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I want to see real evidence that these turbines are having no negative effect healthwise on any living beings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health has stated that the scientific evidence available to date does not demonstrate a direct causal link between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects. The project has been designed to meet or exceed all the regulations prescribed by the Ministry of Environment to protect public health and safety. NextEra Energy Canada will have a communication program in place to address any concerns related to the operation of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohlhc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-between.html Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf))
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where will the towers be located 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several studies are currently being conducted to understand where the wind turbines and project infrastructure can be located. The proposed locations of the project infrastructure will be provided to the public 60 days prior to the final public meeting. The project design will be shown and discussed at the second public meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures 2-4, Appendix A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does this project fall within the Green Energy Act? i.e. setbacks Will it create or aggregate stray voltage problems in the immediate area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, this project will be permitted under the Green Energy Act, specifically under the Renewable Energy Approvals process, O.Reg. 359/09. Stray voltage is not a wind energy issue but is related to electricity. In Ontario, stray voltage is addressed by the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Project Description Report Stray Voltage, Hydro One http://www.hydroone.com/MyBusiness/MyFarm/Documents/S

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #1, Dec. 2, 2009 and emails)	Response	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of prime agricultural lands to access roads? Will access to the grid for biogas projects be affected? 	<p><i>Ontario Energy Board, through an amendment to the distribution system code, as of June 16, 2009 (EB-2007-0709). This amendment requires a local distribution company to investigate complaints from farmers regarding stray voltage and all complaints should be addressed by the local distribution company for resolution. NextEra Energy Canada will use Industry Best Practices in the design of the project to minimize the chance of an increased risk of stray voltage to consumers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Access roads for the project will be designed with input from the local landowner and will be done to minimize loss of productive land. Topsoil will be conserved for reuse by the landowner and the roads will be removed and restored to their pre-construction condition in the decommissioning process</i> <i>Access to the electrical grid is awarded through the Feed In Tariff (FIT) program run by the Ontario Power Authority (OPA). Projects will be awarded a contract based on the availability of capacity on the circuit they have applied to. Projects not initially awarded a contract will be placed on a waiting list until there is sufficient economic value in expanding the capacity of that circuit. Therefore, if this project is awarded a FIT contract, it has the potential to limit some access to the grid. Smaller projects which are considered "Capacity Allocation Exempt project" are not subject to this "availability" of capacity and would not be affected by this proposed project</i> 	<p><i>trayVoltage2009EN.pdf</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I wanted to know if any of the towers would be in sight of my living room window 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Several studies are currently being conducted to understand where the wind turbines and project infrastructure can be located. The proposed locations of the project infrastructure will be provided to the public 60 days prior to the final public meeting. The project design will be shown and discussed at the second public meeting.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Conestogo PIC 2 Display Boards</i>

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #1, Dec. 2, 2009 and emails)	Response	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of turbine location and impact studies to be done • Will visual impacts and heritage resource impacts be considered? • Remaining question: What is the maximum size? Could it be expanded? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Several studies are currently being conducted to understand where the wind turbines and project infrastructure can be located. The proposed locations of the project infrastructure will be provided to the public 60 days prior to the final public meeting. The project design will be shown and discussed at the second public meeting. Studies to be completed include: Natural Heritage, Avian, Bats, Archaeological and Noise</i> • <i>Impacts on archaeological and heritage resources will be considered. Details of potential impacts (if any) and proposed mitigation measures will be detailed in the Draft REA Documents to be released to the public as detailed above</i> • <i>A visual simulation of the project will be provided for discussion at the final public meeting</i> • <i>The maximum proposed size is 12 turbines up to a maximum name plate capacity of 25.3 MW. It cannot be expanded under this current proposal. In order to expand a new proposal would have to be initiated and all public consultation and studies would have to be restarted</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Revised Project Description Report</i> • <i>Archaeological and Heritage Studies, Appendix E</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it going to lower my energy bill? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It is too early to tell what the final impact of the Feed In Tariff (FIT) program will be on ratepayers. The experience in Germany, which runs a similar FIT program, has shown that there is minimal impact to the hydro bills of ratepayers from the FIT program.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Electricity from renewable energy sources What does it cost?</i> http://www.erneuerbare-energi.de/files/pdfs/allgemein/application/pdf/brochure_electricity_costs.pdf
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decline in land/property house values • Noise Issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Several recent studies have demonstrated that proximity to a wind farm does not have a negative lasting impact on property values.</i> • <i>The Ministry of Environment has established guidelines to protect public health and safety which prescribe setback distances and permissible sound levels at dwellings. The project has been designed to be in compliance with all related noise and setback</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wind Energy Study – Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario</i> http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/PropertyValuesConsultingReportFebruary42010.pdf • <i>The Impact of Wind Power</i>

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #1, Dec. 2, 2009 and emails)	Response	Reference
	<i>requirements.</i>	<p><i>Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States:</i> http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/ems/reports/lbnl-2829e.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Noise Study Report, Appendix F</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No one would put, in writing, that the wind turbines will NEVER exceed 40 dBA at point of reception 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Ministry of Environment has established guidelines to protect public health and safety which prescribe setback distances and permissible sound levels at dwellings. The project has been designed to be in compliance with all related noise and setback requirements.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Noise Study Report, Appendix F</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of heavy clay (Perth Loam) from surface down to hard pan (100 feet depth) transmitting sound. Asked if any noise abatement was done to insulate side or base of tower. • Will anything be done to eliminate the possibility of sound being transmitted from the concrete base to the clay soil? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The majority of the sound generated by wind turbines comes from the tip of the blade moving through the air. As such, the majority of the energy would be transmitted to the air and very little would propagate through the composite blades and down to the foundation. Also, modern wind turbines produce extremely low levels of vibration as vibrations have the potential to damage the turbine components. The monitoring systems within the turbines will shut them down when excessive vibrations are detected to avoid potential damage. Thus it is unlikely that the operation of the turbines will transmit significant sound or vibration through the ground</i> • <i>NextEra Energy Canada has not encountered this issue at any of its over 75 operational wind farms and based on the type and location of the noise sources of a wind turbine, it seems unlikely that sound could be transmitted through the ground in any noticeable amounts. If complaints regarding this issue do arise, NextEra Energy Canada will work with the landowner to resolve the problem</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting of wind energy systems near registered aerodromes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>NextEra Energy Canada takes matters of public safety very seriously and the issues raised are the kind of</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #1, Dec. 2, 2009 and emails)	Response	Reference
	<p><i>valuable public input which are sought at public meetings. There are no provincial set backs from registered aerodromes; however, NextEra Energy Canada uses a minimum 8,000 metre setback from registered aerodromes. NextEra Energy Canada also consults with both Transport Canada and NavCanada on an on-going basis throughout the development process and submits completed Obstruction Clearance forms (Transport Canada) and Land Use Submission forms (Nav Canada) for approval and/or comments.</i></p>	

