



---

**Table of Contents**

---

**General Public Correspondence Summary – Previous REA Process ..... 2**

**General Public Correspondence Summary – Current REA Process..... 26**

---

### General Public Correspondence Summary – Previous REA Process

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
Sent	Project Distribution List	February 1, 2010			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sent Notice of a Proposal to Engage in a Project and Notice of Public Open House.</li> </ul>	
Received	1	February 3, 2010	February 15, 2010	E-mail Voicemail response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquired if their property is a part of the proposed Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left message for correspondent to return call.</li> <li>Noted that they are not in the Project area.</li> </ul>
Received	2	February 4, 2010	February 5, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested to be kept informed with all relevant information pertaining to the proposal.</li> <li>Noted he is a property owner in the affected area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked him for his interest in the proposed Project.</li> <li>Noted that the Project Team will continue to keep him updated.</li> <li>Landowner was added to the Project's e-mail distribution list.</li> </ul>
Received	3	February 4, 2010	February 5, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated he was unable to find the Draft Project Description Report (PDR) for the Project.</li> <li>Asked if the Report will be available online.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital Power provided the link to the PDR available on the Project website.</li> </ul>
Received	4	February 7, 2010	February 23, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquired about how the Project will affect his property.</li> <li>Explained he agrees with using wind power for energy, but recognizes wind turbines are noisy and an eye sore.</li> <li>Inquired about the schedule for the Project and if he gets to "vote" on the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained the Project is in the preliminary development stages and the final turbine layout has not been determined.</li> <li>Stated that the Project layout has been developed over the course of the Project assessment and includes numerous factors such as land lease agreements, turbine and equipment selection, long term wind data for the area, topographic considerations, regulatory setback distances, results from cultural heritage, environmental and water studies, results from sound modelling for the Project, and ongoing consultations with local community members, leaseholders and landowners.</li> <li>Stated that Capital Power has met all applicable regulations regarding the proposed turbine layout.</li> <li>Extended an invitation to the Public Open House to speak and meet with the Project Team (provided Public Open House details).</li> </ul>
Received	5	February 8, 2010	June 2, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested the appropriate person to contact for information and pre-qualification applications so that his company could better prepare for upcoming tenders with Capital Power.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for interest in Project. Indicated the Project is in the preliminary planning stages. Stated request will be kept on file.</li> </ul>
Received	6	February 8, 2010	February 8, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent requested the types of turbines that were being proposed and the location.</li> <li>Noted the turbines at another wind farm were very noisy.</li> <li>Asked if more turbines would be built across from his property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team followed up with the correspondent and stated that a supplier has not been confirmed. Stated Capital Power has not produced a final turbine layout.</li> <li>Noted there is a 550m setback from resident to turbine.</li> </ul>
Received	7	February 9, 2010	Various	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated interest in obtaining wind turbine on property.</li> <li>Noted he would be unable to attending the Public Open House.</li> <li>Requested to be kept posted on the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital Power spoke to correspondent on several different occasions regarding the potential for siting a wind turbine on his property.</li> <li>Confirmed correspondent was on Project distribution list.</li> </ul>
Received	8	February 16, 2010	February 16, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent called because he thought he missed the Public Open House and asked if the layout would be displayed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informed him of the date of the Public Open House as March 9, 2010.</li> <li>Stated that the Project Team does not have the draft Project layout ready for public review at this time.</li> </ul>
Received	33	February 16, 2010	February 22, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquired if Capital Power had decided which turbine they were going to use and if Capital Power is interested in knowing more equivalent turbines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that the Project is in the preliminary planning stages.</li> <li>Stated correspondent's information would be forwarded to Capital Power's</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
N/A	9	February 18, 2010	February 18, 2010	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided details on his company.</li> <li>• Correspondent stopped by the Capital Power Goderich Office.</li> <li>• Requested details regarding the newspaper article about the upcoming Public Open House.</li> <li>• Stated he knew nothing about it and did not receive any letters.</li> <li>• He reviewed the Notice then asked why his property was now excluded from the Project area.</li> <li>• Noted he was under the impression that he would be part of the Project (as a leaseholder) and wanted to know why he is not.</li> </ul>	<p>Contract Manager.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital Power provided correspondent with a copy of newspaper Notice for the Project.</li> <li>• Stated correspondents concerns would be passed along to the Project Team.</li> <li>• In a later follow up, explained that due to the distance from the Project and the proximity to the existing K1 Wind Power Project, having turbines on correspondent's property would not be possible.</li> </ul>
Received	10	February 19, 2010	February 23, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requested to be added to the mailing list for the Project.</li> <li>• Expressed an interest to participate in the early stages of Project development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stated that the Project is in the preliminary planning stages.</li> <li>• Stated correspondent's information would be forwarded to Capital Power's Contract Manager.</li> </ul>
Received	11	February 22, 2010	February 23, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asked how he could view the specific proposed locations of the wind turbines prior to the March Public Open House.</li> <li>• Noted he could not access the PDR.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explained the Project is in preliminary development stages and the final turbine layout has not been determined.</li> <li>• Stated that he will have an opportunity to review a preliminary proposed layout when the updated Draft PDR is made available for public review.</li> </ul>
Sent	1	February 24, 2010	N/A	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In response to correspondents February 3, 2010 e-mail, informed them that their address did not appear to be located within the current proposed Project location area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Sent	12	March 1, 2010	N/A	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wrote to update correspondent on Capital Power's proposal to develop the Kingsbridge II Wind Power Project.</li> <li>• Stated Notices of the Project and upcoming Open Houses have been circulated within the community.</li> <li>• Noted the PDR has been prepared and is available for public viewing.</li> <li>• Stated Capital Power is currently conducting consultations with local residents, leaseholders, Aboriginal communities, municipal officials and other concerned stakeholders.</li> <li>• Informed correspondent that Capital Power will be hosting an Open House on March 9, 2010 at the Lucknow Community Centre (the first of two public meetings).</li> <li>• Encouraged correspondent to attend the upcoming Open House or contact the Project Team with any questions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Received	2	March 2, 2010	March 8, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided a few questions regarding the meeting/Open House at the Lucknow Community Centre on March 9, 2010.</li> <li>• Asked the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is the purpose of this meeting?</li> <li>- Will there be a presentation from the proponent and an opportunity to ask questions and have some discussion or is the idea to have displays for people to wander in and look at between 4:00 and 8:00?</li> <li>- Is local input limited to commenting on the layout or do you expect discussion on the question of whether or not the Project should proceed?</li> <li>- Will the proposed equipment be manufactured in Canada or imported?</li> <li>- Will information be provided on the ownership structure of the Proponent?</li> <li>- Will there be figures on the projected return on investment anticipated by the Proponent?</li> <li>- Will there be projections on the unit cost of power produced by this Project relative to other sources (hydro, nuclear, gas)?</li> <li>- Can you identify the extent of the subsidy required to make this a viable business proposition for investors?</li> <li>- Are there already agreements (options) in place with landowners for the use of their lands in connection with this Project?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided responses to each question.</li> <li>• Identified additional information about the Open House, including the purpose, format, and information that would be available.</li> <li>• Provided additional background information about the Project.</li> <li>• Noted that Capital Power has not finalized the turbine manufacturer or model for the proposed Project.</li> <li>• Identified where the correspondent could learn more about Capital Power.</li> <li>• Noted that Capital Power is proposing to build the Project on privately owned land in the Township of ACW and that there has been tremendous interest from local landowners in potentially hosting turbines.</li> <li>• Identified that the Project Notice was provided to local municipalities and the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) and that further discussions are being planned with municipal officials.</li> <li>• Noted that the 2006 assessment was completed by the environmental consultant based on their experience with other wind turbine sites.</li> <li>• Identified that the 2006 report has not been published on the Project website because it refers to a previous Project design and specifications.</li> <li>• The current consultants are updating the environmental and cultural heritage information.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How much per site will be offered to landowners and for what term?</li> <li>- Has the Proponent considered offering landowners a share of the revenue stream instead of a fixed rent?</li> <li>- Why does the site not extend to the shoreline of Lake Huron and how was the setback determined?</li> <li>- Will representatives from the Province and the municipality attend?</li> <li>- Who determined in the Stantec 2006 report that the Projected Environmental Effect on Aesthetics and viewscape were "Low"? What qualifications do they have?</li> <li>- Please advise how I may obtain the Stantec 2006 report.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that additional information is available on the Project website and the Project Team members will be on hand to speak with correspondent at upcoming Open House.</li> </ul>
Received	11	March 3, 2010	March 4, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked Capital Power for the reply on February 23, 2010.</li> <li>• Requested the written material being distributed, directed to his e-mail address or the address he provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that his contact information has been added to the Project distribution list.</li> <li>• Thanked him for his interest in the proposed Project.</li> </ul>
Received	2	March 8, 2010	March 8, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correspondent stated he is a property owner in the affected area of this next phase of the Project.</li> <li>• Stated he sent a list of questions to Capital Power via e-mail, and requested a reply before the meeting and heard no response.</li> <li>• Asked if EPCOR was just going through the motions with this "stakeholder consultation bit".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked the correspondent for his e-mail and questions.</li> <li>• Noted that the views of the neighbours and stakeholders are important to Capital Power.</li> <li>• The Project Team is working on his questions and should have a response to him shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	2	March 8, 2010	March 8, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correspondent stated he doesn't care for the term stakeholder as it sounds like a term invented by a consultant in order to include everyone and offend no one (prefers the term neighbour).</li> <li>• Provided personal history on growing up in Ashfield Township.</li> <li>• Discussed how things have changed since then, that many farms are large agribusiness operations, groundwater is contaminated with chemicals (can no longer drink well water), shoreline of Lake Huron is polluted with algae from fertilizers, and e-coli.</li> <li>• Stated he is trying to see turbines in positive light but is having no luck.</li> <li>• Feels as though Capital Power is demanding a huge price from those who consider the natural beauty of Ashfield.</li> <li>• Asked why should he love the Project and how important are his views really?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked correspondent for additional comments and feedback regarding the Project. Stated the Project Team is currently in the process of responding to correspondent's e-mail and will be forwarding a communication shortly.</li> </ul>
Sent	2	March 8, 2010	March 8, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital Power apologized for the late response as it took some time to develop responses by the Project team.</li> <li>• Invited the correspondent to the Public Open House.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correspondent said he would attend the Public Open House.</li> <li>• Asked if the municipality would be attending.</li> <li>• Capital Power indicated they could not confirm the municipality's attendance; however the municipality was invited to attend.</li> </ul>
Received	2	March 10, 2010	March 23, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked the Proponent for the response to his questions.</li> <li>• Noted that some answers were helpful and others were not.</li> <li>• Provided additional comments where he felt the response was missing or not particularly constructive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital Power thanked him for the additional comments and feedback regarding the proposed Project.</li> <li>• Noted that Capital Power is currently in the process of responding to his e-mail and will be forwarding a communication shortly.</li> <li>• See response letter on April 21, 2010.</li> </ul>
N/A	16	March 15, 2010	March 19, 2010	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correspondents stated that they were at the Open House, and were interested in seeing a lease for the Project.</li> <li>• Requested a follow-up phone call.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team provided them with a land lease option to review.</li> </ul>
Sent	18	March 17, 2010	N/A	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital Power enclosed requested studies regarding wind projects and property values.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Sent	9	March 23, 2010	N/A	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team explained that due to the distance from the main body of the Project and proximity to the existing Kingsbridge I turbines, the correspondent will likely not be able to get a turbine on his property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Sent	19	April 12, 2010	April 13, 2010	Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital Power left message for correspondent in the evening requesting phone call in regards to the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correspondent returned call and left a message in the evening in response to earlier phone message.</li> </ul>
Received	20	April 12, 2010	April 23,	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted his company is the leading supplier to North American Wind Projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked the correspondent for their interest in the Project.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
			2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested information relating to the Project and other wind projects.</li> <li>Attached a reference list.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advised Capital Power is in the planning stages of the Project and would be reviewing future contractor's needs if the Project is developed.</li> <li>Noted his contact information has been forwarded to Capital Powers Contract Manager for review.</li> </ul>
Sent	21	April 12, 2010	April 13, 2010	Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital Power left a message for correspondent to call back regarding Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent left a message regarding the Project.</li> <li>Noted he was returning the phone call from Capital Power on April 12, 2010 regarding a meeting for the Project.</li> </ul>
Sent	21	April 14, 2010	N/A	Phone call – no answer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phoned correspondent – no answer.</li> <li>Capital Power did not leave another message.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
N/A	19	April 14, 2010	April 14, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted interest in meeting.</li> <li>Identified his property and noted that he feels the property is hard to sell because of the wind turbines</li> <li>Noted that he knows people that are sick because of turbines.</li> <li>Correspondent feels the minimum distance for turbines is too little.</li> <li>He would like a guarantee that if there are any health problems, companies will take the responsibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital Power responded that the Project is in response to the government's request for green energy.</li> <li>Noted that Capital Power operates within a highly regulated industry and meets all applicable regulations.</li> <li>Identified that there are many health studies available that Capital Power can share with him.</li> <li>Welcomed the opportunity to speak in person and to hear his concerns.</li> </ul>
Sent	21	April 16, 2010	April 16, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team member called to follow-up with some questions the correspondent had at the Public Open House and his interest in developing his own wind farm in the K2 Project area.</li> <li>Indicated that it would be a good opportunity for the Project Manager to meet him.</li> <li>Tried to coordinate a meeting on April 20 or 21, 2010.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted that he is busy in the fields but requested a follow-up phone call on April 19, 2010.</li> </ul>
Sent	21	April 19, 2010	N/A	Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Project Team member made a follow-up phone call regarding the Project and left a message.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
N/A	21 & 22	April 21, 2010	April 21, 2010	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondents stated they had first made an application to install wind turbines on their property under the old SOP and RFP system, and still wanted to pursue that.</li> <li>Voiced concern over the noise the Kingsbridge II transformer would make at the transmission tie in point.</li> <li>Correspondents felt as though the existing Kingsbridge I Wind Operations was badly handled in construction, in both treatment of landowners and how it was constructed.</li> <li>Gave positive attitude towards the overall Kingsbridge II Project; however the correspondents want to have the option to be able to move forward with their own Project.</li> <li>Described difficulty in completing a tie in to Hydro One transmission infrastructure as they had been told that they would have to extend the power line for almost 40 km, which was too large for a project the size that they were proposing.</li> <li>Seemed interested in partnering in a wind opportunity or in considering a combined tie in.</li> <li>Expressed concern that their project would be prohibited by the proximity of the K2 Wind Project turbines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team members included the Project Manager and Land Representative from Capital Power.</li> <li>Capital Power explained how new Feed-In Tariff (FIT) process works.</li> <li>Capital Power identified the noise guidelines that the Project must comply with.</li> <li>Stated that they can make an effort to move forward on their own Project.</li> <li>Stated that Capital Power would take into consideration their project size and location, and noted that it was not mandatory for the company to do so at this point.</li> <li>Noted that Capital Power would send them any information that may be helpful to them moving forward with their own project.</li> <li>Recommended they contact REFO for assistance and advice in terms of understanding the FIT program.</li> <li>Discussed timeline and the fact that the Project was on the ECT list.</li> <li>Discussed the ECT process and noted that they would have to submit an application if they wanted to proceed with their project.</li> <li>Offered that if the correspondent could define their own project that Capital Power would be willing to investigate a mutual tie in point which would mean considerable cost savings for them.</li> </ul>
Sent	2	April 21, 2010	May 11, 2010	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that the proposed Project is still in the planning phase and some of the Project details he has requested are yet to be determined.</li> <li>Identified that the Project Team will continue to communicate with stakeholders regarding the Project.</li> <li>In response to his question, noted that heritage and archaeological resources are currently being studied as part of the project assessment under the Renewable Energy Act and the Ontario Heritage Act.</li> <li>Noted that based on the findings of the Heritage Resource Assessment a visual impact assessment may be triggered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claims that they both know the government has bet the "farm" on large scale wind power.</li> <li>States that a portion of lands in Ashfield fall within a designated settlement area and he will ensure this is made known.</li> <li>Stated that turbines will be totally out of scale with everything in this landscape and will transform surroundings into an ugly and painful reminder of misplaced values.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified that, upon completion, the studies will be submitted to the Ministry of Tourism and Culture for assessment and provided for public comment.</li> <li>Explained that he and other members of the community will have an opportunity to review the preliminary proposed layout when the Draft Project Reports are made available for public review and input, at least 60 days prior to the date of the second public open house for the proposed Project.</li> </ul>	
Received	19	June 7, 2010	June 7, 2010	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landowner provided information about his woodlot and the history of his property.</li> <li>Noted that his property has been for sale and on the market for 2 years.</li> <li>No longer interested in living/ building a home on his property due to the proximity of turbines.</li> <li>Claims his property will not sell / has a lower value due to the proximity of the turbines.</li> <li>Correspondent was under the impression that the Proponent would offer to purchase his woodlot and was disappointed that there was a misunderstanding in the purpose of the meeting.</li> <li>He noted that he felt that the turbines had made his property unsellable, and the Proponent should therefore buy it from him.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team members in attendance included the Project Manager from Capital Power and a Project Land Consultant.</li> <li>Explained that there are many leases in the area with landowners who had land that they were willing to lease for turbines and that no properties were being purchased.</li> <li>Explained that the correspondent's property could not be leased as it was wooded and the proponent cannot cut trees in woodlots for placing turbines.</li> </ul>
Received	23	June 18, 2010	June 21, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested the name of the selected EPC contractor for the Project.</li> <li>Explained that they are interested in the opportunity to advise on some of the equipment required in the Control House for the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for his interest in the Project.</li> <li>Explained that Capital Power is currently in the planning stages of the Project and will be reviewing future contractor needs if the Project is developed.</li> <li>Advised that his information has been forwarded to Capital Power's Contract Manager for review and will be kept on file.</li> </ul>