5.1.3 Public Meeting #2, November 30, 2010

Table 12: Issues Raised at Public Meeting #2

Specific Issues from Public Meeting #2	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health concerns about wind turbines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohltc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-between.html • <i>Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf))</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise levels from wind turbines, will the modeling be accurate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Noise Study Report, Appendix F</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern about the impact of wind turbines on adjacent property values 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wind Energy Study – Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/PropertyValuesConsultingReportFebruary42010.pdf)</i> • <i>The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/ems/reports/lbnl-</i>

Specific Issues from Public Meeting #2	Reference
	2829e.pdf
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People would prefer if the overhead collection lines were buried or not routed along 16th line 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation Report, Section 6.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People would prefer if the overhead transmission lines were buried or not routed along 16th line and Sideroad 18 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation Report, Section 6.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What impacts will the project have on dairy farms in the area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation Report, Table 13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What impacts will the projects have on other livestock operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation Report, Table 13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will the project increase stray voltage? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised Project Description Report, Section 2.2.6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The transformer is located too close to 16th line. Could it be located further back? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation Report, Section 6.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants wanted to know what setbacks from residences and roads were used and why the difference for participating and non-participating landowners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised Design and Operations Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants wanted to know about shadow flicker and how an epileptic would be impacted by the turbines and what NextEra Energy Canada would do if they were impacted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conestogo PIC 2 Display Boards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants were opposed to wind because they believe that wind is not an economical source of energy and that wind proponents receive subsidies from the government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation Report, Table 13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants wanted to know why no health studies were being completed as part of the process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohltc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-between.html • Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf))
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants wanted to know the effect on birds and bats in the area and what studies were completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avian Report, Appendix C • Bat Studies, Appendix D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants wanted to know why infrasound and low frequency noise were not being studied further 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants wanted to know what the process was for public to oppose the project and where they could provide input on the project in the future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conestogo PIC 2 Display Boards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some participants wanted to know why the project was proceeding if the municipality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

Specific Issues from Public Meeting #2	Reference
wanted a moratorium	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some participants were in favour of renewable energy but wanted the infrastructure to be located in northern Ontario away from populated areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation Report, Table 13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants wanted to know what the impact would be on the groundwater in the area and how deep the foundations would be in the ground 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation Report, Table 13 Revised Construction Plan Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants wanted to know the distance between the closest turbine and a non-participating residence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures 3 & 4, Appendix A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants wanted to know what health studies NextEra Energy Canada was basing their findings on and said that health studies should be done by an independent third party that is not funded by the government or wind developers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohltc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-between.html Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some participants wanted to know what happens to the turbines if NextEra Energy Canada is no longer around and/or at the end of the project life 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decommissioning Plan Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some participants wanted to know whether NextEra Energy Canada could expand on the project and/or whether there were future projects proposed for the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation Report, Table 13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some participants wanted to know what happens if changes are made to the layout between this meeting and submission of the documents to the Ministry of the Environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation Report, Section 6.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants wanted to know what other wind farms NextEra Energy Canada owned and operated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some participants wanted to know why wind when coal fired plants are burning cleaner now and should be used since they provide energy all year round (especially during peak needs in the summer) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Table 13: Summary of Written Comments Received From Public Meeting #2

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #2 and emails)	Response	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is the line going on Sideroad 18 instead of Wellington Road 12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The interconnection point was chosen to enable the project to connect at a Hydro One Networks Inc. circuit with available capacity. The route was designed as the most efficient route 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #2 and emails)	Response	Reference
	<p><i>to the point of interconnection. NextEra Energy Canada has considered feedback from the public on this route.</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I want research that shows the effect of the wind turbines have on dairy operations in other wind farm areas along with animal and crop health 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>It has not been the experience of NextEra Energy Resources that wind turbine operations have any negative impact on livestock.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohlrc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-between.html <i>Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment – health related complications for nearby & not so nearby residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health has stated that the scientific evidence available to date does not demonstrate a direct causal link between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects. The project has been designed to meet or exceed all the regulations prescribed by the Ministry of Environment to protect public health and safety. NextEra Energy Canada will have a response plan in place to address any concerns related to the operation of the project.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Response Plan, Section 4 of the Revised Design and Operations Report</i> http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohlrc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-between.html <i>Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setbacks should be tripled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The project has been designed to meet or exceed all the regulations prescribed by the Ministry of Environment to protect public health and safety.</i> <i>Setbacks are established by the province. Please see references for further information on the Provincial Setbacks</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Wind Facilities Fact Sheet, MOE (http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/en/business/green-energy/docs/fs-wind.pdf)</i> <i>Guide Provincial approvals for Renewable Energy Projects, MOE (http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/en/business/green-energy/docs/REP_Guide.pdf)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why here? This is good farmland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>This area has been shown to have a strong and consistent wind resource, access to nearby transmission capacity without</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Revised Project Description Report</i>

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #2 and emails)	Response	Reference
	<p><i>upgrade investments, landowners interested in participating in the project and has been awarded a Feed In Tariff contract by the Ontario Power Authority for the generation of electricity.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wind turbines occupy only a fraction of the land they are sited on and work in harmony with its established uses. Farming and grazing continue undisturbed. In general, the entire wind farm including towers, substation and access roads use only about 5% of their allotted land. This project uses 16.2 hectares in total out of 2400 hectares in the study area.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Figures 3 and 4, Appendix A</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Property values drop</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There is no evidence to show a decline in property values from the siting of a wind farm. Numerous studies have been conducted by leading universities and the U.S. Department of Energy, all of which have concluded that the construction of a wind facility does not detract from property values.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wind Energy Study – Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/PropertyValuesConsultingReportFebruary42010.pdf)</i> • <i>The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: http://eetd.lbl.gov/ea/ems/reports/lbnl-2829e.pdf</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The mass killing of our bats by windmills – will devastate crop production and lead to an explosion in mosquito populations & other undesirable pests</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Bat studies were completed in accordance with Ministry of Natural Resources guidelines and found that potential impacts were not significant. A post-construction mortality monitoring program and consultation with the Ministry of Natural Resources will indicate if operational mitigation is necessary.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Bat Studies, Appendix D</i> • <i>Post-Construction Bird and Bat Monitoring Plan, Appendix H</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How strong is the structure in a tornado area or path! At what point is a danger to the residents in its path of destruction</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wind turbines are designed to meet rigorous engineering standards and can withstand high wind speeds. Some of the locations where NextEra Energy Resources currently owns and operates wind facilities would be considered much higher risk areas for tornados (such as Kansas and Oklahoma). To date, tornado conditions have not resulted in any safety concerns for the public. The last recorded tornado in the Conestogo project area was in 1993.</i> • <i>The project has been designed to meet or exceed the setback</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Design & Operations Report</i>

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #2 and emails)	Response	Reference
	<p><i>regulations prescribed by the Ministry of Environment to protect public health and safety.</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would you be doing this if the OPA exorbitant subsidy was not in place? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Renewable energy generation facilities do not receive a subsidy. The Ontario Government through the Ontario Power Authority Feed in Tariff program offers long term contracts for electricity generation to renewable energy generation facilities. Renewable energy generation is part of the government's Long Term Energy Plan.</i> • <i>The Ontario Power Authorities Feed In Tariff prices were derived from a range of sources using best available and most recent information. Prices were developed based on experience in Ontario and in other jurisdictions. They cover building and maintenance costs, basic connection costs for typical projects and allow for a reasonable rate of return on investment over an approximate 20 year period.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://fit.powerauthority.on.ca/Page.asp?PageID=1115&SiteNodeID=1052
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMF? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Magnetic field at 60 Hz when standing under a transmission or collector line carrying 300 A is less than 5 μT.</i> • <i>83 μT limit at 60 Hz based on World Health Organization International Commission on Non Ionizing Radiation Protection</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://www.icnirp.de/documents/LFgdl.pdf
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our government is a dictatorship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Comments related to government policy will be included in our Consultation Report for consideration by the Ministry of the Environment.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project will be very detrimental to the health and well being of people, animals our land. We have the best farmland in the country and would like to keep it that way. Wind turbines have no place anywhere people and livestock live. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health has stated that the scientific evidence available to date does not demonstrate a direct causal link between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects. The project has been designed to meet or exceed all the regulations prescribed by the Ministry of Environment to protect public health and safety. NextEra Energy Canada will have a communication program in place to address any concerns related to the operation of the project.</i> • <i>Wind turbines and the associated infrastructure take up only a small portion of the land on which they are situated. This</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohltc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-between.html • <i>Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf)</i> • <i>Revised Project Description Report</i>

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #2 and emails)	Response	Reference
	<p><i>allows wind turbine operations to be very compatible with the continuation of farming and livestock activities.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>It has not been the experience of NextEra Energy Resources that wind turbine operations have any negative impact on livestock.</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put it up north where there no people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Generally speaking, energy generation is most efficiently placed near load – where the energy is in demand. This siting reduces energy losses associated with long transmission lines, and reduces the impact of siting and constructing those long lines. In Ontario, this means that new generation is more practically sited in Southern Ontario, where most of the demand for electricity exists. Ontario is investing in upgrading transmission lines to allow for greater investment in generation in the North, but at this time it is not feasible to create all the power needed in Southern Ontario in Northern Ontario.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there plans to expand this operation in the future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The maximum proposed size is 10 turbines up to a maximum name plate capacity of 22.92 MW. It cannot be expanded under this current proposal. In order to expand a new proposal would have to be initiated and all public consultation and studies would have to be restarted</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I need a health study from the government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health has stated that the scientific evidence available to date does not demonstrate a direct causal link between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects. The project has been designed to meet or exceed all the regulations prescribed by the Ministry of Environment to protect public health and safety. NextEra Energy Canada will have a communication program in place to address any concerns related to the operation of the project.</i> <i>The Province of Ontario has appointed a Research Chair to “actively monitoring and providing the latest in scientific research and data about any possible health impacts of renewable energy”</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohltc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-between.html <i>Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf)</i> http://www.newswire.ca/en/releases/archive/February2010/16/c2268.html
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much do you stand to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Feed In Tariff program through the Ontario Power Authority offers a fixed price for electricity generation at 13.5</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> http://fit.powerauthority.on.ca/Page.a

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #2 and emails)	Response	Reference
make \$	<i>cents/kWh. Prices were developed based on experience in Ontario and in other jurisdictions. They cover building and maintenance costs, basic connection costs for typical projects and allow for a reasonable rate of return on investment over an approximate 20year period.</i>	<i>sp?PageID=1115&SiteNodeID=1052</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the amount of livestock in the area, I feel that you will not properly address stray voltage issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Stray voltage is not a wind energy issue but is related to electricity. In Ontario, stray voltage is addressed by the Ontario Energy Board, through an amendment to the distribution system code, as of June 16, 2009 (EB-2007-0709). This amendment requires a local distribution company to investigate complaints from farmers regarding stray voltage and all complaints should be addressed by the local distribution company for resolution. NextEra Energy Canada will use Industry Best Practices in the design of the project to minimize the chance of an increased risk of stray voltage to consumers</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Revised Project Description Report, Section 2.2.6</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effect on agriculture production specifically dairy and swine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>It has not been the experience of NextEra Energy Resources that wind turbine operations have any negative impact on livestock.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>N/A</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the public come from Mapleton (or outside) I am concerned that too many other agendas are derailing the process of getting the farm up and running 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The meeting was open to any member of the public. Based on attendance records and verbal reports from staff representatives, the majority of people who attended were not local residents of Mapleton.</i> <i>All comments provided in writing or verbally are included in the Consultation Report to the Ministry of Environment</i> <i>NextEra Energy Canada remains open to receiving comments throughout the approvals process, construction and operational phases</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>N/A</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please bury the hydro lines A lot of people are under a lot of stress. Our health 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>On private land, all collector lines are buried. All lines sited in road allowances and right of ways are built using overhead configurations engineered and built to Hydro One Networks Inc.'s standards and are consistent with infrastructure already</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohltc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-</i>