Received	24	June 21, 2010	June 21, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted he received a letter/newsletter for the Project.</li> <li>Requested to be taken off the mailing list and would like all mailing to go to his grandson.</li> <li>Provided his grandson's contact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment noted by Project Team.</li> </ul>
Received	26	July 2, 2010	July 2, 2010	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquired about leasing land for the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided contact information, but noted that Capital Power would call him if they are still interested in leasing land for the Project.</li> </ul>
Sent	26	July 6, 2010	July 6, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent is looking to buy a 30 acre piece of property and wanted to know if turbines would work.</li> <li>Correspondent was satisfied with answers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that 30 acres would be tight to build a turbine.</li> </ul>
Received	27	July 6, 2010	July 14, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted that it appears the Project was abandoned in 2008 and now it seems the Project is back on track and waiting for an environmental approval.</li> <li>Inquired about when the decision was made to re-develop the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that an application was submitted to FIT in November 2009.</li> <li>Stated that the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) process has commenced for the Project with environmental studies and consulting activities throughout 2010.</li> </ul>
Received	29	July 20, 2010	July 23, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to purchase green energy directly from the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided additional Project details.</li> <li>Explained that energy generated through the Project would be contracted directly to the Ontario Power Authority (OPA) to help meet Ontario's clean energy goals.</li> </ul>
N/A	30	August 20, 2010	N/A	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent stated that he spoke to someone at the Open House about his property.</li> <li>Correspondent may want to build a house on his property and spoke to someone about the placement of the turbines.</li> <li>Requested a follow up phone call.</li> <li>The correspondent's main concern was acquiring a building permit to complete his retirement cottage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed-up in person on August 20, 2010.</li> <li>Informed correspondent that his potential house would not be affected by the wind Project.</li> </ul>
Received	31	August 25, 2010	August 25, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent explained they are a major supplier and manufacturer of industrial lubricants with plants in the US and Canada.</li> <li>Claimed they could provide Capital Power with the most high quality lubricants and best pricing.</li> <li>Requested to be connected with someone in charge of lubricants for the K2 facility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for their e-mail.</li> <li>Explained that Capital Power is in the preliminary planning stages of the Project and would be reviewing their future contactor needs if the Project is developed.</li> <li>Explained that their information would be forwarded to Capital Power Contract Manager for review and kept on file.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
Received	170	August 30, 2010		E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claimed their products have the necessary approvals and certificates needed.</li> <li>Provided information on a renewable energy project development company and was seeking interest in wind development opportunities in Canada.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment noted by Project team.</li> </ul>
Received	32	September 7, 2010	September 10, 2010	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided details on what the company offers in the area of project cost management.</li> <li>Explained the company specializes in project controls and have been providing best practise software and services to companies operating major projects for nearly twenty years.</li> <li>Attached an overview of the company and a summary of how they bridge the gap in project cost management.</li> <li>Attached a separate overview introducing their fully configurable, flagship solution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for their e-mail.</li> <li>Explained that Capital Power is in the preliminary planning stages of the Project and would be reviewing their future contactor needs if the Project is developed.</li> <li>Explained that their information would be forwarded to the Capital Power contract manager for review and kept on file.</li> </ul>
Received	34	October 8, 2010	October 8, 2010	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent requested information on where the turbines would be located on neighbour's property.</li> <li>Requested the proponent be aware of the property line before turbines are erected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided landowner with Capital Power's Land Agent contact information. Encouraged landowner to contact Land Agent for additional Project information.</li> </ul>
Received	34	October 8, 2010	October 8, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent expressed that he is not against wind power.</li> <li>Relieved that there are a set of rules to follow when siting turbines.</li> <li>Expressed interest in employment opportunities as a result of the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital Power informed resident that his house lot has been taken into account with sound modeling.</li> <li>Informed resident his contact information would be passed along regarding contractor work.</li> </ul>
Received	35	November 1, 2010	November 2, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent requested follow up about the requirements to become a turbine participant.</li> <li>He called because he noticed that the Project Team was doing the staking for the archaeology survey work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed up with correspondent, who stated he was interested in becoming a part of the Project.</li> <li>Informed him that due to the status of the layout he could not be added.</li> </ul>
N/A	36	November 8, 2010	November 9, 2010	Meeting – local Goderich office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent asked Goderich office staff why another project has stray voltage and Capital Power's existing Kingsbridge I Wind Operations does not?</li> <li>Asked if the Capital Power land leases are dirty and if not to explain why.</li> <li>Would like to know if HV cable will pass overhead or underground of property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Office staff provided the correspondent's contact information to the correct Project Team member, who called the correspondent the following day but there was no answer. Correspondent was followed up with again on December 13, 2010.</li> </ul>
Received	21	November 8, 2010	November 8, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent called to inform Capital Power that he has major concerns regarding the Project.</li> <li>He stated he made this call based on instruction he received from the MOE (MOE) and the Ministry of Energy (MEE).</li> <li>Stated he had 8 to 10 major concerns that he wants answers to, however before he can elaborate on these concerns he is waiting for a response to an e-mail he sent to the MOE.</li> <li>Stated that Capital Power has not been in contact with him about the Project and what is happening – which is a big problem.</li> <li>Requested any correspondence that has been made between himself and Capital Power be made available upon request.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital Power asked correspondent to elaborate on his concerns.</li> <li>Reminded the correspondent of the meeting they had after the Open House in the Spring of 2010.</li> <li>Explained that Capital Power logs all correspondence and that the correspondent should do the same for his records.</li> </ul>
Received	176	November 15, 2010	November 15, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent expressed interest in getting involved with the Project construction.</li> <li>Noted that they own an excavator, bulldozer &amp; other equipment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed they would be added to the Project's Contractor List.</li> </ul>
N/A	38	November 30, 2010	December 1, 2010	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent interested in the location of turbines on his property.</li> <li>Concerned about the potential negative effects of property values and health.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Message left for correspondent as there was no answer upon follow up call.</li> </ul>
Received	49	November 30, 2010	December 1, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expressed interest in leases, status and layouts on property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spoke with correspondent who is interested in getting a turbine. Land Agent followed up with correspondents to discuss turbine siting.</li> </ul>
Received	21	December 2, 2010	December 2, 2010	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called Capital Power stating that he is still waiting to get some of his questions answered before asking Capital Power anything.</li> <li>Stated that he might start with two questions, let Capital Power answer and then ask more, since he had a few questions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Offered to meet with the correspondent or have a call when he has questions prepared.</li> <li>Noted that Capital Power would make sure he talks to the right person from the Project Team to answer his questions.</li> </ul>
Sent	36	December 13,	December	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted he is looking to educate himself on wind power in general.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed stray voltage.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
		2010	13, 2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Main concern is stray voltage issues.</li> <li>Noted he would like to see the collector system buried.</li> <li>He discussed other companies looking for land lease agreement in the area.</li> <li>Identified that he is concerned that he lives closer than 550m to other turbines, a sentiment shares with some of his neighbours.</li> <li>Requested to see the full Project layout.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed Capital Power would measure the distance of the turbines he is concerned about to ensure they are greater than 550 metres from correspondent's house.</li> </ul>
Received	17	January 28, 2011	February 1, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called with a couple questions regarding the Project and Township of ACW's new 1000m setback Bylaw Policy, as he was unable to make council meeting.</li> <li>Requested someone return his call.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updated the correspondent on the Council meeting and where the 1000m setback came from.</li> </ul>
Received	43	February 1, 2011	February 1, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interested in purchasing a property and would like to know if turbines will be going up on or around the property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that there would be a turbine approximately 1.6km from potential purchase location.</li> <li>Also explained the 40 dBA regulation when modelling turbines.</li> </ul>
Received	21	February 8, 2011	February 8, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested to meet with Capital Power to talk about some of his concerns regarding the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained someone would call the following day at the latest to arrange a meeting.</li> </ul>
Received	42	February 9, 2011	February 9, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about burying the gathering system for the Project.</li> <li>Happy to hear that Capital Power was open to discussing gathering system and that several people in the community would be more supportive of the Project if the lines were buried.</li> <li>Stated he would be starting a petition.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that Capital Power was aware of the interest in burying the lines and that the Township of ACW had a policy.</li> <li>Stated that Capital Power was open to the idea in areas where it could be buried, but needs to discuss specific location concerns with the Township of ACW.</li> </ul>
Sent	21	February 14, 2011	February 14, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called to set up a meeting date with the correspondent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that he would be available Monday, Tuesday or Friday the following week.</li> </ul>
Sent	12	February 16, 2011	February 18, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that there have been delays in the government process for evaluating projects, as well as environmental reports; therefore the Public Open House has been delayed.</li> <li>Stated that a Notice would be published in the newspaper when a date has been set.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asked if the proposed site plan for the Project was available to the public, and if not, when it would be.</li> </ul>
Sent	12	February 18, 2011	N/A	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restated the information provided in e-mail sent on February 16, 2011.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
N/A	21 & 12	February 22, 2011	February 22, 2011	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent presented a list of questions to which he requested a written response from Capital Power.</li> <li>Stated that he had no luck getting any response from the MOE despite multiple attempts.</li> <li>Explained his only concern with the Project is the chosen location for the substation which is immediately adjacent to his farm – feels the substation will devalue his property and it should be located where fewer people live.</li> <li>Expressed that regardless of Capital Power's answers to his questions, he does not believe that a substation can be designed such that his property will not be devalued or made unlivable and that he will exhaust every avenue to fight this location.</li> <li>Asked when the Project layout would be made public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project team members included the Project Manager, Land Representative and Kingsbridge Wind Operator from Capital Power.</li> <li>Project Team will provide written answers to the questions provided at the meeting.</li> </ul>
Received	21	February 22, 2011	April 19, 2011	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a list of concerns to be addressed.</li> <li>Concerns included EMF and vibration, soil erosion, earth worm populations, the substation and its parts, hazardous materials, emergency spill and clean-up protocols, drainage, disruption of light to solar panels, surveillance, reduction of property value, noise, health issues, long term effects of grounding the substation, training of emergency personnel, run off, insurance, notification, dirty power, IEEE519, growth and expansion, stray voltage, impacts to telecommunications, and sound limits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided written answers to the questions provided to the Project Team on February 22, 2011 regarding such topics as EMF, vibration impacts to earth worms, the substation, safety concerns, drainage, effects to solar panels, property values, health issues, noise, dirty power, IEEE519, stray voltage, and affects to GPS.</li> <li>Advised that the Project is still in planning stages and some information may not be available as of yet.</li> </ul>
Received	35	February 25, 2011	February 25, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested to set up a meeting with K2 Wind as he has concerns regarding K2 Wind – specifically the switchyard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital Power employee confirmed a Project Team member would respond the following week.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
Received	44	February 28, 2011	March 25, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested the setback distances required by Hydro One from the turbines to the existing 500kV lines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained the MOE Regulation 359/09 outlines the requirements for assessing turbine setback distances.</li> <li>The government's current requirements are for turbines to be a minimum setback of 500 metres from the edge of right of way to a 500 kV transmission line.</li> </ul>
Received	35	March 4, 2011	March 7, 2011	Phone call Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was unhappy and inquired about why a specific Capital Power member would not be meeting with her and her husband at their scheduled meeting to discuss the Project.</li> <li>Requested a specific attendee be at the meeting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left a message on the correspondents phone to say requested Capital Power staff member would be joining the meeting via telephone and if they preferred that he be there in person a meeting would have to be scheduled for a later date.</li> </ul>
N/A	45	March 7, 2011	March 7, 2011	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent stopped by the Capital Power Goderich Office.</li> <li>Inquired about what Capital Power's plans are.</li> <li>Mentioned he may be interested in purchasing property that is for sale and would like an update on Capital Powers plans before making any offers.</li> <li>Stated he may be interested in researching building his own wind turbines.</li> <li>Requested a status update.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spoke to the landowner at the meeting about Project plans.</li> <li>Confirmed landowner was on Project distribution list to receive ongoing Project updates.</li> </ul>
Sent	35	March 7, 2011	March 16, 2011	Voicemail Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left a message regarding who will be joining the meeting on March 15, 2011 via telephone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted she has more questions she forgot to ask.</li> <li>Asked when the Open House is scheduled for.</li> <li>Asked for someone to return her phone call.</li> </ul>
Sent	21	March 15, 2011	N/A	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked them for meeting with members of the Project Team on February 22, 2011.</li> <li>Noted that the Project Team is working to provide answers in regards to the number of questions they provided.</li> <li>Advised them to contact the Project Team with any additional comments or questions regarding the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
N/A	35 & 12	March 15, 2011	March 15, 2011	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a letter of questions dated March 15, 2011 (summarized below).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed questions around how the Project Team did the siting work for the Project, the FIT program rules, the meaning of the ECT and the process followed by the OPA.</li> <li>Discussed items leading to the May 2011 Public Open House.</li> </ul>
Received	35	March 15, 2011	May 25, 2011	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a list of questions during the meeting held that day and requested a written response to them by the third week of March.</li> <li>The questions are as follows (summarized): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How deep are the wind turbine bases and how will this affect ground water?</li> <li>How would Capital Power address turbine oil leak? Have there been any on Capital Power's existing K1 Wind Project?</li> <li>Do the turbine blades contain any anti-icing chemicals? Is it environmentally friendly? How will thrown ice be dealt with?</li> <li>Will the noise, flicker, EMF, vibrations, infra sound affect the ability for breeding stock to continue to produce as productively as they are today?</li> <li>If you cut down a tree will you replace that tree?</li> <li>How will the Project impact species and bird migration?</li> <li>Will you guarantee that the power to our property will not be affected by any of the parts of the wind Project?</li> <li>Are there any studies that show a link between shadow flickers from the turbines and reduced quality and production of vegetables, fruits and berries?</li> <li>This will be the largest wind project substation in all of Ontario – why is it sited in the middle of the largest numbers of people and homes in our community?</li> <li>How will you monitor stray voltage?</li> <li>Noted these are some, but not all their concerns.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided written answers to the questions provided to Capital Power at March 15, 2011 meeting. Capital Power endeavoured to provide as much information to answer questions and address concerns as possible, the Project Team is still currently in the planning phases of our Project and some of the information may not be available or determined at this time.</li> </ul>
Received	35	March 16, 2011	March 16, 2011	Phone call Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asked when the Open House is scheduled for.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left a message with the details of the Open House.</li> </ul>
N/A	12	March 23, 2011	March 23,	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent explained that the market is influenced so much by external factors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team commented about Capital Power doing a real estate evaluation prior</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
			2011		that while being a good idea; it would never really give Capital Power an accurate picture of the true land value.	to the wind turbines going in, to see if they leave an impact on land value. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed that even if Capital Power did the evaluation, and the value went down, it would be hard to convince landowners because of the economy.</li> </ul>
Received	21	April 13, 2011	April 14, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent was upset that his questions were not answered before the K2 Draft Site Plan Notice went into the newspaper.</li> <li>The correspondent explained that he was upset over the lack of response to his questions that he submitted at the previous meeting – he feels that his question are related directly to Capital Power's choice of switchyard site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phoned the correspondent back at 3:30 pm April 12, 2011 and had no answer, phoned him again at 9:30 am April 13, 2011 and spoke with him.</li> <li>Capital Power explained that they have been working on the site plan and overall Project for over a year.</li> <li>Capital Power explained that the release of the proposed site plan at this time is part of ongoing work toward a REA submission and there are still several months from an Open House and REA submission.</li> <li>Advised that Capital Power has not seen issues in environmental studies or consultation to date which would result in the chosen switchyard location being moved.</li> </ul>
Sent	Project Distribution List	April 13, 2011			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sent Notice of Draft Site Plan.</li> </ul>	
Sent	Project Distribution List	April 19, 2011			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sent Notice of Public Open House.</li> </ul>	
Received	47	April 13, 2011	October 18, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claimed the company is a utility-scale developer of wind and solar energy projects in North America.</li> <li>Expressed interest in jointly developing and/or acquiring projects in Ontario.</li> <li>Interested in learning more about Capital Powers projects awarded with FIT contracts.</li> <li>Inquired if Capital Power is seeking partners/financing or are interested in selling equity in projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for their inquiry.</li> <li>Stated that their information has been forwarded to Capital Power's purchasing department.</li> </ul>
Received	21	April 14, 2011	April 14, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upset over lack of response to questions submitted at the previous Project meeting.</li> <li>Feels issues raised regarding choice of switchyard site are more than sufficient to justify moving the site to an alternative location.</li> <li>Expects responses to his questions within a week.</li> <li>Requested face-to-face meeting to review responses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that Capital Power has been working on the site plan for the better part of a year, and the overall Project, including the switchyard site for much longer than that.</li> <li>Explained that the release of the proposed site plan at this time is part of Capital Power's ongoing work toward a REA submission.</li> <li>Stated Capital Power is several months away from Final Open House and REA submission, and that consultation will continue.</li> <li>Stated that Capital Power has not seen issues in their environmental studies to date, or in consultations to date, which would result in the chosen switchyard location being moved.</li> </ul>
Received	48	April 14, 2011	April 14, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called to voice support of the Project.</li> <li>Noted that after viewing the layout he realized he will have turbines all around his property.</li> <li>Stated he thinks wind energy is a good thing – mentioned the nuclear disaster in Japan and said we need to focus on safer forms of energy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called the correspondent back and thanked him for his comments.</li> </ul>