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #2 and emails)	Response	Reference
<p>and lives are at stake</p>	<p><i>in place in the community.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health has stated that the scientific evidence available to date does not demonstrate a direct causal link between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects.</i> • <i>The project has been designed to meet or exceed all the regulations prescribed by the Ministry of Environment to protect public health and safety.</i> • <i>NextEra Energy Canada will have a communication program in place to address any concerns related to the operation of the project.</i> • <i>NextEra Energy Resources has never received a confirmed or documented claim of health effects from anyone, despite operating more than 9,000 wind turbines in the U.S. and Canada.</i> <p><i>In 2009, a scientific advisory panel was commissioned by the American and Canadian Wind Energy Associations to review currently available literature on perceived health effects of wind turbines. The panel's top findings include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The sounds emitted by wind turbines are not unique. There is no reason to believe, based on the levels and frequencies of the sounds, that they could plausibly have direct adverse physiological effects.</i> • <i>If sound levels from wind turbines were harmful, it would be impossible to live in a city given the sound levels normally present in urban environments.</i> • <i>Sub-audible, low frequency sound and infrasound from wind turbines do not present a risk to human health.</i> • <i>Some people may be annoyed at the presence of sound from wind turbines. Annoyance is not a pathological entity.</i> 	<p><i>between.html</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wildlife studies were completed in accordance with Ministry of Natural Resources guidelines and found that potential impacts were not significant. A post-construction mortality monitoring program and consultation with the Ministry of Natural Resources will indicate if operational mitigation is necessary.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Natural Heritage Report, Appendix B</i>

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #2 and emails)	Response	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I believe that the project will be very beneficial to my community. I believe that Mapleton should be a leader in sustainable development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Your comments will be included in the Consultation Report to the Ministry of Environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Soil Health? Visual appearance Added jobs? Where? When? Who? How are you beneficial to my community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NextEra Energy Resources is not aware of any potential impacts to soil health from wind turbine operation. Visual simulations were provided at the public meeting for discussion with attendees. Construction of the project is expected to provide 40 to 50 temporary jobs and one to three permanent jobs. Construction is scheduled to take place next summer and the project is scheduled to become operational by late fall 2011. The project will contribute to the overall economic prosperity of the community through payments to landowners participating in the project and by adding to taxation revenues collected by the municipality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conestogo PIC 2 Display Boards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I understand that some of your sales people have signed up a farmer who cannot read! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NextEra Energy Canada has not knowingly signed a lease agreement with anyone that cannot read. To ensure there is a full understanding of our lease arrangements, NextEra Energy Canada offers to pay for the land owner's legal counsel to review the lease option agreements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why are industrial installations allowed in areas zoned agricultural High cost of power vs. Clean Coal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wind turbines and the associated infrastructure take up only a small portion of the land on which they are situated. This allows wind turbine operations to be very compatible with the continuation of farming and livestock activities. Onshore wind power typically costs 8 to 12 cents per kilowatt hour, depending largely on how windy the site is and how far it is from existing power transmission lines. This cost is already competitive with many other power sources, and once turbines are installed, the cost of generating wind power will remain steady for decades. By contrast, electricity prices have risen steadily across Canada over time. Regulations to make polluters pay for their emissions will mean that the cost of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Project Description Report Wind Power Realities (http://www.pembina.org/docs/re/web-eng-wind-factsheet.pdf)

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #2 and emails)	Response	Reference
	<p><i>power from fossil fuels will continue to rise, on top of normal market fluctuations.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Comparing the cost of new generation, such as wind, to existing and legacy generation, such as coal and hydro, is an unfair comparison. The comparison of cost should be between different types of new generation.</i> • <i>The majority of Ontario's current energy mix and resulting spot price is a result of old assets, whose capital costs were financed and accounted for years ago. Therefore, their operating costs are much lower. Additional, power prices in Ontario are still heavily regulated and do not reflect the true cost of power.</i> • <i>When discussing the cost of wind the comparison should be between the cost of a megawatt hour (MWh) of new wind vs. the cost of an MWh of new nuclear, gas, hydro, etc. When the comparison is made between new MWhs of generation wind is competitive on cost.</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reps are very open and well informed. They are answering questions to my satisfaction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Your comments will be included in the Consultation Report to the Ministry of Environment.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why bother with all of this when the public input is going to be ignored by NextEra and the provincial government • Rural electricity subscribers will pay much more proportionally than larger cities and towns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>NextEra Energy Canada considers all input received and has made decisions about the project that have been influenced by public comment. Some of those changes are outlined in sections below.</i> • <i>Your comments will be included in the Consultation Report to the Ministry of Environment.</i> • <i>According to the Ontario Ministry of Energy, residential electricity prices are expected to rise by about 7.9 per cent annually over the next 5 years. This increase will pay for critical improvements to the electricity capacity in nuclear and gas, transmission and distribution as well as for investments in new, clean renewable energy generation. Consumers who purchase electricity from their local utility, pay rates for electricity consumption that are set by the Ontario Energy Board (OEB) as part of the Regulated Price Plan (RPP). The</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6.1, Consultation report • Ontario's Long-Term Energy Plan (http://www.mei.gov.on.ca/en/pdf/ME1_LTEP_en.pdf)

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #2 and emails)	Response	Reference
	<i>RPP is set every six months (November and May) by the OEB.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Billions of dollars that are spent on a project that does not pay back. My children and grandchildren will carry the burden. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Renewable energy projects are financed by private companies and the public or Ontario government will not be liable should the projects not payback</i> <i>The Government of Ontario's Long Term Energy Plan is to displace coal-fired generation with renewable energy. Other forms of electricity have hidden costs related to health. A 2005 study prepared for the government found that the average annual health-related damages due to coal could top \$3 billion.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Ontario's Long-Term Energy Plan (http://www.mei.gov.on.ca/en/pdf/MEI_LTEP_en.pdf)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improper consultation No assurances concerns will be dealt with No assurances of compensations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>NextEra Energy Canada has followed the consultation requirements as set out by the Ministry of Environment.</i> <i>NextEra Energy Canada will have a response plan in place to address any concerns related to the operation of the project. This response plan is a mandatory component of the Renewable Energy Approval</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Consultation Report</i> <i>Response Plan, Section 4, Revised Design and Operations Report</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it actually happen or does lack of support from other distant communities hinder it? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The project must receive the REA application approved by the Ministry of Environment before construction can start. Any person can make comments relate to the project.</i> <i>The project is supported by numerous local residents</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>N/A</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial wind turbines ruin the peaceful enjoyment of neighbouring properties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Ministry of Environment has established guidelines to protect public health and safety which prescribe setback distances and permissible sound levels at dwellings. The project has been designed to be in compliance with all related noise and setback requirements.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>N/A</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is so much information – pros and cons – which is circulating, I find it difficult to come to a conclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>NextEra Energy Canada is open to discuss the project at anytime and is committed to providing the best available information to stakeholders</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>N/A</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why only 550 m from nearest human habitation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The setback distances are prescribed by the Ministry of Environment to protect public health and safety.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Guide Provincial approvals for Renewable Energy Projects, MOE (http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/en/busine)</i>

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #2 and emails)	Response	Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ss/green-energy/docs/REP_Guide.pdf)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why aren't wind turbines built near or in cities where the power is required? Why not use more smaller units which are less invasive? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The setback distances and noise requirements prohibit the installation of wind turbines in densely populated areas.</i> <i>To achieve the same output, more wind turbines would need to be used which could cause additional visual impacts and environmental disturbance.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who will be held accountable if my family becomes ill? How do you justify installing more turbines when the MOE claims to be unable to properly measure and monitor sound emanating from turbines? When you model the noise from the wind turbines to our homes why don't you use worst case values in your calculations instead of the average? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health has stated that the scientific evidence available to date does not demonstrate a direct causal link between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects. The project has been designed to meet or exceed all the regulations prescribed by the Ministry of Environment to protect public health and safety. NextEra Energy Canada takes all concerns seriously and will have a response in place to address any concerns related to the operation of the project.</i> <i>The MOE is the regulatory agency and would address any measuring and monitoring concerns</i> <i>Sound generation and propagation from the proposed 22.92 MW Conestogo Wind Farm has been modeled for the worst case scenario in accordance with Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) publication entitled, "Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms: Interpretation for Applying MOE NPC Publications to Wind Power Generation Facilities", October 2008.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohltc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-between.html</i> <i>Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf)</i> <i>Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms (http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/publications/4709e.pdf)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What will the transmission lines look like? How much voltage presently passes by? Have you done a Geotech survey? Is 40 dBA inside my house with the windows closed, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Transmission lines will have a similar appearance to existing hydro line, and where possible, will share the same poles</i> <i>The distribution system is 44kV, the same as the proposed transmission line</i> <i>The Geotech survey is scheduled to take place December 2010</i> <i>The "Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms: Interpretation for Applying MOE NPC Publications to Wind Power Generation</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms (http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/publications/4709e.pdf)</i>

Written Comments Received (from Public Meeting #2 and emails)	Response	Reference
<p>with windows open or in my backyard?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plans are not done. Transmission lines are not final...location of turbine 6 and the substation is still being "discussed" 	<p><i>Facilities", specifies that "Points of Reception" includes any point on the premises within 30 m of a dwelling, This would be consistent with being outside of the house.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The plans released for public consultation prior to the second public meeting are draft documents, as changes due to the consultation process can occur. NextEra has made changes to the project due to consultation activities; these are detailed in Section 6.1.</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you guarantee that this project will not be expanded - now or in the future? There were too few representatives for the number of people present How many claims (health/property values) have been settled? Replies to inquiries (including mine in the spring) and this open house were handled very poorly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The maximum proposed size is 10 turbines up to a maximum name plate capacity of 22.92 MW. It cannot be expanded under this current proposal. In order to expand a new proposal would have to be initiated and all public consultation and studies would have to be restarted</i> <i>25 experts in various fields attended the PIC on behalf of NextEra Energy Canada</i> <i>To date, NextEra Energy Canada has never had a documented health claim</i> <i>Several recent studies have demonstrated that proximity to a wind farm does not have a negative lasting impact on property values. Replies were responded to the best of NextEra Energy Canada's abilities. In some cases the person asking the question did not agree with the answer given.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Consultation Report, Section 6.2</i>

5.1.4 Public Meeting, March 18, 2011

Table 14: Issues Raised during the drop-in Public meeting

Specific Issues from the Public Meeting, March 18, 2011	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Photomontages presented at the Public Meeting 2 and in the Heritage Report were inaccurate 	<p>The Photomontages were created using WindPro™ version 2.6 software and industry standard best practices.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why did moving the 3 turbines lower the noise level at receptor 67 by 0.4dBa when it is only raised by 0.1dBa at receptor 21 when Turbine 6 moved an equal distance away from receptor 67 and closer to receptor 21? 	<p>Receptor 67 is much closer to turbines 4, 5 and 6 than is receptor 21. Noise decline over a distance behaves in an inverse square</p>

Specific Issues from the Public Meeting, March 18, 2011	Response
	<p>relationship where, in a simple outdoor situation, for every doubling of distance, sound intensity declines 4 fold. For example, moving turbine 6 from 870 to 1,100 m from receptor 67 would have a much larger change in noise intensity than moving it from 1950 to 1800 m from receptor 21.</p> <p>See Appendix F – Conestogo Noise Assessment Report of the Final REA Documents</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What computer model was used to run the noise study? How was it certified? Who is checking it? 	<p>The noise analysis was conducted using the CadnaA (computer aided noise abatement) 3-D acoustical modelling software V4.0. CadnaA is based on ISO Standard 9613-2 “<i>Acoustics - Attenuation of Sound During Propagation Outdoors – Part 2: General Method of Calculation</i>”.</p> <p>The Conestogo Noise Assessment Report, including the modeling has been reviewed by noise engineers at the Assessment and Approvals Branch at the MOE.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What process will be in place to handle complaints? 	<p>Contact information for the construction manager will be made available to local residents and municipal officials to address construction-related complaints. During operation, a toll-free number will be made available and a storefront office will be opened in Mapleton Township. Additional details are contained in the Response Plan located in Section 4 of the Design & Operations Report, December 15, 2010.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ‘Questions About the Project Changes’ document states that the distance to the nearest non-participating receptor has increased to 1,138 m, but some turbines are closer than this. 	<p>The document refers to the turbine locations that were moved, not the other turbine locations. Of the turbines which were moved (turbines 4, 5 and 6), prior to the moves turbine 6 was the closest to a non-participating receptor, which was 890m from receptor 67. After the changes were made, the new location</p>