N/A	36	April 15, 2011	April 15, 2011	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent requested to see a detailed site map of the Project.</li> <li>Noted some houses are missing (red dots) on the site plan.</li> <li>Requested information regarding how Capital Power placed receptors on vacant land.</li> <li>Stated some vacant landowners will build future homes and that the red dot receptors are unreasonably placed.</li> <li>Stated he does not like the 43kV transmission line (underground or overhead) due to stray voltage concerns.</li> <li>Asked whether HONI or Capital Power will own the transmission line.</li> <li>Asked how future projects have to take into consideration the Project receptors and turbines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital Power informed correspondent that map information is on the Project website and provided the appropriate contact to answer his Project specific questions.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested turbine distance to residents.</li> <li>Stated he inherited a property with an EDP lease on it and is not impressed.</li> <li>Requested a follow-up phone call.</li> </ul>	
Received	49	April 18, 2011	April 18, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified that she was upset because Port Albert was not listed on the site plan map which was in the papers.</li> <li>Noted she could see the word Dungannon but not Port Albert.</li> <li>Indicated Port Albert is their largest community in the area and should be on map.</li> <li>Noted that she feels it is important for people to see this to help orientate themselves with the Project and where turbines are being placed.</li> <li>Indicated she could see the town with streets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified that a more detailed map is available at the public locations noted in the Notice.</li> <li>Indicated that maps have been updated to include Port Albert.</li> <li>Thanked correspondent for her feedback and correspondent noted that she did not want to be sent a detailed map.</li> </ul>
Received	2	April 18, 2011	April 29, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified that he received a copy of the Notice of Draft Site Plan and was sending an e-mail to provide comments.</li> <li>Noted it was good news that the turbines would be a distance from his family home.</li> <li>Asked Proponent to stop talking about "Community Consultation".</li> <li>He noted that the only issue that really matters is not up for discussion – should this Project be allowed to go ahead?</li> <li>Stated that sponsoring peeewee hockey teams and celebrating Earth Day does not make the proponent a good neighbour.</li> <li>Stated that moving turbines around doesn't add to democracy in action and that their only hope lies in the Provincial election.</li> <li>Noted the turbines might be somewhat more acceptable if they were evenly spaced in a row like transmission towers to provide some sense of purpose or order.</li> <li>Noted that a copy of this e-mail would be sent to the Editor at the Lucknow Sentinel as it may be of interest to others.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for his e-mail.</li> <li>Stated that the Project layout has been developed over the course of the Project assessment and includes numerous factors such as land lease agreements, turbine and equipment selection, long term wind data for the area, topographic considerations, regulatory setback distances, results from cultural heritage, environmental and water studies, results from sound modelling for the Project and ongoing consultations with local community members, leaseholders and landowners.</li> <li>Stated that Capital Power has met all applicable regulations regarding the proposed turbine layout.</li> <li>Extended invitation for Open House to speak and meet with the Project Team (provided open house details).</li> </ul>
Received	50	April 18, 2011	April 18, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent stated that she received two of the Notice of Draft Site Plans in the mail (one addressed to her old mailing address).</li> <li>She requested the address be changed on the Project mailing list.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment noted by Project team.</li> </ul>
Received	51	April 18, 2011	April 18, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wished to inform Capital Power that a property was sold and provided the new owner's name to send Project information to.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment noted by Project team.</li> </ul>
Received	46	April 19, 2011	April 29, 2011	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted the Project Team has some nerve sending the Spring 2011 Newsletter.</li> <li>Noted they are not easily brainwashed and still capable of thinking for themselves.</li> <li>Asked what good is something that only works 28% of the time.</li> <li>Noted that there is proof that turbines affect health.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided information in regards to Project mailings, wind turbine efficiency, health and the public open house.</li> <li>Extended invitation to upcoming drop-in style Open House scheduled for May 25, 2011.</li> <li>Advised them to contact the undersigned if any questions or concerns regarding the Project.</li> </ul>
Received	52	April 19, 2011	April 19, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated he received two Project Notices.</li> <li>Requested the mailing list be adjusted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment noted by Project team.</li> </ul>
Received	35	April 19, 2011	April 19, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested the status of his Project questions reply.</li> <li>Requested where he could see the K2 transmission line routing map.</li> <li>Asked if Capital Power knew anything about a 4 year turbine low frequency noise study being completed in Kitchener or Waterloo?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that Capital Power's website has a proposed draft site plan map where he could see the proposed K2 transmission line routing map.</li> <li>Advised Capital Power does not know specific details regarding the referenced study.</li> </ul>
Received	40	April 19, 2011	April 19, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted receipt of a Notice of Draft Site Plan at her address, but addressed to the landowner, not her.</li> <li>Requested a name/ mailing list change.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital Power to update Project distribution list.</li> </ul>
Received	7	April 19, 2011	April 19, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted he received a Notice of Project in the mail and would like to know if it is too late to lease his land.</li> <li>Correspondent understood the Project Team's reasoning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Returned phone call and explained that because the correspondent is close to the airport he would not be able to receive a turbine.</li> <li>Capital Power thanked him for his interest.</li> </ul>
N/A	36	April 21, 2011	April 21, 2011	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent stopped in the office to talk to a Project Team member.</li> <li>Discussed stray voltage studies completed in the States and possible long term</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team member was out of the office but another contact from Capital Power had a discussion with him.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					effects on young people causing leukemia and brain tumours.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested that he send the Project Team copies of the studies discussed.</li> <li>Provided contact information for the Project Team member he was looking for.</li> </ul>
Received	21	April 26, 2011	April 27, 2011	Multiple voicemails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called Project office looking for a Project Team member and noted he had stopped by the Project office and the door was locked.</li> <li>Noted that he was happy to receive his FedEx of replies to his questions, however, he wants the noise modeling/assessment for the existing K2 draft site plan.</li> <li>Noted disappointment that no one is returning his phone calls.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corresponded with landowner the following day.</li> </ul>
N/A	21	April 27, 2011	April 27, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted that he sent a letter based on the fact that he felt his calls were being ignored the past couple of days.</li> <li>Requested a copy of the noise report, which he understood would be available 60 days before the Final Open House.</li> <li>Asked why Capital Power asked for the coordinates of his solar panels in previous responses.</li> <li>Talked about shadow flicker and how that would affect solar panels.</li> <li>Asked if the Proponent agrees that there will be a flicker problem with his solar panels.</li> <li>Stated that he was surprised with the Proponent's response to vibration from the switchyard and stated that anything that produces a hum also vibrates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team explained that May 25, 2011 was not the Final Open House for the Project.</li> <li>Indicated the noise report would be made available for public review at least 60 days prior to the Final Public Open House for the Project.</li> <li>Explained that the correspondent brought up the location of his solar panels, but the Proponent could not discuss the solar panels without knowing the location of them (explained they could be found on micro-FIT application).</li> <li>Proponent explained he was not agreeing there would be flicker problems but could not discuss it until the location of them were known.</li> <li>Explained that there are a wide variety of vibrations and some sources, as expected for the switchyard, do not produce vibrations. Stated that just because the switchyard produces a hum, does not necessarily mean vibrations will be felt</li> </ul>
Received	49	April 27, 2011	April 28, 2011	Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left voicemail stating disappointment in the K2 map in the local paper because she was assured a week ago that Port Albert, Amberley and Kincardine would be listed on the map to better orientate people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called to follow up – no answer.</li> <li>Left message for correspondent to return call as the maps had been updated as per her request, but the Notice had already been placed for the next publication date prior to discussion regarding map.</li> </ul>
Received	21	April 27, 2011	May 3, 2011	Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent stated he is disappointed that his calls have not been returned and he wants the noise/modelling study for the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corresponded with landowner on May 3, 2011.</li> </ul>
Received	21	April 27, 2011	May 5, 2011	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested the noise modelling done by Aerocoustics for the Project.</li> <li>Stated that they have made numerous attempts to contact Capital Power by phone.</li> <li>Stated they went to the office on April 26 at 11:36 am and it was closed.</li> <li>They then phoned the number listed in the paper and have yet to receive any responses.</li> <li>Stated they also called and left messages.</li> <li>Stated that Capital Power has released the Draft Site Plan to the paper and have also notified the public of the second meeting.</li> <li>Understands that on release of these that the noise modeling should be available to the public.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow-up to April 27, 2011 telephone conversation and April 27, 2011 written communication.</li> <li>Advised the May 25, 2011 Open House is not the final Open House for the Project and provided details.</li> <li>Noted that details of the Final Public Open House and the Draft REA Reports will be communicated at least 60 days prior to Final Open House.</li> <li>Followed up on the May 3 and 4, 2011 telephone conversations regarding visual renderings around the switchyard site.</li> <li>Noted that photos will not be taken from the perspective of their property.</li> <li>Noted that the Project Team still plans on preparing the visual renderings of the switchyard and sharing the renderings with them in the near future.</li> </ul>
Received	52	April 27, 2011, May 3, 2011, May 19, 2011, January 12, 2012	January 13, 2012	Phone call Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquiring about leasing and turbines around his property.</li> <li>Requested a Project update and noted that no one has been returning his calls.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that due to the stage of the Project Capital Power is unable to site a turbine on the correspondent's property, but Capital Power would explore possible locations of a met tower.</li> </ul>
Received	35	April 27, 2011	April 28, 2011	Voicemail Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent left a message requesting that his call be returned.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phoned the correspondent who informed Capital Power that he wanted to know the status of his written questions.</li> <li>Capital Power informed the correspondent that they were close to the completion and the response would be back to him soon.</li> <li>Correspondent also mentioned the MOE engaging the University of Waterloo to conduct both Low Frequency Noise and Health Studies – would like to know whether the studies are finished.</li> <li>Capital Power explained they do not know the details of these studies, but would try to provide further information.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
Received	35	April 28, 2011	April 28, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent inquired about the status of his written questions.</li> <li>Asked about the MOE engaging the University of Waterloo to conduct both low frequency noise and health studies (has an understanding the studies will be completed by 2016).</li> <li>Inquired whether the Project will be allowed to proceed before the studies are finished.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that the Proponent is close to the completion of his questions and a response would be back to the correspondent soon.</li> <li>Stated that the details of the studies are unknown but would try to provide further information.</li> </ul>
Sent	36	April 28, 2011	April 28, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Proponent explained that Capital Power has done their best to locate the Virtual Receptors, but would be happy to get community feedback if he feels some of them should be moved to a different spot.</li> <li>Noted that there may be cases where he felt that a receptor was missing, but that this may be a case where there are other receptors closer to turbines that have been identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted his main concern was over the placement of Virtual Receptors and he would like to understand how locations are chosen.</li> <li>Would like to ensure that Capital Power is not preventing the building of a house in a location where the landowner would like to build it.</li> <li>Stated that everything he has heard, read and experienced suggests that Capital Power is one of the better wind companies when it comes to consultation and actually listens to the concerns of the community.</li> <li>Noted he will be marking up a map with questions and sending it in to the Project Team.</li> </ul>
Received	2	April 29, 2011	N/A	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that response on April 29, 2011 was entirely consistent with the meaningless consultation process.</li> <li>Stated it is obvious that the Project will proceed with no discussion about meaningful issues.</li> <li>Stated that the Proponent should be straight forward and tell the public opposed to the Project that they are wasting their time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments noted by Project Team.</li> </ul>
Sent	21	May 3, 2011	May 3, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called to ask permission to enter correspondent's property on May 5, 2011.</li> <li>Explained purpose of entering the property would be to take photographs toward the switchyard in order to render landscaping plans and improve aesthetics of the view.</li> <li>Replied that Capital Power would like the chance to draft these renderings and that the best way would be with visual simulations. Identified that the photographs can be taken from the public road but being more specific is better.</li> <li>Noted the staff that works out of the Goderich office.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent was not interested and stated his opinion that after doing his research he is unaware of any home within a km of one of these switchyards.</li> <li>Stated if the Proponent continues to plan the switchyard next to his farm, they will have to pay him to move.</li> <li>Asked if the Goderich office is closed permanently because he never sees anyone there.</li> </ul>
Received	21	May 19, 2011	May 19, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent believes that Capital Power chose the switchyard location because it was the only site with the appropriate configuration of the Hydro One 500 kV towers.</li> <li>Claims there are reports from Hydro One indicating that other locations considered were not acceptable due to the angle that the tower line intersects the property.</li> <li>Requested copies of these reports.</li> <li>If these reports do not exist he would like a letter stating that Capital Power does not have them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that Capital Power is not aware of such reports but would inquire.</li> <li>Stated that Capital Power chose the switchyard site from those available for sale, based on the preliminary engineering and that the configuration was most suitable for their needs.</li> </ul>
Received	54	May 24, 2011	June 2, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left a message regarding the Open House content.</li> <li>Noted she would not be attending the Public Open House.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left a message hoping to follow up to provide content on open house.</li> </ul>
Received	55	May 25, 2011	July 8, 2011	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advised as property owners, they have concerns about the proposed Draft Site Plan from April 2011 showing the proposed locations of potential houses on vacant properties and also existing houses.</li> <li>Advised they feel the proposed location of the potential house on their property is not ideal due to the location of existing services and due to the historical location of their family farms.</li> <li>Requested a discussion in regards to the potential location for the house.</li> <li>Noted the proposed location in the Draft Site Plan of April 2011 is not acceptable for the future options on the property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked them for their May 25, 2011 communication.</li> <li>Responded to concerns in regards to the potential house/Vacant Lot Receptor (VLSR).</li> <li>Advised proposed locations had been modified and the VLSR would be moved 114 metres east and 36 metres north from the original location on the Draft Site Plan.</li> <li>Advised VLSR is now 130 metres from the road easement.</li> </ul>
Received	56	May 26, 2011	June 1, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that he was unable to attend the information session in Lucknow.</li> <li>Requested if Capital Power would reconsider placing certain windmills near a pond.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for their communication.</li> <li>Requested the 911 number, Lots and Con. Number, road and PIN for the property</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that he believes it is one of a very few spring fed year round water sources for wildlife, especially birds in the area and windmills should be kept away.</li> <li>Requested to be added to the mailing list so he could monitor this issue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to investigate the pond in question.</li> <li>See e-mail on June 1, 2011 for further follow up.</li> </ul>
Received	12	May 27, 2011	May 27, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent called regarding a request for a map on the Project.</li> <li>She specified that she would like a large map which clearly shows setbacks with exact measurements from every turbine to every noise receptor, and exact measurements from every turbine to every virtual receptor.</li> <li>Noted that the map should clearly distinguish between the two types of receptors and all the lot numbers and roads should be clearly marked.</li> <li>Noted that the map at the Open House had all the receptors in red and she found that confusing.</li> <li>Noted she was not happy with the lack of responses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided contact information for a Project Team member to answer her questions.</li> <li>See June 2, 2011 e-mail.</li> </ul>
Received	12	May 27, 2011	May 27, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called the office looking for Capital Power contact number.</li> <li>Called Capital Power contact in the morning but she was on a conference call.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phone number was provided to the correspondent.</li> <li>Left a message with correspondent at 11:50 am.</li> <li>Indicated that Project team member had a scheduled call at 12 but to call before then if correspondent could.</li> </ul>
Received	56	June 1, 2011	July 11, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attached the Geowarehouse Report on the pond property.</li> <li>Recommended a site visit to his property by Capital Power to fully understand what is being explained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that based on the property mapping, the pond that is being referenced is not owned by a landowner who is participating in the Project and therefore the site has not been assessed.</li> <li>Explained based on the current layout, the pond would be at least 120 m from the closest proposed construction area, meeting setback requirements.</li> <li>Advised that based on Capital Power investigations, the wetland is less than 1ha, which the MNR does not generally consider to be provincially significant and the feature likely does not meet the criteria for waterfowl.</li> <li>Advised drafts of the Environmental and Cultural Heritage reports will be released for public review at least 60 days before the Final Public Open House.</li> </ul>
Received	12	June 2, 2011	June 2, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested someone return her call.</li> <li>Requested the e-mail of a Capital Power contact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital Power explained that her call had been noted and an appropriate Project team member would get back to her.</li> </ul>
N/A	12	June 2, 2011	June 2, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted she is not happy with Capital Power's response and wants to know why Capital Power cannot give her information that was required to complete the site plan.</li> <li>Quoted information from the Lucknow newspaper, the Project website and CanWEA and said that Capital Power is not doing what they said.</li> <li>Referred to the fact that Capital Power must have the information in order to produce the maps.</li> <li>Requested a list of all receptors and the nearest turbine distance.</li> <li>Asked to be called back.</li> <li>She indicated that she was frustrated with the lack of information and the process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital Power noted their concern with releasing information to the public when site plan is still being drafted.</li> <li>Noted that the Project Team has not finished compiling comments from the Open House and that the layout will likely change based on comments.</li> <li>Indicated that Capital Power wanted to ensure that the information/plans are what they wanted to move forward with.</li> <li>Indicated that all the information she was looking for would be in the noise report available for 60 day review before the Final Open House.</li> <li>Committed to sending a layout to her when it was ready.</li> <li>Noted that it may take some time to respond because of the amount of information she is requesting and number of Project Team members providing input.</li> <li>Stated that Capital Power can provide her with a large map now and that the other requested information will be sent later.</li> <li>Provided information on turbine distances from her property.</li> </ul>
Received	12	June 3, 2011	June 3, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent upset that Capital Power will not release setback data as it has to exist to produce layout.</li> <li>Felt as though questions were not answered at Open House.</li> <li>Asked how she could comment on plan without this data and when the data would be ready for public release.</li> <li>Asked about the timing of the Open House and who she could follow up with from time to time for updates.</li> <li>Requested the map be updated with the following: turbine numbers, lot &amp;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding changes to the map, the Proponent stated that these changes would be looked into.</li> <li>Explained that data would not be released at this time because it is not ready, although it does exist it is not in the form of a report.</li> <li>Explained that Capital Power is unsure about timing of the Final Open House as it depends on turnaround time with various reports to various ministries.</li> <li>Identified that the goal is to have it by the end of the year.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					concession, road names, three colours for dots differentiating participants, receptors and VLSR's.	
Received	57	June 6, 2011	June 6, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified that he is an owner of a local Bed and Breakfast in the Township of ACW and does not support turbines.</li> <li>Requested information regarding how much power a turbine uses to turn when the wind is not blowing.</li> <li>Discussed height of Capital Power's existing Kingsbridge I turbines compared with the proposed Project turbines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that the turbines do need little power supply to power a simple internal computer system which monitors wind speed, temperature, grid voltage etc.</li> <li>Stated that turbine hydraulic systems use a little amount of power to pitch the blades to catch just enough wind to spin slowly.</li> </ul>
Received	58	June 6, 2011	October 18, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested to be directed to the person in charge of the turbine procurement.</li> <li>Noted that he is looking to provide turbines and financing opportunities for the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for their e-mail.</li> <li>Stated their information would be kept on file.</li> <li>Referred correspondent to the Project website for additional Project information.</li> </ul>
Received	12	June 10, 2011	June 10, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent called stating that she requested a large map of the Project and was told it would be provided.</li> <li>Requested follow up phone call.</li> <li>Asked the status of Capital Power releasing a list of receptors and distances to the closest turbine.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed-up on June 10, 2011.</li> <li>Provided a large map for her from the Open House and included a letter stating that Capital Power is working on another map which captures requests regarding updated receptors, and it will be sent as soon as it's ready.</li> </ul>
Received	21	June 14, 2011	June 14, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three main concerns were discussed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hydro One on Switchyard Location Selection: correspondent is under the impression that he was told that Hydro One had provided comments/reports indicating that other considered locations were not suitable due to "tower configuration". He requested copies of these reports, or a letter explaining there are no such reports.</li> <li>Surface Water Drainage: correspondent requested a copy of surface water drainage plan.</li> <li>Solar Panel Locations: correspondent wants to submit coordinates of his solar panels as he wants the Proponent to ensure there will be no shadow flicker from turbines.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hydro One on Switchyard Location Selection: explained that as indicated in the past, the Proponent is unaware of such reports. Hydro One has not commented on the suitability of the chosen site.</li> <li>2. Surface Water Drainage: explained that a preliminary drainage plan would be prepared for submission to the drainage superintendent at the Township of ACW and that the correspondent could be sent it at the same time. Explained the plan would be preliminary based on best information at this time but the final design would be done in conjunction with overall site design between Capital Power and Hydro One</li> <li>3. Solar Panel Locations: the Project Team is to follow-up on his shadow flicker concerns. Please see August 31, 2011 communication for additional follow up.</li> </ul>
Received	12	June 17, 2011	June 17, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested updates on the whereabouts of a map requested on June 3, 2011.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that the map was almost ready, but some changes are needed to be made due to printing issues.</li> <li>Provided estimate of when the map would be available for her in the Project's local Goderich office.</li> </ul>
Received	61	June 29, 2011	June 29, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested that her mother's name be taken off the contact list as she had passed away and sold her property in Township of ACW.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment noted by Project team.</li> </ul>
N/A	62	June 30, 2011	June 30, 2011	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent's primary concern is in regards to routing down the Mill Line – correspondent feels that no matter how Capital Power proceeds with hydro routing it will cause damage to the trees that line that road.</li> <li>Stated that their hobby farm/zoo is located down in a flood plain and is already susceptible to flooding – they feel that if Capital Power digs into the bank to bury line that may cause even more trouble, such as extensive erosion and if it is above ground it could impact the way the farm/zoo looks.</li> <li>Stated that running the facility is a great cost to them as they currently pay for two hydro services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team member in attendance was the Lands Representative from Capital Power.</li> <li>Explained that Capital Power could more than likely come to an arrangement for tree replacement.</li> <li>Mentioned that in building the Project, Capital Power may have restrictions in how they can develop, however Capital Power are good neighbours and may be able to eliminate one of the hydro services and perhaps save them money by burying a line from the road to their home to get rid of the extra hydro meter.</li> </ul>
Received	171	June 30, 2011	August 2, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided information on his company.</li> <li>Requested to keep in touch with the Proponent to help meet wind and solar energy project goals and objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted his company's information has been forwarded to the Project Team members and the Purchasing Department.</li> <li>Asked that they contact the Project Team if they require additional information.</li> </ul>
Received	12	July 8, 2011	July 11, 2011	Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The correspondent indicated that the Project Team was working on some things for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Proponent provided follow up to telephone conversations on June 3 and July</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
				Letter	<p>her and she wants a follow-up regarding these items.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that she had a map that was saved on June 7, 2011 and was wondering if there was an updated map that she could have since she knew changes were being made to the site plan.</li> </ul>	<p>8, 2011, regarding the Project and her request for setback distances from the proposed turbine locations to nearby residences (receptors).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advised this information will be made available to the public at least 60 days prior to the Final Open House for the Project.</li> <li>Provided Draft Site Plan which differentiates between existing receptors, participants and VLSR.</li> </ul>
Received	21	July 22, 2011	August 31, 2011	E-mail Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On July 22, 2011, the Correspondents provided the co-ordinates for their existing solar panels.</li> <li>Noted they were provided as requested by the Proponent to look into the correspondents concern regarding shadow flicker reducing their capabilities to produce solar energy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See below response on August 31, 2011.</li> </ul>
Received	21	July 24, 2011	August 31, 2011	E-mail Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted the correspondents have been searching for the Environmental Assessment (EA) that should have been done for the Substation and Switchyard area for the Project.</li> <li>Requested a copy as soon as possible.</li> <li>Also requested a paper copy of the switchyard and substation layout in a large enough size to distinguish the area. Noted that it is very poor quality on the website.</li> <li>Stated their displeasure at the way the substation and switchyard were displayed at the latest Public Open House.</li> <li>Identified that showing it with mature trees was a complete misrepresentation of what the people surrounding the station will have to endure visually for the next 20 years.</li> <li>Identified that there was also no recognition of the health effects a substation poses to the public – childhood leukemia is a given from excess exposure to electromagnetic radiation (EMR) (source: Ontario Ministry of Labour).</li> <li>Stated that it is a heavily populated corner and that there are areas on the line that will affect no one – provided sites in past communications.</li> <li>Requested how drainage from the site was going to be handled and was told it would be available in July.</li> <li>Requested written descriptions and layouts (drawings) that would be applicable regarding drainage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked them for their communications dated July 22, 2011 and July 24, 2011.</li> <li>Noted that a separate EA will not be completed for the switchyard site, as it will be considered as part of the REA process, and the required environmental and cultural heritage studies will be completed as outlined in the regulation.</li> <li>Indicated that the Draft REA Reports will be made publicly available at least 60 days before the Final Open House.</li> <li>Acknowledged comments regarding the visual simulation of the switchyard location at the May 2011 Open House.</li> <li>Responded to comments made at the Open House in May regarding the visual simulation of the switchyard, advising that the Project Team will be revising the renderings.</li> <li>Provided a large print out of the draft switchyard location drawing.</li> <li>Provided details to questions in regards to storm water drainage at the switchyard site and advised a preliminary Storm Water Management Plan will be included in the Draft Design and Operations Report.</li> <li>Responded to questions concerning EMF and attached information from Health Canada regarding EMF.</li> <li>Provided distances from the closest turbine location to his current solar panels on his property.</li> <li>Advised to contact the Project team if there are any questions or concerns.</li> </ul>
Received	172	July 27, 2011	August 2, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided the Proponent with information about his internet based marketing firm.</li> <li>Requested the Proponent visit his website or call if they have questions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified that his company information has been forwarded to the Proponent's Corporate communications department.</li> </ul>
Received	77	August 1, 2011	August 2, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested to be a qualified vendor for Capital Power.</li> <li>Claimed their products are: main step up power transformers and pad mount transformers.</li> <li>Requested to be informed of how to apply and the right person in Capital Power to contact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for their interest in Capital Power's proposed Kingsbridge II Wind Power Project.</li> <li>Indicated that their information has been forwarded to Capital Power's Purchasing Department.</li> </ul>
Received	77	August 2, 2011	August 5, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asked who is in charge of purchasing debt (name and e-mail address).</li> <li>Requested a brief outline of projects with their time schedules.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided timelines for start of construction and commercial operation, if all the required approvals are obtained for the Project.</li> <li>Noted that their information has been forwarded to the Proponent's Purchasing Department.</li> </ul>
Received	78	August 30, 2011	October 11, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquired about the most appropriate person to speak with at K2 Wind regarding field operations, asset management and data capture (specifically for turnarounds, shutdowns and outages).</li> <li>Stated the company has more than 20 years of experience with major capital projects and has a proven track record of improving performance through the entire project life cycle.</li> <li>Requested a 20 to 30 minute meeting to introduce the company and learn about K2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for their interest.</li> <li>Explained that the Project is currently in the preliminary planning stages and additional Project details are available on the Project website.</li> <li>Stated that the correspondent's information has been forwarded to K2 Wind's Contract Manager for review and the request is being kept on file.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					Winds corporate objectives.	