Specific Issues from the Public Meeting, March 18, 2011	Response
	for turbine 6 is now 1,138 m from receptor 67. All turbine locations are well beyond the minimum 550 m setback prescribed by O.Reg. 359/09, as amended

Table 15: Summary of Written Comments Received From the Public Meeting, March 18, 2011

Written Comments Received (From Public Meeting, March 18, 2011)	Response	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Which side of 14th Line will the hydro poles be installed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Overhead collection and interconnection lines required for the Conestogo Wind Energy Centre will be co-located with existing Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI) distribution assets. This process is described in more detail in our Revised Project Description Report. Wherever collection and interconnection line routes for the Conestogo Wind Energy Centre do not have existing HONI infrastructure, the Right-of-Way within the road allowance will be used. The details of that design will be determined with input from the Township of Mapleton staff.</i> 	<p>Revised Project Description Report, September 7, 2011</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To suggest that the six landowners who receive remuneration will spend their money in the community and ultimately benefit the community is really “grasping at straws” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Farmers participating in the project benefit from having a reliable, consistent, fixed source of annual revenue in addition to their agriculture-based revenues which can be volatile and fluctuate with commodity prices, weather conditions and other elements outside of their control. This helps stabilize the overall economic prosperity of the community while allowing the land to continue to be used for its primary function - agriculture</i> ▪ <i>The project will contribute to the municipal tax base through property taxes while not drawing on any municipal services such as water, sewer, road clearing, etc.</i> ▪ <i>The Conestogo Wind Energy Centre will employ 2 – 3 full time employees as wind technicians as outlined in the Revised Design and Operations Report. The Operations Centre, approximately 2,000 sq. ft., will be leased within the Township of Mapleton. All of these items are long-term contributions to the economic prosperity of the entire community.</i> 	<p>Revised Design and Operations Report, September 7, 2011</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I feel all electricity lines need to be buried to the substation. Nicole said it does not cost anymore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The decision regarding the design, engineering and location of collection and interconnection lines</i> 	

Written Comments Received (From Public Meeting, March 18, 2011)	Response	Reference
<p>to bury the line than to put in a pole, so it should be buried even though Mr. Dudek said there will be no stray voltage from turbine lines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The majority of home owners are against this and yet your company can come in and set up wind turbines. Please tell me why? 	<p><i>is one that involves many factors and many parties. Cost is not the only variable. Through discussion with HONI, the local utility and the local municipal staff responsible for public works, a final site plan will be developed that will incorporate underground lines where feasible.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The Ontario government has been committed to the phase out of coal based electricity generation and increased integration of renewable energy generation, including wind energy for many years. NextEra Energy Canada has been working with local residents and landowners since 2006 to develop a wind energy project and the Conestogo Wind Energy Centre is a result of that work. There are 10,000 residents in the Township of Mapleton and 85,000 in the County of Wellington. It is unfair to characterize them as ‘against this’ when the majority are in favour of green energy. NextEra Energy Canada has complied with or exceeded all requirements by the regulatory agencies in its design of the Project and will continue to strive to be ‘best in class’ with the construction and operation of the Conestogo Wind Energy Centre. NextEra Energy Canada is aware of the concerns of some of the neighbours of the project and has attempted to address the concerns, some of which are outlined here.</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Ministry of Environment should not just consider physical aspects, it should also consider the personal aspects of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>All comments will be forwarded to the Ministry of Environment for their consideration.</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a building code in the Municipality of Mapleton—how is it that NextEra Energy can override this law? ▪ How is it that NextEra assumes that the Ministry of Environment has already given them approval to go ahead with this project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>NextEra will abide by all Ontario Building Code requirements and will apply for and receive building permits according to that Code prior to commencement of construction.</i> ▪ <i>NextEra Energy Canada is required to present reports that state how the project will be built and operated if approved. NextEra Energy Canada has</i> 	

Written Comments Received (From Public Meeting, March 18, 2011)	Response	Reference
	<p><i>not 'assumed' that the project will be approved by the Ministry of Environment. However, all rules, regulations and guidelines associated with wind energy projects have been adhered to or exceeded where possible in the design of the Conestogo Wind Energy Centre.</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What method does your model use to measure the intensity of low frequency infrasound? ▪ The identification number or code of the MOE Guideline for allowable limits for low frequency infrasound at various distances of this infrasound? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Infrasound is typically associated with frequencies of less than 20 Hz. The "Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms, October 2008" does not require an assessment of frequencies below the 63 Hz octave band</i> ▪ <i>Neither The "Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms, October 2008" nor the Renewable Energy Approvals Regulation (O.Reg. 359/09, as amended) specify noise limits specifically for "infrasound"</i> ▪ <i>All noise modeling for the Conestogo Wind Energy Centre was completed in accordance with the MOE Guidelines.</i> 	<p>Appendix F – Conestogo Noise Assessment Report</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Turbine 6 was moved because the landowner signed an agreement not to have a turbine on his home property not to be further away from his neighbours as presented by NextEra 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>NextEra Energy Canada takes landowner preference into consideration when determining the most suitable locations for wind turbines and project components</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I'd like a copy of the geotechnical assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>This report may contain commercially sensitive information. NextEra Energy Canada will review the report and if possible, the report or sections of the report will be provided.</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How were the noise modeling calculations made? I want to see the standard that they are based on. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The noise analysis was conducted using the CadnaA (computer aided noise abatement) 3-D acoustical modelling software V4.0. CadnaA is based on ISO Standard 9613-2 "Acoustics - Attenuation of Sound During Propagation Outdoors – Part 2: General Method of Calculation".</i> 	<p>Appendix F – Conestogo Noise Assessment Report http://www.iso.org/iso/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=20649</p>

5.2 Letters and Reports Received

Comment forms distributed at the PIC #2 were received at the meeting and up until December 6, 2010 by fax, mail and e-mail. In addition to comment sheets, after completion of Public Meeting #2, NextEra Energy Canada received correspondence by e-mail. In particular, one letter. "Conestogo Wind Energy Centre, Public Meeting #2; Comments About the Public Meeting held at the PMD (Drayton) Arena on November 30, 2010 and was copied on the report Analysis of "Conestogo Wind Farm Draft REA September 15, 2010" Prepared December 4, 2010. Specific concerns and how these were addressed or considered are detailed below. Responses and References are included to demonstrate whether and how the comments were considered and/or addressed in the Final REA submission.