Received	79	August 31, 2011	October 11, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested to meet with K2 Wind to introduce their company's expertise and experience in construction management of wind farms, substations, etc.</li> <li>Requested to be put in touch with the correct individual within K2 Wind that would allow for cross orientation with other project managers planning other projects in addition to the K2 Wind Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that the Project is currently in the preliminary planning stages and additional Project details are available on the Project website.</li> <li>Stated that the correspondent's information has been forwarded to K2 Wind's Contract Manager for review and the request is being kept on file.</li> </ul>
Received	62	September 6, 2011	September 7, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquired about information regarding collector line plans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team left a message in response to phone call.</li> </ul>
Received	62	September 7, 2011	September 7, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent called again.</li> <li>She mentioned that she went to the Township of ACW office with the understanding that they had Project maps and plans; however, she indicated they stated that they know very little.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided an alternate contact number for the Project Team.</li> <li>Project Team left a message in response to phone call.</li> </ul>
Sent	62	September 7, 2011	N/A	Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K2 Wind called and left a message in response to correspondent's previous phone call message.</li> <li>Indicated K2 Wind would follow-up on the following Monday.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
N/A	62	September 12, 2011	September 12, 2011	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted concern regarding surrounding trees that grow along the side of the road that borders their property.</li> <li>Concerned about noise and property value.</li> <li>Requested a map of where turbines will be located.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K2 Wind explained the Green Energy Act's Guideline and how they work in relation to placement of turbines for sound modelling.</li> </ul>
Received	80	September 14, 2011	October 11, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted he is updating his list of projects to be built in Ontario.</li> <li>Identified that they are an Ontario civil construction company that has extensive wind experience in Ontario.</li> <li>Noted that he would like to keep informed on the Project so that the company can submit a bid at the appropriate time.</li> <li>Requested a meeting to provide K2 Wind with more information on the company.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked him for the e-mail.</li> <li>Noted that the Project is currently in the preliminary planning stages.</li> <li>Provided Project website and noted that additional details are provided there.</li> <li>Identified that his information has been forwarded to K2 Wind's Contract Manager for review and the request will be kept on file.</li> </ul>
Received	12	September 20, 2011	N/A	Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left a message at 12:39 pm and requested a call in response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed up with correspondent later in day, see response below.</li> </ul>
Sent	12	September 20, 2011	September 20, 2011	Phone Call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Call made by Project Team: Followed up on a message that correspondent had left for the Project Team.</li> <li>Indicated that calling the Project's Goderich office is the best way to contact the Project Team.</li> <li>Regarding the switchyard: could not confirm the location at that time but they were looking at another site for a transformer station in addition to the substation/switchyard site.</li> <li>Indicated the updated Draft Site Plan would be released that day in the newspaper, and later on the Project website and at local review locations showing the proposed location.</li> <li>Noted that she would be mailed a large map, as requested.</li> <li>Explained that as the Project plans continue, there will be changes to the Project.</li> <li>Team representative explained that she personally did not have the technical knowledge to explain the electrical modeling but are working on the Project details as the Project progresses.</li> <li>Noted that the detailed work would continue and provided information about discussions around details and requirements with HONI.</li> <li>Stated she would bring receptor colours on the Draft Site Plan to the Project Team's attention.</li> <li>Stated that regulations are in place that must be followed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response by Correspondent: Inquired about whether there was a switchyard being proposed for Belgrave Road and Lanesville Line.</li> <li>Requested a copy of the maps showing locations of switching station/switchyard.</li> <li>Inquired about where two sites were being looked at for the switchyard.</li> <li>Concerned that it is hard to distinguish the receptors and the VLSR on the previous detailed plan.</li> <li>Stated that she did not like the fact that not one person has the answers and she is getting the same reply from everyone.</li> <li>Requested the status of the MOE study – where Dr. Arlene King was asked to do in field studies and modeling of LFN from turbine infrastructure – would like to know if K2 Wind has information on this and who she needs to speak to regarding this study.</li> <li>Stated she was upset that the company was not following this study closely.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that in order to operate the Proponent needs to comply with the government regulations regarding operations.</li> <li>Explained that K2 Wind cannot speak for the MOE or the studies they are conducting but they would be able to inquire.</li> </ul>		
Sent	Project Distribution List	September 21, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sent Notice of Draft Site Plan.</li> </ul>				
Received	177	September 22, 2011	September 22, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested information regarding the new/second transformer station near their property.</li> <li>Wanted to know if the switchyard was relocated from near a neighbouring property.</li> <li>Stated all the neighbours around that property did not sign a lease for the Project therefore they thought the area was safe.</li> <li>Stated that they planned to build their retirement home on that piece of property.</li> <li>Stated that the Project is getting out of control and there is no need for another 145 turbines in the community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informed them that it was a second small station designed to reduce the amount of lines travelling from the turbine to the main transformer station she just mentioned.</li> <li>Explained that someone who knows the details of the new collector station would follow up with them.</li> <li>K2 Wind tried calling back but received no response.</li> </ul>	
Received	7	September 22, 2011	Unknown	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interested in leasing property to the Project.</li> <li>Noted he saw the new map for the Project and would like to speak to someone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recorded the correspondent's contact information and said that a contact from K2 Wind would follow up with him.</li> <li>Project Team communicated with correspondent a number of times regarding leasing property for the Project.</li> </ul>	
Received	11	September 22, 2011	October 4, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asked why the height marking light could not be white rather than red.</li> <li>Stated that white lights are more aesthetically pleasing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that Transport Canada sets requirements for wind farm lighting and that the Project Team is investigating various strategies to reduce the local impact of wind turbine lighting while staying within the regulated safety requirements.</li> </ul>	
Received	82	September 23, 2011	October 11, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that the company is one of the leading manufacturers of wind turbines for onshore and offshore installations.</li> <li>Attached a brief introduction of the company for K2 Wind's consideration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that the Project is currently in the preliminary planning stages and additional Project details are available on the Project website.</li> <li>Stated that the correspondent's information has been forwarded to K2 Wind's Contract Manager for review and the request is being kept on file.</li> </ul>	
Received	83	September 24, 2011	October 20, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that K2 Wind did not address people who had to move from their property due to a gag order.</li> <li>Asked why a turbine was placed on Nile Road, when further west of the location there may be fewer homes.</li> <li>Asked how K2 Wind's statement regarding animals can be trusted when gag orders are placed on people having problems, so one would assume the same is happening with animals.</li> <li>Stated that there is nothing K2 Wind can say to make her feel safe from what is being forced upon her.</li> <li>Asked to reconsider placing turbine to a less populated area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that turbine placement involves the evaluation of land lease options, long-term wind data, proximity to electrical transmission lines, topography and environmental/cultural heritage features.</li> <li>Explained government requirements for turbines are a minimum setback of 550m from non-participating landowners.</li> <li>Stated there are many studies which have reached the conclusion that there does not appear to be a direct link to impact on human health.</li> <li>Stated that K2 Wind is unaware of any scientific research that has been conducted on possible impacts on farm animal health from wind turbines.</li> <li>Explained that most recent studies indicate that neither the view of the turbines nor the distance have any consistent, measurable, or statistical significant effect on home sale prices.</li> </ul>	
N/A	177, 84, 85 & 86	September 26, 2011	September 26, 2011	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondents concerned that the method used to let the public know about the Project does not take into account minor changes such as the addition of the Transformer Station.</li> <li>Noted they are not strongly opposed to the Transformer Station, they would like it to be moved.</li> <li>Requested if the Transformer Station cannot be moved that they are provided with a Detailed Site Plan showing that a berm/trees will be planted, and would like it in writing that this would be done.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team members in attendance included the Land Representative and Kingsbridge Wind Operator from Capital Power.</li> <li>Explained that K2 Wind is following procedure set out for them for public consultation, however in the future direct mailing to those most affected may be appropriate.</li> <li>Explained that K2 Wind had few options when it came to siting and sited the transformer station where it would be compliant with noise requirements and where the landowner would agree to selling their land.</li> <li>Explained that because the design is not finalised at this point in time it will be difficult to commit to specifics about the details. Comments noted by the Project Team.</li> </ul>	
Received	87	September 26,	September	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted receipt of a Project mailing and requested to be taken off the mailing list.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment noted by Project Team.</li> </ul>	

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
		2011	26, 2011			
Received	88	September 27, 2011	September 27, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent expressed that she was very upset as she can already hear turbines by her home and cannot believe how many more K2 Wind will be putting up.</li> <li>Stated that she felt the map was too small to read.</li> <li>Expressed concern with property being devalued and not being able to sleep.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determined that correspondent was frustrated over a variety of reasons and only in part had to do with Project.</li> <li>Explained that the turbines do not run all year long and that certain turbines may be noisier than others because of design differences.</li> <li>Explained that K2 Wind is committed to working with the community and that her concerns are taken seriously.</li> <li>Explained that there are stringent guidelines for wind projects in the province that currently exceed the standards in many countries.</li> </ul>
Received	12	September 29, 2011	N/A	Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requesting follow up to the previous conversation where correspondent requested a map.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information provided to correspondent on October 5, 2011.</li> </ul>
Received	12	October 1, 2011	Various	Text Message	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested a phone call.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See communication dated October 5, October 19, November 10 and November 15.</li> </ul>
Received	177, 84, 85 & 85	October 2, 2011	November 29, 2011	E-mail Post mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided an attached letter regarding the meeting on September 26, 2011.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondents for meeting with the Project Team members in September and for e-mail in October.</li> <li>Provided information about specific questions they raised regarding the proposed transformer station location at Lanesville Line and Belgrave Road.</li> <li>Noted siting conditions and that the optimal site for the proposed transformer station is the one proposed.</li> <li>Concerns addressed regarding the proposed transformer station included noise and visual impacts, property values, and community benefits.</li> <li>Advised further information is available on the Project website.</li> </ul>
Received	85	October 2, 2011	October 4, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sent an e-mail with an attached letter regarding meeting on September 26, 2011.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for her comments.</li> <li>Noted that her comments will be forwarded to the Project Development team.</li> <li>Noted that it is currently uncertain what the final Term will be made of.</li> <li>Identified that the additional trees that herself and the landowners would receive would be considered on a per landowner basis.</li> </ul>
Received	89	October 3, 2011	October 7, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that he bought a farm in January and is unsure if it is being leased for the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that if correspondent was getting a turbine someone would be in touch with him.</li> <li>Followed up stating that it does not appear they have purchased any land that has been leased for the Project.</li> </ul>
Received	90	October 3, 2011	October 20, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested taking the resources to construct the K2 Wind Project into safe, reliable, proven, continuously available, nuclear power in the site nearby.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for his communication.</li> <li>Explained that Project Team is responding to the Ontario Governments request to build additional renewable power in the province.</li> <li>Explained that K2 Wind has completed due diligence for the proposed Project which indicated the winds off of Lake Huron offer a significant wind resource in the area where the Project is being proposed.</li> </ul>
Sent	12	October 5, 2011	N/A	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for speaking to the Project Team on September 20, 2011.</li> <li>Attached a large copy of the revised Draft Site Plan.</li> <li>Indicated the Project Team will be following up with questions regarding why K2 Wind is proposing a transformer location as part of the Project and will address the request for more information regarding the MOE noise modelling study.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Received	17	October 7, 2011	October 20, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was curious if now that the election is over it is possible to add to the Project.</li> <li>Proposed Project Team puts solar panels on a roof and transmits power through the new line.</li> <li>Stated if they leased his roof, he had a solar tracking unit that might make it interesting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that in August 2011, the K2 Wind Power Project was offered a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) from the OPA.</li> <li>Explained that the current contact with the OPA does not allow K2 Wind to mix different technologies under the same PPA; however, property owners are permitted to build their own solar projects on the same lands where turbines are proposed.</li> <li>Provided additional information on solar contracts and the OPA's microFIT</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
						program.
Received	38	October 11, 2011	N/A	Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left a message requesting someone call him back.</li> <li>Noted he is a landowner in the Township of ACW.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed up with correspondent. See January and February 2012 communications.</li> </ul>
Received	19	October 12, 2011	October 20, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested follow up regarding how close the Project will be built to his property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed concerns with the correspondent who expressed that the wind farm is being built close to his property and he won't be able to sell it.</li> <li>The correspondent says that 3 people have been interested in his property but when they find out turbines are going near it they back away.</li> <li>Correspondent has no real issues with the wind farm if K2 Wind purchases his land.</li> <li>He is not upset with the company but lays the blame solely on Dalton McGuinty and the Green Energy Act.</li> <li>Stated that he feels not enough studies have been done and people will leave their homes due to health issues.</li> <li>Proponent explained that the property would receive a VLSR to keep the property viable for future development.</li> </ul>
Received	91	October 14, 2011	October 18, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested follow up regarding how close a wind turbine will be to his home.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K2 Wind followed up with a phone call – no answer.</li> <li>Correspondent did not have an answering machine.</li> </ul>
Sent	19	October 14, 2011	N/A	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phoned the correspondent – no answer.</li> <li>Did not leave a message.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Received	91	October 21, 2011	October 21, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent curious to know how far his house is from the Project is and if the Project mapping is missing any homes.</li> <li>Noted that people in the neighbourhood mentioned that the Project mapping is missing homes altogether and to make sure K2 Wind knows where his home is.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that to K2 Wind's knowledge that they have accounted for all residences in the Project area and the only minor issues they have had are with some VLSR's.</li> <li>Explained how the process worked for sighting the VLSR's and some of the minor issues encountered.</li> <li>Confirmed the location of his home and that the proposed turbine is at least 550m away.</li> </ul>
Received	12	October 17, 2011	November 10, 2011	Voicemail Letter response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two voicemails left from correspondent requesting updated site map.</li> <li>Requested the property boundaries on the map.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided large copy of Draft Site Plan outlining property line boundaries as per her request.</li> </ul>
Received	19	October 17, 2011	October 17, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent asked if someone was going to call him.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K2 Wind indicated he would hear from a member of the Project Team that day and verified his number.</li> <li>See phone call communication dated October 19, 2011.</li> </ul>
Sent	12	October 19, 2011	N/A	Response Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Team response to request for additional information in regards to the proposed transformer station and inquiry about recent MOE studies pertaining to wind farm siting.</li> <li>Provided information on why the Project Team identified the requirement for a transformer station during detailed site work and planning.</li> <li>Noted that specific questions regarding MOE studies should be directed to the Ministry for a response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Sent	19	October 19, 2011	N/A	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K2 Wind returned correspondent's call and provided a direct line, asking him to call back.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Received	19	October 20, 2011	October 20, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that K2 Wind is building the wind farm too close to his property and he will be unable to sell it – claims that three people have been interested in it but they back away when they find out the turbines are going near it.</li> <li>Solely blames Dalton McGuinty and the Green Energy Act.</li> <li>Feels as though not enough studies have been done.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that the correspondent's property would have been modeled by the Project team as having a VLSR to keep the property viable for future development.</li> </ul>
Received	19	October 27, 2011	October 27, 2011	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asking about the distance from the nearest turbine to the lot line.</li> <li>Stated that many people are leaving their homes because of wind turbines.</li> <li>Stated that no noise or health studies exist.</li> <li>He wants studies in writing to show the potential buyers that they will not experience any trouble from the wind turbines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that the south half of his property does have a good separation based on the VLSR's that have been added and they give him about 690m to 740m of distance.</li> <li>Noted that a lot of studies exist.</li> <li>Identified that Ontario has one of the greater setbacks regarding turbine siting in the world.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that the Netherlands is removing all of the onshore wind turbines.</li> <li>Stated that K2 Wind will have to buy his property because he is going to be a problem if he can't sell.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that no other country has enacted a minimum setback greater than Ontario, they are more based on a dBA rating than distance.</li> </ul>
Sent	19	November 2, 2011	N/A	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided follow up to concerns identified in October 27, 2011 discussion in regards to property values, health and setback requirements.</li> <li>Advised relevant government regulatory authorities are responsible for establishing policies and advised that the Project Team's role is to comply with regulations.</li> <li>Responded to questions in regards to purchasing homes around the proposed Project.</li> <li>Noted rationale in regards to not changing the proposed Project layout or purchasing homes near the proposed Project.</li> <li>Provided Project website for further information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Received	83	November 6, 2011	December 16, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent responded to Project Team e-mail response of October 20, 2011.</li> <li>Noted that the e-mail response did not address people who have had to move from their property.</li> <li>Mentioned gag orders and placement of turbines.</li> <li>Asked why a turbine is placed on Nile Road in the location chosen, as there are fewer homes further west.</li> <li>Noted that she is quite certain that the government who came up with the setbacks do not live in close proximity to a turbine.</li> <li>Noted she does not trust the statements on animals.</li> <li>Respectfully requested that the Project Team reconsider placing the referenced turbine and move it to a less populated area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K2 Wind indicated that they cannot speak to projects that they do not own (i.e. the gag order referred to), but can provide more information on site selection process in relation to the proposed turbine on Nile Road.</li> <li>Provided information on Project siting and layout.</li> <li>Noted that consultation is an integral part of K2 Wind's planning process and is a mandated part of any project the company undertakes.</li> <li>Provided information about future reports and consultation milestones.</li> </ul>
Sent	Project Distribution List	November 10, 2011			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sent Fall 2011 Project Update Community Newsletter with the Notice of Draft Site Plan.</li> </ul>	
Received	12	November 15, 2011	November 28, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked K2 Wind for the large map mailed to her.</li> <li>Provided follow up questions regarding recent map: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have any remaining turbines been moved from previous locations; if so, which ones, by how much and in which direction?</li> <li>What is the purpose of notating the areas within 300m?</li> <li>Why do some of the existing receptors show as green squares and others as black houses?</li> <li>What does other (+) represent?</li> </ul> </li> <li>Please clarify whether or not land is being leased on the west side of highway 21.</li> <li>Noted she looks forward to hearing from the Project Team.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated there was a delay in response due to vacations and training courses and that someone should be responding to inquiry soon.</li> <li>Requested if the correspondent chose to correspond directly to a member of the Project Team that she should send her e-mails via the Project e-mail to ensure nothing gets lost.</li> <li>Provided the Project e-mail address.</li> </ul>
Received	12	November 25, 28, 2011 December 7 and 15, 2012	December 16, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent stated that she looks forward to hearing from the Project Team.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response provided on December 16, 2011.</li> </ul>
Received	12	November 21, 2011	November 21, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that the map that was mailed to her is no longer available on the Project website.</li> <li>Requested information on why that is.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informed correspondent that Project Team is unaware of the map not being available on the website but will ask someone to look into it.</li> <li>Thanked correspondent for bringing concern to K2 Wind's attention.</li> </ul>
Received	35	December 14, 2011	January 24, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested a detailed map of the proposed turbines near his property – specifically the turbines located on a property to the south.</li> <li>Stated that he will be out of his home for the day and if he does not hear from K2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map provided to correspondent on January 24, 2012.</li> <li>See phone call follow-up on January 5, 2012.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					Wind he will try again tomorrow.	