5.2.1 Concerns Raised by Direct Correspondence with NextEra Energy Canada

Table 12: Summary of Correspondence Received

Written Comments Received	Response	Reference
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is "scientific uncertainty" with regards to health risks from exposure to industrial wind turbines (IWT). This dictates that the precautionary principle should be invoked before more IWT are built 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health has stated that the scientific evidence available to date does not demonstrate a direct causal link between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects. The project has been designed to meet or exceed all the regulations prescribed by the Ministry of Environment to protect public health and safety. NextEra Energy Canada takes all concerns seriously and will have a response in place to address any concerns related to the operation of the project.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>http://www.news.ontario.ca/mohltc/en/2010/05/new-report-from-ontarios-chief-medical-officer-of-health-says-there-is-no-direct-causal-link-between.html</i> <i>Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review (http://www.canwea.ca/pdf/talkwind/Wind_Turbine_Sound_and_Health_Effects.pdf)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are very concerned about our livestock. There is no setback for livestock operations. We are very concerned because this in combination with our high groundwater table will possibly trigger higher levels of stray voltage When negative results show in our livestock operations who can we turn to? Who is responsible for that? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>It has not been the experience of NextEra Energy Resources that wind turbine operations have any negative impact on livestock.</i> <i>There is no relation between stray voltage and groundwater levels.</i> <i>NextEra Energy Canada will have a response plan in place to address any concerns related to the operation of the project. This response plan is a mandatory component of the Renewable Energy Approval</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Response Plan, Section 4, Design and Operations Report</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We were very surprised to see your project map that the electrical line going past our home from the turbines to Highway 6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>In the article I believe you are referring to, Nicole Geneau, the project director, was talking about the cables on peoples' properties that connect to the wind turbines.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>N/A</i>

Written Comments Received	Response	Reference
<p>are to be overhead. I'm sure I saw in the paper, that a representative of your company being quoted as saying the lines would be buried.</p>	<p><i>These cables will be buried underground where possible. However, the transmission line you are referring to that runs up to Highway 6 will be overhead on hydro poles. Where possible, this transmission line will be placed on the existing hydro poles rather than new ones. We are working with Hydro One to determine where we can share their existing poles</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At PIC #1, there was no opportunity for a question and answer session which the people who came to the meeting could participate in as a group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Previous experience has shown that the Open House format is a more effective way of distributing information to the public.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

5.2.2 Letter

The Conestogo Wind Energy Centre, Public Meeting #2; Comments About the Public Meeting held at the PMD (Drayton) Arena on November 30, 2010 was received on December 5, 2010 and was signed by 31 individuals. This letter contained some concerns and numerous baseless accusations which are not substantiated. Key concerns and our responses are presented below.

1. Concern – A December 6, 2010 deadline for including public comments in the Consultation Report is an unfair time limit to complete and submit comments.

Comments were requested in both Public Notices published for Public Meeting #2 and a mailing address; fax number, phone number and e-mail were provided. Participants at the public meeting were encouraged to fill out comments sheets which were collected and included in this report. Members of the public were also informed that they could provide comments directly to the MOE through the Environmental Registry once the REA application was filed.

2. Concern – Public Meeting #1 was held in Moorefield, too far away.

In Ontario Regulation 359/09, section 16(1) it is specified that the public meeting must be held in the local municipality where the project location is situated. At that time, due to the location of leased land, it was known that the project location would be entirely in the Township of Mapleton, and thus NextEra Energy Canada was required to hold the meeting in Mapleton. While the original greater "Study Area", which was established under the old EA process, does encompass North Wellington, it would be a breach of O.Reg. 359/09 to hold a meeting solely in Wellington North.

3. Concern – NextEra Energy Canada did not observe the 30 day notification for the Public Meeting #1.

The Conestogo Wind Energy Centre project was started in 2007 under the Environmental Assessment process, not the REA process. Public Meeting #1 was actually held on March 7, 2007. After the publication of O.Reg. 359/09, NextEra Energy Canada met with the Director of Approvals (MOE) where it was recommended that an additional meeting be held to "re-introduce" the project. As it was not technically Public Meeting #1, it was not bound to the 30-day advance notice.

4. Concern – The Draft Project Description report and supporting documents were not made available on September 20, 2010 as shown in the first Public Notification published.

The Draft REA documents were received by the Township of Mapleton on September 17, 2010. If they were not made immediately available for public inspection, this concern should be raised with the Township staff. The documents were also made available on the website, <http://www.CanadianWindProposals.com> from September 20, 2010.

5. Concern – Nothing changed with the project design, as required in the Technical Bulletin #5.

“As outlined in O.Reg. 359/09 the Consultation Report is to be completed AFTER Public Meeting #2. In fact, the changes suggested by Mr. Krul are being made and are detailed in Section 5.1 and the revised REA Reports.

The remaining comments are addressed in this report. It should be noted that NextEra Energy Canada brought over 30 technical specialists and general representatives to the Public Meeting #2 who answered questions openly and honestly. It is acknowledged that some people at the public meeting did not agree with the answers provided. Technical experts included: Noise, Natural Heritage, Bat, Bird, General Environmental, REA, Stray Voltage, Construction, Operations, Maintenance and Transmission line experts.