Received	92	December 14, 2011	December 16, 2011	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested more information on the K2 Wind Power Project.</li> <li>Noted company offers an industry with proven solutions for bird and bat surveying, monitoring, and risk mitigation.</li> <li>Provided detailed information on services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that the Project is currently in the preliminary planning stages and additional Project details are available on the Project website.</li> <li>Stated that the correspondent's information has been forwarded to K2 Wind's Contract Manager for review and the request is being kept on file.</li> </ul>
Sent	12	December 16, 2011	N/A	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E-mail in response to correspondents November 15, 2011 inquiry.</li> <li>Noted that there have been some modifications to the proposed Draft Site Plan, including updates to the Project layout.</li> <li>Provided a list of turbines and their shifts since the April 2011 Draft Site Plan was released.</li> <li>Noted that under O. Reg. 359/09, K2 Wind is required to assess the environmental effects within 300 m of the Project infrastructure location. The map identified the 200 m boundary line around the Project infrastructure that the Project Team studied during the REA process.</li> <li>Provided information on the map symbols.</li> <li>Stated that K2 Wind does not have an option to lease the property that she has identified.</li> <li>Noted that K2 Wind has committed to the community that turbines will not be built on the west side of Highway 21.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Received	12	January 2, 2012	January 6, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested status of the Project.</li> <li>Asked if there was a projected date for the Final Open House.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K2 Wind will be hosting an additional Public Open House in early 2012 to provide further details pertaining to the Project; however an exact date has not been determined yet. Notices advising community members of the Public Open House will be mailed to the Project distribution list and published in local newspapers at least 60 days prior to the Open House.</li> </ul>
Received	35	January 5, 2012	January 5, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow up call to inquire about the status of the requested map.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated a member of the Project Team would be responding shortly.</li> <li>See phone call response on January 5, 2012.</li> </ul>
Received	35	January 5, 2012	January 5, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landowner requested map showing his property and the surrounding turbines with clear measurements from the closest turbine to his residence, as well as the nearest building. An aerial photo as a backdrop would work best. Also requested a scale on the map.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed Project Team would be able to provide this information to correspondent.</li> <li>See response letter on January 24, 2012.</li> </ul>
Received	12	January 6, 2012	January 9, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested if upcoming Open House will be the final Public Open House for the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated the upcoming Open House is expected to be the Final Open House for the Project prior to submission of the REA application.</li> </ul>
Sent	35	January 24, 2012	N/A	Letter Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As requested, provided a map in person at Council meeting outlining his property and distances of proposed turbines to his house and farm buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Received	12	January 26, 2012	February 9, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested number of leaseholders that would have turbines for the K2 Wind Power Project.</li> <li>Asked for the number of turbines each leaseholder would have.</li> <li>Followed up with an e-mail on February 1, 2012 indicating that she looks forward to a response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated there are approximately 90 landowners in the Township of ACW that have lease option agreements with K2 Wind. The number of turbines on each landowner's property varies from none to several. K2 Wind does not limit the freedom of landowners to discuss details of their lease or option agreements; however K2 Wind considers this information confidential.</li> </ul>
Received	21	January 26, 2012	March 7, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested all studies, past and present that have been done relating to the Piezometer/monitoring wells on the proposed substation/ switchyard site.</li> <li>Requesting the studies from both wells, the well registered with the MOE and the one that is not registered with the MOE.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that K2 Wind has not completed a hydrogeological assessment under the REA for the proposed substation/switchyard property.</li> <li>Stated the current Project does not intend to use groundwater at the site for drinking water purposes, and there is no intention to extract groundwater at a level that would require an assessment under the REA process.</li> <li>Stated a member of K2 Wind's Project Team member recently visited the substation/switchyard property to observe the drainage issues and obtain GPS coordinates of specific features.</li> <li>Stated on January 24, 2012, K2 Wind provided correspondent with hard copies of decommissioning data for the site, along with the borehole and monitoring well logs.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
Received	38	January 27, 2012	January 27, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested further information regarding the K2 Wind Power Project.</li> <li>Noted he received a letter in the mail stating some shifts in the Project have occurred.</li> <li>Requested what these changes are.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Proponent attached electronic documents for correspondent's records.</li> <li>Provided correspondent with the office number.</li> <li>Indicated that if no one returns his call by Monday, he can call again.</li> </ul>
Received	93	January 30, 2012	January 30, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left a message stating he received a letter from K2 Wind.</li> <li>He noted that the other contact name on the letter is not accurate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment noted by Project Team.</li> </ul>
Received	177	January 30, 2012	February 9, 2012	E-mail Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Received K2 Wind's "untimely" letter of January 19, 2012 regarding the change in the Site Plan which was published in September 2011. Landowners are against the siting of the transformer station on the specified corner.</li> <li>Stated there are three landowners across from the transformer site who did not lease their land for wind infrastructure, and one landowner agreed to site the transformer station. Proponents should be situating the transformer station on property that has been signed up by more people in favour of wind. Requested K2 Wind rethink the proposed siting of the transformer station as the land across the road from the site would be their choice to build a new home on, but fear K2 Wind will make this impossible.</li> <li>Letter was also provided to the Township of ACW.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the planning of the K2 Wind Power Project, Township of ACW Council and a large number of community members have consistently requested that the collector system be constructed underground in order to mitigate visual impacts. This request was formalized in the Township of ACW's Wind Turbine Development Policy adopted in December 2010. During further detailed design work, K2 Wind has determined that designing the collector system as a primarily buried system would necessitate the inclusion of an additional transformer station to aggregate approximately half of the turbines into fewer circuits of higher voltage.</li> <li>The siting for this proposed transformer station would be required to meet the following conditions: lack of sensitive environmental restrictions; near to an intersection where several collector circuits were already planned to converge; and willingness of a landowner to enter into an agreement for the site. Based on this criteria, the optimal site for this proposed transformer station is the one proposed.</li> <li>K2 Wind has engaged a landscape architect to produce visual renderings of the proposed transformer site. These renderings will provide a visual representation of the proposed site at three different stages – upon construction completion, sixth year in operation and eleventh year in operation. Once the renderings have been completed, K2 Wind would be happy to share them and receive any feedback.</li> <li>Attached both the previous letter from landowner, sent in fall 2011 and the Project Team's response, dated November 29, 2011.</li> </ul>
Received	38	January 31, 2012	January 31, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called again and noted that no one has returned his call.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated that a Project Team member would follow up with him shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	38	February 1, 2012	February 1, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that his parents are deceased and would like to know why they are still on the title.</li> <li>Requested information on what has moved near his lands.</li> <li>Stated that the Ontario Federation of Agriculture (OFA) is against wind turbines and mentioned a family in Shelburne that can't sell their house because real estate values have dropped due to the wind farms.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that K2 Wind will look into the Project distribution list for him.</li> <li>Explained that K2 Wind is not delaying on his request and is moving as quickly as possible to fill his request and provide him with the requested information.</li> </ul>
Received	12	February 12, 2012	February 16, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent appreciates that K2 Wind cannot disclose lease information. Would just like to know how many leaseholders would have turbines and how many turbines each of the leaseholders would have.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As mentioned in previous correspondence, there are approximately 90 landowners in the Township of ACW that have lease option agreements with K2 Wind. The proposed K2 Wind Power Project would include up to 142 wind turbines and other Project infrastructure located on some of these lands, and there are also some of these lands with lease option agreements which could not be included in the Project for a wide variety of reasons.</li> <li>K2 Wind considers the lease option agreements to be confidential and we therefore cannot disclose specific details, including any information regarding the Project infrastructure of each leaseholder.</li> </ul>
Sent	38	February 17, 2012	February 17, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed up with the correspondent whom provided more questions regarding registry, modifying the map and mailing it to him.</li> <li>K2 Wind is moving forward to address his concerns.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted that he owns two farms.</li> <li>Requested measurements from the surrounding turbines to his lot lines.</li> <li>Noted concern regarding decreased property values.</li> </ul>
Received	21	March 9, 2012	May 7, 2012	E-mail Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated the amount of water that has been eliminated from the substation/switchyard property is not from a couple tile blowouts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked them for their E-mail of March 9, 2012.</li> <li>Provided details on decommissioning information for the well previously provided</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated the farm has not stopped running over almost a year and even at the height of last summer the outlet was running a significant amount of water.</li> <li>Stated that the Proponent only sent a portion of the decommissioning report and is short important pages.</li> <li>Requested K2 Wind send the full decommissioning report to himself, MOE and the Ministry of Energy.</li> <li>Hopes the missing pages were an oversight and not a way to mislead the REA approval process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to them on January 24, 2012 and March 7, 2012.</li> <li>Provided decommissioning data for the well and borehole, and also the borehole and monitoring well logs.</li> <li>Outlined AMEC's site visit to further investigate the well closure and locations and concluded no evidence of seepage, ponded water or wet soils within the general area of the boreholes and their associated monitoring wells.</li> <li>Advised the substation/switchyard property had been included in REA assessments and the required environmental and cultural heritage reports were complete and will be made available to the public at least 60 days prior to the final Open House for the Project.</li> </ul>
Received	94	March 10, 2012	May 16, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asked if there have been any hydrology tests done for ground water in the proposed area or anywhere near the correspondent's property , if so, requested the address and name of the company that conducted the tests.</li> <li>Noted concern about tingle voltage or any type of power that may escape into the ground water because of the transmission lines that will run along their property.</li> <li>Asked how K2Wind will guarantee that aquifers will not be changed with the number of holes that will be dug for tower bases.</li> <li>Also noted concern with high level of groundwater where the transformer station is located on another property</li> <li>Asked if there is any possibility of ground water pollution from a liquid or gas that may be emitted from the station or construction of the station.</li> <li>Stated opposition to the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attached a letter in response to the e-mail from the correspondent.</li> <li>Noted information about the depth of the proposed turbine foundations.</li> <li>Identified that monitoring wells were installed as part of the geotechnical work at the proposed substation property.</li> <li>Regarding correspondent's concern, noted that power cannot escape from cables.</li> <li>Provided more information about underground cables.</li> <li>Noted that K2 Wind has been in regular contact with MVCA regarding the Project and seeking their comments and input with regards to the plans and any concerns they may have with the proposed Project layout.</li> <li>Provided information about the transformers and insulating oil within the main transformer.</li> <li>Identified that a full site drainage and water management plan is being prepared.</li> </ul>
Sent	Multiple contacts	March 19, 2012			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided Project update.</li> <li>Noted that the Project Team is moving forward with the planning and development phases to build and operate the K2 Wind Project.</li> <li>The Project Team is working to complete the requirements of the Renewable Energy Approvals process.</li> <li>Provided the Spring 2012 Edition of the K2 Wind Community Newsletter.</li> </ul>	
Received	95	March 21, 2012	March 23, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does K2 Wind do tours on weekends?</li> <li>What days during the week are tours available?</li> <li>Does K2 Wind require a certain number of people before doing a tour?</li> <li>Will the tour include going into the turbine?</li> <li>Are the tours for individuals or groups?</li> <li>Does K2 Wind provide transportation/bussing to the tour site?</li> <li>Who will be coordinating tours?</li> </ul> </li> <li>Ad stated "tours will provide ACW residents with an opportunity to see and experience a wind turbine close-up" – does this mean tours are available for ACW residents only?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concluded that correspondent was interested in his motel guests having the opportunity to tour the site.</li> <li>Proponent explained that they could work with the correspondent on a case-by-case basis and would need advance notice to set up tours.</li> <li>Offered to send correspondent a dozen copies of the K2 Wind newsletter for guests.</li> </ul>
Received	28	April 16, 2012	April 24, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team received permission from the landowner to access the property of the Heronry.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the landowner for providing the Project Team permission to access his woodland.</li> <li>Provided a summary of methods used to survey and the results.</li> <li>Identified that the field surveys confirmed the heronry supported fewer than five nests (this is the amount required to be considered significant). As such it is not considered significant wildlife habitat and no further studies will be conducted.</li> </ul>
Received	12	April 26, 2012	April 30, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that she "heard through the grapevine" that there is an updated map for the Project.</li> <li>Requested a copy if there is one.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for their inquiry.</li> <li>Explained that someone will be responding to her e-mail shortly.</li> <li>See e-mail correspondence immediately below.</li> </ul>
Received	12	April 30, 2012, May 7, 2012, May 14, 2012, May 21, 2012,	June 6, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Looking forward to hearing a response for her previous inquiry sent April 26, 2012.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for her inquiry.</li> <li>Explained that after K2 Wind took over the development of the Project in 2011, a decision was made to change to Siemens wind turbine technology and change the</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
		May 29, 2012				<p>Project layout.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained to ensure that the reconfigured Project meets all new provincial regulatory and consultation requirements, K2 Wind is restarting the MOE REA process and is therefore issuing a new Notice of Proposal to Engage in a REA project, Notice of Draft Site Plan and Notice of an upcoming Public Meeting.</li> <li>Provided details on the Public Meeting that K2 Wind will be hosting.</li> <li>Stated that the Draft Site Plan Map, Notice of Draft Site Plan and Notice of Public Meeting are available for public review.</li> </ul>
Sent	38	May 1, 2012	May 1, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for speaking with K2 Wind regarding the Project.</li> <li>As requested, enclosed map showing locations and distances of nearest proposed turbines in proximity to his residence.</li> <li>Advised as per REA regulation, communication with landowners on title with the Land Registry Office is required.</li> <li>Provided details in regards to property values, referencing available studies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Received	21	May 7, 2012	May 7, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested exact diagram of the connection of the transformer station and switchyard to the Hydro One 500kV line.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that the detailed drawings of the proposed substation and transformer station will be provided for public review as a part of the Draft REA Reports at least 60 days before the Final Public Open House.</li> <li>Stated notices of the Open House and the locations of where the Draft REA Reports will be made available will be mailed to the community member, and will appear in local newspapers and on the Project website.</li> </ul>

## General Public Correspondence Summary – Current REA Process

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
Sent	Project Distribution List	June 5, 2012	• Sent Notice of a Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project, Notice of Draft Site Plan and Notice of Public Meeting.			
Received	12	June 6, 2012	June 11, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquired if K2 Wind is starting over with the Project.</li> <li>Inquired what regulatory requirements the Proponent was referring to in the e-mail chain.</li> <li>Asked what date the previous Draft Site Plan will expire on.</li> <li>Requested a large map for the new Draft Site Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for her inquiry.</li> <li>Stated that someone will be responding to her e-mail shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	96	June 8, 2012	June 13, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent asked why it is necessary to download the detailed maps on the Project website in order to find the key for which detail map applies to a particular area.</li> <li>Noted the key should be available separately or at least on the Figure 1: Draft Site Plan Overview map.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a link to an overall Project map.</li> <li>Noted where information can be found on the Project website and that hardcopy maps are available at the Township of ACW office, the County of Huron Administration office and the County of Huron Public Library – Goderich Branch.</li> </ul>
Received	96	June 8, 2012	June 13, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quoted: "We're listening. You asked us not to impede the views of the lake. We are locating all turbines east of Highway 21 to ensure an obstructed westward view of the lake".</li> <li>Correspondent responded with: "umm...wonderful and considerate...for the estimated 5-10% of residents who live west of 21! What about the other 90% east of 21?"</li> <li>"I'm asking: Do not impede my views of the lake. I live east of 21. Please let me know what you propose. Will you listen?"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for their inquiry.</li> <li>Explained that the Project Team has been consulting with the ACW community for a number of years regarding wind development in the area.</li> <li>Explained some neighbours asked very early in planning that K2 Wind plan a project east of Highway 21 – some people expressed an interest that K2 Wind make efforts to minimize the visual impact of equipment and infrastructure associated with the wind farm.</li> <li>Explained as a result of the above point the Proponent is committed to planning the Project to keep it east of Hwy 21.</li> <li>The Project plans also include burying the collector lines used to collect and distribute the energy from the Project, where possible, to reduce visual obstructions.</li> <li>Stated as part of the Project planning, the MOE Regulation 359/09 outlines requirements for assessing setback distances from residences, roads and property lines.</li> <li>Stated a copy of the Draft Site Plan for the Project is available on the Project website and at municipal offices.</li> </ul>
Received	44	June 11, 2012	June 14, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that it is his understanding that wind companies must supply HONI a map showing all turbines s within 1km of their 500 kV corridors.</li> <li>Explained that he studied the Project info and cannot find such a map.</li> <li>Requested the map.</li> <li>Stated that he also understands that the HONI policy states that there can be no turbines built within 500 m of the same corridor.</li> <li>Asked if there are any turbines within 500m of the 500 kV right-of-way.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for his e-mail.</li> <li>Explained that the MOE Regulation 359/09 outlines the requirements for assessing turbine setback distances and within the regulation there are no setbacks from Hydro One infrastructure right of ways.</li> <li>Explained that K2 Wind has consulted with Hydro One regarding their infrastructure and Hydro One has requested a 500m setback.</li> <li>K2 Wind has taken this into consideration and located all turbines in excess of 500 m from Hydro One Right-of-Way.</li> <li>Stated that a Draft Site Plan Report, which includes an overall Project Location map, is available on the Project website.</li> </ul>
Received	62	June 12, 2012	September 26, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested information regarding what side of the road transmission lines would be dug on Hawkins Road and Rivermill Line.</li> <li>Requested information on how far off the road and how deep the transmission lines would be dug.</li> <li>Inquired if he trees would be affected and what will be done if they are.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for her e-mail.</li> <li>Explained the preliminary plan for the Project is to install the collector lines on the north side of Hawkins Road and east side of Rivermill Line.</li> <li>Stated all cables would be buried according to current electrical code requirements.</li> <li>Explained cables would be laid in trenches approximately 0.5 m wide by 1.0 m deep and would be installed in the municipal road allowance.</li> <li>Explained that the intent is to avoid tree removal however it may be necessary and the preferred option is to replace trees at a suitable location on landowner's property.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
Received	44	July 2, 2012	September 24, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated he could not find the information he requested – requested to be sent a map showing the exact distances of all turbines within 1km of the HONI 500 kV Right-of-Way.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for their e-mail.</li> <li>Explained that the MOE Regulation 359/09 outlines the requirements for assessing turbine setback distances and within the regulation there are no setbacks from Hydro One infrastructure Right-of-Ways.</li> <li>Explained that K2 Wind has consulted with Hydro One regarding their infrastructure and Hydro One has requested a 500 m setback.</li> <li>K2 Wind has taken this into consideration and located all turbines in excess of 500 m from Hydro One Right-of-Way.</li> <li>Stated that a Draft Site Plan Report, which includes an overall Project Location map is available on the Project website</li> </ul>
Received	97	July 3, 2012	July 3, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated she is unable to attend the upcoming Public Open House and would like to see a map of the proposed turbines (specifically the ones located between Hwy 21 and Lake Huron).</li> <li>Stated she is not concerned about the turbines on the east side of 21, as she does not mind the look of them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed that a Project map would be provided to her. See July 11 correspondence.</li> </ul>
Received	97	July 3, 2012	July 11, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested a map of all proposed wind turbines between Hwy 21 and the water – also any proposed turbines in the water.</li> <li>Noted they have a cottage in Port Albert.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided link to map of Project infrastructure. Confirmed that K2 Wind is not proposing turbines between Highway 21 and Lake Huron.</li> </ul>
Sent	177	July 9, 2012	July 9, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated that K2 Wind engaged a landscape architect to develop 3D visualizations of the transformer station and that Capital Power wanted to share the renderings with them and their neighbours to receive feedback.</li> <li>Requested a meeting on July 12, 2012.</li> <li>Noted that the renderings would be available at the Open House and offered to drop a few copies off at their house.</li> <li>Noted that the Project Team would be happy to discuss the renderings at the open house to get feedback or could set up a meeting with the neighbor group after the Open House and once they have had time to review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent indicated that it was a very busy time.</li> <li>Noted that they would share the renderings with the neighbours that previously attended the meeting with K2 Wind Project team back in September 2011.</li> <li>Correspondent thought this was a good idea.</li> </ul>
Sent	177	July 11, 2012	N/A	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided draft visual simulations of the proposed transformer station for the Project.</li> <li>Included additional copies to share with neighbours.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Sent	99	August 1, 2012	August 1, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left a message for the correspondent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set up appointment to meet on August 13, 2012 to discuss Project.</li> </ul>
Received	100	August 6, 2012	August 6, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that they received an empty envelope from K2 Wind.</li> <li>Requested to be sent whatever was originally intended.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment noted by Project Team. Notice of Public Meeting re-sent to correspondent.</li> </ul>
Sent	Qualifying Landowners who own a Residence within 1km of Project Infrastructure	August 8, 2012			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Writing to introduce the Community Renewable Energy Benefit for Project neighbours.</li> <li>Noted that K2 Wind will be providing an annual payment of \$1,500 to qualifying landowners through the Community Renewable Energy Benefit.</li> <li>Advised the Benefit will be offered to landowners who own homes within one kilometer of a Project turbine, the substation or the transformer station and are not already participating in the Project through land lease option agreements.</li> <li>Noted further information will be sent confirming land location and mailing address in the next few months.</li> </ul>	
Received	21	August 8, 2012	August 9, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent explained that K2 Wind was sent a registered letter stating that the day the noise modeling was available to the public the correspondent requested it be sent directly to their home.</li> <li>Stated that there were notices in the weeks paper regarding noise modeling and they have yet to receive documentation.</li> <li>Requested a full set of documentation for the K2 Wind Power Project along with the modeling request.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained under O. Reg. 359/09, drafts of the REA Reports are required as part of the REA application for the Project and are to be made available for public review and comment for a period of at least 60-days prior to the Final Public Meeting.</li> <li>Explained as noted in the Notice, published in the local paper, the Draft REA Reports will be made available on the Project websites and at the locations indicated on the notice August 17, 2012.</li> <li>The noise assessment will be included in the Draft REA Reports.</li> <li>Stated that K2 Wind will forward an electronic copy of the Reports to the correspondent the following week when the Reports are distributed to the public review locations.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
Received	101	August 13, 2012	November 2, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent received a letter stating that he is entitled to \$1,500/year from K2 Wind.</li> <li>Stated that K2 Wind is trying to make it look good to the public and like they are thinking about the community.</li> <li>Expressed concerns regarding stray voltage affecting his cattle once the turbines are up and running.</li> <li>Expressed that he has heard of stray voltage becoming an issue in other wind farms.</li> <li>Concerned about how to get ahold of Capital Power when they keep changing names.</li> <li>Stated that he cannot talk to any landowners to get more information due to all of the gag orders that are in place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent expressed concern about big companies taking advantage of the little guy.</li> <li>Correspondent has called HONI to get stray voltage testing completed on his farm, but has not been able to speak with anyone. K2 Wind offered to find the appropriate contact to speak with.</li> <li>Correspondent acknowledged there may be no stray voltage problems even if Project is built.</li> <li>Asked what would happen if there were problems. K2 Wind confirmed he should call HONI and K2 Wind to report any issues. K2 Wind stated the Project Team is not anticipating any problems because the issue was considered during the planning of the Project.</li> </ul>
N/A	99	August 13, 2012	August 13, 2012	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent expressed concern on the location used for a VLSR on his property.</li> <li>Concerned about the noise coming from the nearest turbine to his proposed home – felt that a constant noise level of 40 dBA was not the average noise or consistent with a quiet country night.</li> <li>Inquired about how much noise the substation would make and how it would affect him – noted the substation is very close to homes and would like to know how K2 Wind would be addressing it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team member in attendance was the Land Representative for K2 Wind.</li> <li>Pointed out that the Township of ACW currently enforces a 450 m setback when building near a turbine.</li> <li>Explained that many of the normal operating appliances in a home generate the same noise level and in some cases more.</li> <li>Assured the correspondent that there would be answers for his questions and thanked him for his patience.</li> </ul>
Sent	99	August 14, 2012	August 29, 2012	Voicemail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left a message for correspondent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Sent	Project Distribution List	August 16, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sent Notice of Public Meeting.</li> </ul>			
Received	102	August 16, 2012	August 16, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expressed that he was pleased to receive the letter regarding the Benefit payments he will receive and felt it is a good step for K2 Wind to take in the community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked landowner for his comment.</li> </ul>
Received	103	August 19, 2012	September 26, 2012	Question Form E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested rates expected to receive now that Ontario has announced lower FIT rates.</li> <li>Requested details of municipal, county and education taxes to be paid, and how the number was determined.</li> <li>Requested capacity factor expected for the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for their questions.</li> <li>Stated K2 Wind anticipates the K2 Wind Power Project will have an average capacity factor of over 40%.</li> <li>Explained the Project received a Power Purchase Agreement from the OPA and the contact price has stayed the same at \$.135 kWh.</li> <li>Provided calculation for the estimated taxes the Project will generate – noted that they are only estimates.</li> </ul>
Sent	21	August 20, 2012	N/A	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per the August 9, 2012 e-mail communication, enclosed an electronic copy of the draft REA Reports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Received	12	August 20, 2012	August 30, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquired about the Green Energy and Economy Act about whether or not the REA Branch of the MOE considers/ takes into account independent submissions made by ratepayers, residents and/or municipal councils of a "host" community for a wind project when deciding whether or not to approve a Project application.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for their e-mail.</li> <li>Explained that as a part of the REA application made to the MOE, comments and questions received regarding K2 Wind will be submitted as part of the Consultation Report for the Project.</li> <li>The MOE reviews all comments it receives with the application.</li> <li>Directed the correspondent to contact the MOE regarding the approval process and granting of REA approvals.</li> </ul>
Received	104	August 20, 2012	August 20, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested a map showing turbine possibility on his property.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spoke with the correspondent's wife who expressed that they had a hard time making out the turbine locations on the map sent to them in the mail.</li> <li>The correspondent did not think they had a turbine on their land because K2 Wind never approached them and expressed some interest in getting one.</li> <li>The proponent explained that K2 Wind has already begun the process to move the Project forward and the correspondent's property could not be</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
						added at this time.
Received	81	August 27, 2012	September 25, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that the planned substation is very close to an intermittent water source.</li> <li>Asked if there has been a water study done for this property to determine where the aquifers are, how deep they are and other impacts to the environment.</li> <li>Stated that O. Reg. 359/09 recommends minimum setback of 120m from any nearby water body – asks why make these rules if an exception can be made.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for their e-mail.</li> <li>Stated Draft REA Reports have been made available on the Project website and provide detailed information on how the Project will be build, designed, operated and decommissioned.</li> <li>Explained the 120m setback represents an area of investigation.</li> <li>Explained that if a Project component falls within 120 m of a REA Regulation, a study must be completed by a qualified person to understand possible effects and mitigation techniques to protect the water body.</li> <li>Explained that the requirement for a groundwater assessment stems from the need for a permit to take water during construction.</li> <li>Advised that K2 Wind has recently conducted a hydrogeological study for the Project and based on the assessment of groundwater – they do not anticipate impact on groundwater supply or quality.</li> <li>Advised the Report would be made available prior to the Final Public Open House on October 18, 2012.</li> </ul>
N/A	60	August 30, 2012	August 30, 2012	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent came into the office to discuss the “bribe” K2 Wind was offering – he wanted to know what he needed to do.</li> <li>Expressed that he should receive more than one payment as there are three turbines within a km of his home.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>K2 Wind informed the correspondent that there was nothing he needed to do at this time but if he wished to decline the benefit he should let the Project Team know in writing.</li> </ul>
Received	105	August 30, 2012	August 30, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated the whole purpose of harnessing wind energy is to produce electricity and to support engineering involved in designing and manufacturing wind-availing technologies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the correspondent for his e-mail.</li> <li>Directed him to the Project website to find additional Project information.</li> </ul>
Received	106	September 7, 2012	September 21, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called to ask if the EA of his property has been completed.</li> <li>Requested a copy of the EA if one had been completed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See phone call response on September 21, 2012.</li> </ul>
Sent	Project Distribution List	September 11, 2012			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sent Notice of a Question and Answer Session.</li> </ul>	
Sent	107	September 11, 2012	N/A	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided information regarding property values and wind farms.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Received	108	September 11, 2012	September 13, 2012	Phone call Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent requested the public documents including the ESR for the K2 Wind Project.</li> <li>Requested a phone call to let him know when he can expect to receive them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per his September 11, 2012 request, enclosed an electronic copy of the Draft REA Reports.</li> </ul>
Received	108	September 11, 2012	September 19, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent was writing in regards to the Environmental Screening Report for the K2 Wind Power Project.</li> <li>Stated that they do not believe the Project should go ahead until all problems they claim are associated with Kingsbridge I are addressed. The letter outlines issues related to Kingsbridge I, which include issues with their cattle previous livestock operation and adverse health effects on family members.</li> <li>Provided copies of three letters (dated December 22, 2006, January 9, 2007, and February 1, 2007) explaining the history of their situation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted K2 Wind is in receipt of their letter dated September 11, 2012.</li> <li>Advised all comments and question received regarding K2 Wind will be included in the REA application and submitted to the MOE.</li> </ul>
Received	173	September 14, 2012	October 23, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interested in contractor opportunities as a result of the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked them for their letter and interest in contracting opportunities.</li> <li>Noted that the company information has been forwards to the Project’s Contract Manager for review and the request will be kept on file.</li> </ul>
Sent	E-mail Distribution List	September 20, 2012			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided the K2 Wind Community Update Newsletter – Fall 2012 and noted that it is also posted on the Project website.</li> </ul>	
N/A	165	September 20, 2012	September 24, 2012	Meeting Phone call Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent brought in a list outlining various reports he would like to obtain copies of.</li> <li>Requested a phone call from K2 Wind the following day.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team called the correspondent at 4:45pm and left a message indicating the CD of Reports had been mailed to him.</li> <li>Indicated he should call the Project’s Goderich office if he has any further questions.</li> <li>Provided an electronic copy of the Draft REA reports as requested.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
Received	2	September 20, 2012	N/A	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In response to the Community Update Newsletter – Fall 2012.</li> <li>Expressed he feels that this is all propaganda and requested not to be sent anything else.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent taken off Project mailing list as requested.</li> </ul>
Received	106	September 21, 2012	September 21, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent indicated that he was contacted by someone from the Project Team to ask for permission to go on his property for studies.</li> <li>Noted that he is interested in the results of this field work.</li> <li>Identified that he is not against wind power and is a supporter but wants to know what was studied and what the results were.</li> <li>Indicated he was familiar with the REA process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated that the Draft Reports are available on the Project website.</li> <li>Explained that the Project Team is completing an REA, not an EA.</li> </ul>
Received	109	September 21, 2012	N/A	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responding to letter she received August 8, 2012 regarding Community Renewable Energy Benefit Fund.</li> <li>Confirmed qualifying address.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response required. Initial letter to landowners stated Project Team would confirm addresses closer to Project operations.</li> </ul>
Received	110	September 24, 2012	October 24 and November 5, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called regarding information she read about Community Renewable Energy Benefit Fund payments in a newsletter.</li> <li>Requested someone call her to explain.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left message on October 24, 2012 and on November 5, 2012. Provided Goderich office contact information and requested correspondent call when they have time.</li> </ul>
Sent	60	September 24, 2012	October 3, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left a message at 3:00 pm indicating that K2 Wind was following up with the correspondent's visit to the Goderich office.</li> <li>Requested the correspondent call K2 Wind back.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent called back at 9:40am.</li> <li>Expressed that he should receive more than one Community Renewable Energy Benefit payment since he owns two properties with two residences.</li> <li>Project Team requested addresses and advised they would check before confirming anything.</li> </ul>
Received	177	September 25, 2012	November 1, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asked about K2 Wind's landscaping plan at the substation.</li> <li>Requested K2 Wind installs a berm behind the plantings of the substations to hide more of the buildings, wires, poles and to reduce any noise.</li> <li>Requested the size of the trees be much larger to decrease the visual impact.</li> <li>Expressed there should be at least 2 more "clumps" or groupings of trees on the side road side.</li> <li>Requested reply in writing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for their comments regarding the proposed landscaping plans for the Project's Transformer property. Based on the comments provided, the Project Team is working through a few different options to see if the property can be further screened.</li> <li>Stated the desire to meet with correspondents to discuss further options and receive comments. Proposed two meeting dates for mid-November.</li> </ul>
Received	53	September 26, 2012	November 2, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that they would love a turbine in their backyard as they see nothing wrong with them.</li> <li>Noted there is a turbine less than 1000 feet from the road and it cannot be heard.</li> <li>Feels as though if the turbines were not built tough and anchored well mishaps would have already happened.</li> <li>Advised their questions regarding stray voltage and property values were answered in the Project's flyer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondents for the letter of support regarding the proposed Project.</li> <li>Noted that the Project Team knows the importance of building and maintaining relationships with the community at all stages of Project development.</li> <li>Provided the K2 Wind Fall 2012 newsletter and noted that more information about the Project is available on the Project website.</li> </ul>
Received	103	October 1, 2012	October 31, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked the proponent for the answers to his questions.</li> <li>Requested details on how the Project Team calculated the value per acre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The value per acre of \$26,000 is based on the fact that land for wind turbines is classed industrial and valued accordingly. While agricultural land is selling for approximately \$10,000 per acre, sources indicate that land classed as industrial is assessed at a substantially higher value, approximately the value indicated. As mentioned, the numbers provided are estimates only. The Municipal Property Assessment Corporation will determine the final property assessments and rates.</li> </ul>
Received	62	October 1, 2012	November 1, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated she will be living less than 1km from the turbines and will be able to see at least 12 of them.</li> <li>Provided studies on the negative health effects of turbines.</li> <li>Requested Project Team call her if they disagree with the papers.</li> <li>Requested answer to her question based on concerns regarding if she can no longer live at her home and no one will purchase it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided correspondent with the approximate distances from residence to nearest Project turbines. Based on these distances the calculated sound level is 38.2 dBA.</li> <li>The Project will follow the guidelines put in place by the MOE regarding sound levels and minimum distances for wind projects in Ontario. The key consideration is the sound level. The requirements, supported by information from the Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health, Health Canada</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
						and The World Health Organization (WHO) Europe, and upheld by Ontario Environmental Review Tribunals, ensure a project must be sited at least 550 metres from non-participating residences provided a cumulative sound level does not exceed 40 dBA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Team recognizes that wind turbines, along with many other human and natural activities and processes, produce infrasound.</li> </ul>
N/A	159	October 2, 2012	October 2, 2012	Drop-in session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed concerns regarding stray voltage, noise impacts from a Kingsbridge I Wind Power Operations turbine near his farm and about the process for offering the \$1500 Community Renewable Energy Benefit Fund.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Team noted that he does qualify for the Community Renewable Energy Benefit Fund.</li> </ul>
Sent	60	October 4, 2012	October 4, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called the correspondent at 4:00 pm and left a message on his answering machine.</li> <li>Indicated that the correspondent was eligible for two payments due to there being a residence on each of his two properties.</li> <li>Indicated the benefit was designed to provide payment to all landowners within 1km of Project infrastructure regardless of how many turbines.</li> <li>Provided information on October 18, 2012 Public Open House.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Returned phone call at 4:35 pm.</li> <li>Pleased with response but felt as though he should receive additional payment because they are several turbines within 1 km of both homes.</li> </ul>
N/A	99	October 10, 2012	October 10, 2012	Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted that building a single story home would increase the size of the foundation of the home and would thereby increase the cost.</li> <li>Requested that the Project Team plot his VLSR on the west side of his lot, and provided the exact location.</li> <li>Noted he has other concerns but no time to go into detail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team member in attendance was the Land Representative from K2 Wind.</li> <li>Project Team provided correspondent with a custom map based on the noise profile for K2 Wind.</li> <li>Showed the correspondent that building on his lot, regardless of where the VLSR is sited, has moderate impact on being able to build in the future.</li> <li>Discussed noise from the switchyard.</li> </ul>
Received	12	October 11, 2012	October 11, 2012	Phone call E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Called in the morning requesting information on the different avenues that can be used to provide feedback to the Proponent.</li> <li>Called around 2:30pm requesting a response that day.</li> <li>Inquired if comments could be sent by fax and if so, what number should be used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments regarding the Project can be accepted:</li> <li>By e-mail at: K2Wind@capitalpower.com;</li> <li>By telephone at: 519.524.2760;</li> <li>In person at: 46 Victoria Street North, Goderich or at our upcoming public open house for the Project at the former St. Joseph's School in Kingsbridge, 84685 Bluewater Hwy #21 on Thursday, October 18, 2012 from 4 – 7pm;</li> <li>By mail at : 46 Victoria Street North, Goderich, ON N7A 2R6; or</li> <li>By facsimile: 519.524.5046.</li> </ul>
Received	12	October 15, 2012	November 2, 2012	Phone call Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested map showing all turbine locations and noise receptors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided correspondent with requested map.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
Received	31 Form Letters	October 17 to 26, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form Letters – Version 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided a letter of objection.</li> <li>• Noted that the impact the Project would have on the township would be immense and that it is a hugely divisive issue that has already pitted neighbours against each other.</li> <li>• Identified that the Township of ACW is one of the most productive agricultural areas of the province and should be used for food production.</li> <li>• Stated they are greatly concerned with how the development would affect their homes and quality of life. Noted that residents of Shelburne and Ripley areas have already been driven from their homes by previously approved projects.</li> <li>• Noted that the \$1500 annual compensation to non-participating noise receptors is an admission that people living within the radius will be affected. Asked what value the annual payment is if community members cannot live in their homes.</li> <li>• Noted data released from MPAC for Wolfe Island shows that 78 properties have been devalued by the turbine project, some up to 40%. Asked how it is acceptable for the residents of the Township to have the value of one of their most important assets stolen without compensation.</li> <li>• Feels as though the province is sitting in a surplus of power and the turbines are not needed at this time.</li> <li>• Requested the Project not be approved or considered for approval until the Health Canada study on wind turbines be completed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In regards to the use of agricultural lands, after construction, each turbine and its access road would on average use approximately one acre of land, depending on the length of the access road.</li> <li>• The Energy Benefit is the direct result of input the Project Team received from local-area residents, who asked us to share additional benefits of the Project with the community. The Energy Benefit is not considered compensation and is entirely voluntary.</li> <li>• In regards to property values, based on recent information from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), property values have continued to increase in many areas of Ontario where wind projects either exist or are proposed for development, including Huron County.</li> <li>• K2 Wind is continuing with the REA process and will meet those requirements in our work on the Project. K2 Wind remains confident that – following provincial regulations – wind is a safe and environmentally responsible form of power generation. K2 Wind acknowledges that Health Canada's recently announced study has the potential to further contribute to the scientific literature and global knowledge base in this area, but K2 Wind does not expect it to change the fundamental conclusions reached by a large number of studies around the world, that wind power is safe and environmentally responsible.</li> <li>• In response to comment concerning surplus of power, K2 Wind is responding to the Ontario government's policy to develop additional sources of renewable power in the province. The design, implementation and long-term planning of Ontario's electricity markets is at the ultimate direction of the Government of Ontario.</li> </ul>
Received	130	October 17, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form Letter Version 2 with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided a letter of objection.</li> <li>• See Form Letter Version 2 summarized below with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Stated the turbines would be approximately 300 metres from their picnic and camp area.</li> <li>○ Noted concern for conservation area and forest.</li> <li>○ Noted they have worked their whole lives towards having this property to enjoy with family and friends.</li> <li>○ Identified that he has learned from newspapers that the amount of birds killed by turbines will certainly ruin and conservation for wildlife.</li> <li>○ They cannot see their camp grounds being enjoyed in the future with turbines so close.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>• See Form Letter Version 2 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>
Received	99	October 18, 2012	October 18, 2012	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requested that VLSR be relocated to his preferred location,</li> <li>• Expressed concerns about stray voltage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K2 Wind Land Agent confirmed his request would be forwarded to the K2 Wind Team for review.</li> <li>• State that stray voltage is present in all distribution systems,</li> </ul>
Received	160	October 22, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that the unsafe conditions near turbines have already been proven.</li> <li>• Identified concern regarding the Community Renewable Energy Benefit being only \$1500 per year when mortgages are much more.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about livestock operators in the Township due to stray voltage.</li> <li>AG-1 land should be used to grow food.</li> <li>Noted devaluation of property is a great concern.</li> <li>Noted there is already a power surplus and wind power is sporadic at best.</li> <li>Noted objection to the Project.</li> </ul>	responding shortly.