5.2.3 Report

On December 5, 2010 NextEra Energy Canada was copied on an e-mail to Doris Dumais from Brent Horner. Attached to the email was a report, *Analysis of “Conestogo Wind Farm Draft REA September 15, 2010” Prepared December 4, 2010*. This report, although lengthy, is flawed in both its approach and contents. The specific concerns with this report are:

1. Mr. Horner has requested the rejection of an application which has yet to be filed. As outlined in O.Reg. 359/09, the reports released for public review are draft reports and it is expected that these will change due to public input. Details of the changes to the draft documents are included in this report.
2. The specific complaint that Mr. Horner raises is that NextEra Energy Canada and GENIVAR failed to adequately “...describe any negative environmental effect on public health and safety.” Which he further identifies as “annoyance and sleep disturbance”. In section 3.9 (Section 3 being “Potential Environmental Effects”) under 2.1 in the Table, it was noted that Noise impacts on receptors may result in minor irritation to some residents.
3. Mr. Horner has stated that section 2.6.1.3 of the Draft Design and Operations reports that “No residential impacts are anticipated”. This is not what was written. Section 2.6.1.3 states that after mitigation measures are applied, no residential impacts are anticipated.

The remainder of the report involves Mr. Horner trying to establish his point that he feels that wind turbines cause negative health impacts. We share the opinion of Dr. Arlene King, Chief Medical Officer of Ontario that “the scientific evidence does not demonstrate any direct causal link between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects”. We agree with the conclusions of the CANWEA study “*Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review*”.

6. Consideration of Public, Municipal and Aboriginal Input

Input on the project was received from many sources including Mapleton Township and the general public. These comments were taken seriously and used to alter both the Draft Reports and the proposal to engage in the project. Consideration of individual comments is detailed in tables 6 to 11.

6.1 Alterations to the Proposal to Engage in the Project

After consultations with the public, landowners and the municipality, several changes to the project proposal were made. The public input and the resulting changes are detailed in Table 12.

Table 12: Alterations to the Proposal to Engage in the Project

Comment / Concern	Alteration to the Project
People would prefer if the overhead collection lines were buried or not routed along 16 th line	The overhead collection system has been re-routed along 14 th line and 17 th Sideroad where there are fewer houses and the houses are located further from the road.
The transformer is located too close to 16 th line. Could it be located further back?	The transformer substation has been relocated further back from 16 th line.
<p>Concern from a landowner that turbine 6 was too close to his neighbour's property</p> <p>Noise and visual impact concerns.</p> <p>Heritage Landscapes</p> <p>Concerns for bats and wildlife</p>	<p>Turbine 6 was moved further west and turbines 4 and 5 were relocated to make the move feasible. This has moved turbine 6 further from non-participating lands and will reduce sound levels and visual impacts to some residents and will lessen the impact on the Cultural Heritage Landscape #3 as identified in the <i>Initial Heritage Assessment Report: Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes Conestogo Wind Energy Centre Wellington County, Ontario</i>. Re-locating turbine 6 has also moved it further from woodlots where there are suspected to be bat maternity roosts.</p>
Why is the line going on Sideroad 18 instead of Wellington Road 12	<p>Although no alteration has been made to address this concern, NextEra Energy Canada is open to altering the route of the transmission line. Unfortunately the Natural Heritage Field studies necessary to complete this cannot be completed until May, 2011. NextEra Energy Canada is open to the possibility re-routing this line, should appropriate approvals be given.</p>
Changes Made After REA Application Submission	
Public preference that the collection cable not be overhead.	Change of overhead electrical collector system previously running along 14 th Line and Sideroad 17 to an underground electrical line on private property
Landowner preference to minimize impacts to cultivation practices.	Redesign of access roads for turbines 9 and 10
Preferred location for meteorological monitoring.	Relocation of met tower near turbine 10
Landowner preference to minimize impacts to cultivation practices.	Redesign of access roads for turbines 7 and 8
A structural assessment determined that the bridge was sufficient for a crane crossing so the crane path was eliminated.	Removal of proposed crane path and water crossing between turbines 3 and 8
To avoid impacts to mature trees in the road right of way.	Burying of segments of the 44 kV transmission line along 16 th Line and Sideroad 18

6.2 Alterations to the Required REA Reports

After consultations with the public, landowners and the municipality, several changes were also made to the draft documents released for public review. The public input and the resulting changes are detailed in Table 13.

Table 13: Alterations to the Required REA Reports

Comment / Concern	Alteration to the Reports
Concerns about stray voltage were raised during PIC #1	Section 2.2.6 in the Revised Project Description Report was added to provide more information
The Project Description Report inadequately addresses the potential annoyance effects of wind turbines.	Project Description Report, Section 3.7, the following sentence was added " <i>Some individuals may occasionally find the sound from wind turbines under certain operational conditions to be somewhat annoying</i> "
People would prefer if the overhead collection lines were buried or not routed along 16 th line	<p>The overhead collection system has been re-routed along 14th line and 17th Sideroad where there are fewer houses and the houses are located further from the road.</p> <p>This resulted in changes to the following reports:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figures 2,3 & 4, Appendix A 2. Natural Heritage Assessment, Appendix B 3. Design & Operations Report
The transformer is located too close to 16 th line. Could it be located further back?	<p>The transformer substation has been relocated further back from 16th line.</p> <p>This resulted in changes to the following reports:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figures 2,3 & 4, Appendix A 2. Natural Heritage Assessment, Appendix B 3. Design & Operations Report
<p>Concern from a landowner that turbine 6 was too close to his neighbour's property</p> <p>Noise and visual impact concerns.</p> <p>Heritage Landscapes</p> <p>Concerns for bats and wildlife</p>	<p>This resulted in changes to the following reports:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figures 2,3 & 4, Appendix A 2. Natural Heritage Assessment, Appendix B 3. Design & Operations Report. 4. Noise Assessment, Appendix F 5. Detailed Heritage Assessment Report, Appendix E
Layout changes as noted in Table 12	<p>Revisions of the following reports:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figures 2,3 & 4, and new Figure 7, Appendix A 2. Natural Heritage Assessment Addendum, Appendix B 3. Revised Project Description Report 4. Revised Design & Operations Report. 5. Revised Construction Plan Report 6. Revised Decommissioning Report 7. Revised Environmental Impact Assessment Report 8. Water Body Report Addendum, Appendix G