Received	62	October 19, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a letter of objection.</li> <li>Noted information about her property.</li> <li>Provided 15 questions regarding the natural environment, tourism, noise modeling, the high voltage transmission lines, future health effects, and property values and requested a response.</li> <li>Owns three properties within the Project Area and is concerned about the impact the Project will have on these properties.</li> <li>Requested the Project not be approved, or considered until after the Health Canada Study on wind turbines has been completed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	133, 136 & 137	October 19, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form Letter - personalized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Form letter – Version 1 and 2 comments combined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	132	October 19, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form Letter Version 1 with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Form letter – Version 1 with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted it looks like the present Liberal Government and the Premier will do anything to become the greenest group in Canada even at the expense of the local people's health and wellbeing.</li> <li>Asked where is the business sense and common sense in paying corporations 50 cents a KW, when the Hydro sells it to them in London for .06 cents per KW.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>See Form Letter Version 1 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>
Received	134	October 20, 2012	November 6, 2012	E-mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correspondent noted he lives in Township of ACW.</li> <li>Strongly opposed to the Project.</li> <li>Objects to devaluation of properties in the Township.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	135	October 20, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form letter Version 1 with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Form letter – Version 1 with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that 15 of the turbines will be in close proximity of her home.</li> <li>Identified that she cannot support a project which allows its citizens to be used as part of an industrial experiment.</li> <li>Identified concern for wildlife, bird species and deer on her property and that they will be driven from the area or experience health issues as humans will. Stated that independent studies should be done on the effects to wildlife.</li> <li>Asked why participating landowners have to sign a waiver as to their legal rights concerning health and any other issues arising from the Project.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>See Form Letter Version 1 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>
Received	19	October 20, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form letter Version 1 with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Form letter – Version 1 with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that he has had potential buyers but their interest quickly faded away when they found out about the wind turbines.</li> <li>Stated that he believes the Project should not be approved or considered for approval until after the Health Canada study on wind turbines has been completed, the results released, health issues</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>See Form Letter Version 1 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					addressed and proper siting determined and property compensation for the loss of property value.	
Received	18 Form Letters	October 22, 2012 to October 26, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form Letter – Version 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided a letter of objection.</li> <li>• Identified strong objection to the Project for the Township of ACW.</li> <li>• Noted that the impact the Project would have on the township would be immense and that it is a hugely divisive issue that has already pitted neighbours against each other.</li> <li>• Identified that the Township of ACW is one of the most productive agricultural areas of the province and should be used for food production.</li> <li>• Noted that it is also an important lakeshore resource for recreation and tourism and a vital part of the migratory bird flyway for species such as tundra swan and raptors. Asked how ACW can be considered a reasonable area in which to site this Project.</li> <li>• Noted that residents of Shelburne and Ripley areas have already been driven from their homes by previously approved projects. They cannot support a wind project which allows its citizens to be used as part of an industrial experiment.</li> <li>• Noted that turbine developments have been shown to devalue the property of neighbouring landowners.</li> <li>• Noted data released from MPAC for Wolfe Island shows that 78 properties have been devalued by the turbine project, some up to 40%. Asked how it is acceptable for the residents of the Township to have the value of one of their most important assets stolen without compensation.</li> <li>• Feels as though citizens of Ontario are being asked to shoulder a huge economic burden for unnecessary energy production.</li> <li>• Requested the Project not be approved or considered for approval until the Health Canada study on wind turbines be completed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In regards to the use of agricultural lands, after construction, each turbine and its access road would on average use approximately one acre of land, depending on the length of the access road.</li> <li>• Noted that many community members asked K2 Wind to respect the values and visual beauty of the community by not impeding views of Lake Huron. K2 Wind listened to these concerns and as a result, did not locate any turbines west of Bluewater Highway 21 to ensure an unobstructed westward view of the lake. At the closest, Project turbines are located approximately 2 to 4 kilometres from the Lake Huron shoreline.</li> <li>• In regards to migratory bird patterns, the Project Team has studied local plant and wildlife species to ensure that possible impacts to the environment from the Project are minimized or avoided. The Project is sited primarily in actively managed agricultural fields and was not identified for significant wildlife habitat for migratory birds (including raptors and waterfowl). Studies indicate that waterfowl and raptors continue to use areas with wind turbines and studies indicate they can see and avoid wind turbines.</li> <li>• The Energy Benefit is the direct result of input the Project Team received from local-area residents, who asked us to share additional benefits of the Project with the community. The Energy Benefit is not considered compensation and is entirely voluntary.</li> <li>• In regards to property values, based on recent information from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), property values have continued to increase in many areas of Ontario where wind projects either exist or are proposed for development, including Huron County.</li> <li>• K2 Wind is continuing with the REA process and will meet those requirements in our work on the Project. K2 Wind remains confident that – following provincial regulations – wind is a safe and environmentally responsible form of power generation. K2 Wind acknowledges that Health Canada's recently announced study has the potential to further contribute to the scientific literature and global knowledge base in this area, but K2 Wind does not expect it to change the fundamental conclusions reached by a large number of studies around the world, that wind power is safe and environmentally responsible.</li> <li>• In response to comment concerning surplus of power, K2 Wind is responding to the Ontario government's policy to develop additional sources of renewable power in the province. The design, implementation and long-term planning of Ontario's electricity markets is at the ultimate direction of the Government of Ontario.</li> </ul>
Received	119	October 22, 2012	November 6, 2012	E-mail Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided a letter of objection.</li> <li>• Identified the reasons he is opposing the Project, including haphazard planning of the transmission lines, health concerns over stray voltage, health emissions and quality of life issues with noise emissions, moratoriums until health issues are resolved, the need to limit light pollution to the ground at night, wind turbine fires releasing toxic fumes, the environmental impact on animals, loss of trees due to transmission line installation, visual pollution, devaluation of property, economic unsustainability, negative effect on the economy and the secrecy of contracts.</li> <li>• Provided questions regarding the Project and requested response.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Owns three properties within the Project Area and is concerned about the impact the Project will have on these properties.</li> <li>Requested the Project not be approved, or considered until after the Health Canada Study on wind turbines has been completed.</li> </ul>	
Received	122	October 18, 2012 Received: October 22, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a letter of objection.</li> <li>Noted that the land should be used for food production.</li> <li>Identified the health issue as a big concern.</li> <li>Noted that the Project has upset many people and should be cancelled until all the issues have been addressed more thoroughly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	131	October 22, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a letter of objection.</li> <li>Feels turbines will cause environmental destruction.</li> <li>Noted the social, financial, environmental and wildlife arguments against the turbines are very well documented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	161	October 23, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form letter Version 1 with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Form letter – Version 1 with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that the distance should apply to farms, not just the buildings. Stated that they are all over the farm.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>See Form Letter Version 1 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>
Received	162 & 163	October 23, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form letter Version 1 with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Form letter – Version 1 with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that they are very concerned about the possible health effects for themselves and their three young children and their neighbours and friends.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>See Form Letter Version 1 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>
Received	178	October 24, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted objection to the Project.</li> <li>Provided statistics for wind production at the Kingsbridge I Wind Power Operation from 2011.</li> <li>Concerned about paying Bruce Power to produce electricity when wind turbines will be producing.</li> <li>Noted concern with how the development will affect homes and quality of life.</li> <li>Noted that the Township of ACW does not want wind projects.</li> <li>Identified that a petition was signed with over 750 names.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	154	October 24, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided letter of objection.</li> <li>Noted he is in support of alternative power.</li> <li>Wrote that the fact that rural municipalities have no say in this process is a travesty of justice.</li> <li>Identified that the power is not needed in Ontario due to the decimation of the manufacturing industries.</li> <li>Noted the cost and inefficiency of wind power.</li> <li>Identified environmental impacts on bat and migratory bird populations.</li> <li>Noted concern about the destruction of hundreds of acres locally and thousands of acres provincially of prime agricultural land at a time when food prices are set to skyrocket.</li> <li>Health issues must be resolved before this is allowed to proceed.</li> <li>Land devaluation must also be addressed.</li> <li>Identified that the social impact is one of the most concerning issues for him. Families, neighbourhoods and communities torn apart.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	155	October 24,	November 6,	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided letter of objection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
		2012	2012		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted he believes that the property owner in every municipality should have the right to make decisions that affect the value of their property.</li> <li>Identified that the Green Energy Act has taken away those rights and the majority of property owners are opposed to the K2 Wind Power Project.</li> <li>Noted the province does not need the turbines.</li> <li>Stated that he does not believe the K2 Wind Power Project should be approved until after Health Canada Study on wind turbines has been completed.</li> </ul>	Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.
Received	179	October 24, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form letter Version 2 with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Form letter – Version 2 with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>She feels a large industrial wind project is completely wrong for the area because it is a very productive agricultural area, a tourist destination and a migratory flight path for many birds.</li> <li>Objects to the turbines because they are a very massive change to the landscape, as well as the transmission lines and transformer stations required to support the turbines.</li> <li>To have this Project thrust upon them by the government's determination to go ahead with wind farms no matter what the cost to rural residents is unfair and unacceptable.</li> <li>Stated that it is time that the government of the province places the health and well-being of its rural residents ahead of corporate profits.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>See Form Letter Version 2 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>
Received	164	October 24, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form letter Version 1 with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Form letter – Version 1 with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crossed out \$1500 and noted \$2500 as annual compensation for non-participating noise receptors within two (crossed out one) kilometer of turbines.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>See Form Letter Version 1 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>
Received	84	October 24, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that ACW land should be used for food production.</li> <li>Identified that it is also an important lakeshore destination for tourism as well as a pathway for migratory birds.</li> <li>Huge industrial wind turbines, as well as the substations, transmission lines and transformer stations needed to support the industrial development should not be built on agricultural land.</li> <li>Identified that he is very concerned with impact of construction on ground water and he feels that trucking in water for those who are affected is a poor substitute for what they have now.</li> <li>Noted that turbines are inefficient and that the province currently has a surplus of power.</li> <li>Concerned about the devaluation of property values.</li> <li>Correspondent asked that the project not be approved or even considered for approval until the concerns of residents who must live within it are properly considered.</li> <li>Noted that the independent Health Canada study on wind turbines must first be completed, results released, health issues addressed and proper siting determined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	79 Form Letters	October 25, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form Letters – Version 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted they strongly object to the Project proposed in their Township.</li> <li>Noted that the impact the Project would have on the Township would be immense and that it is a hugely divisive issue that has already pitted neighbours against each other.</li> <li>Identified that the Township of ACW is one of the most productive agricultural areas of the province and should be used for food production.</li> <li>Stated they are greatly concerned with how the development would affect their</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In regards to the use of agricultural lands, after construction, each turbine and its access road would on average use approximately one acre of land, depending on the length of the access road.</li> <li>The Energy Benefit is the direct result of input the Project Team received from local-area residents, who asked us to share additional benefits of the Project with the community. The Energy Benefit is not considered compensation and is entirely voluntary.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<p>homes and quality of life. Noted that residents of Shelburne and Ripley areas have already been driven from their homes by previously approved projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that the \$1500 annual compensation to non-participating noise receptors is an admission that people living within the radius will be affected. Asked what value the annual payment is if community members cannot live in their homes.</li> <li>Noted data released from MPAC for Wolfe Island shows that 78 properties have been devalued by the turbine project, some up to 40%. Asked how it is acceptable for the residents of the Township to have the value of one of their most important assets stolen without compensation.</li> <li>Requested the Project not be approved or considered for approval until the Health Canada study on wind turbines be completed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In regards to property values, based on recent information from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), property values have continued to increase in many areas of Ontario where wind projects either exist or are proposed for development, including Huron County.</li> <li>K2 Wind is continuing with the REA process and will meet those requirements in our work on the Project. K2 Wind remains confident that – following provincial regulations – wind is a safe and environmentally responsible form of power generation. K2 Wind acknowledges that Health Canada’s recently announced study has the potential to further contribute to the scientific literature and global knowledge base in this area, but K2 Wind does not expect it to change the fundamental conclusions reached by a large number of studies around the world, that wind power is safe and environmentally responsible.</li> </ul>
Received	156	October 25, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wanted to go on record as stating that he does not currently have any problems with stray voltage at his farm and that his cattle are healthy and show no problems with stress or anxiety; there are no unusual problems with calving or weight loss in the herd.</li> <li>Noted concerns with the potential for voltage problems related to the transmission lines.</li> <li>Also concerned with low frequency noise and vibrations from the turbine disturbing the cattle.</li> <li>Supports the request for baseline voltage studies before development of the wind projects in the Township.</li> <li>The Project should be deferred until voltage tests are completed and the Health Canada noise study is done.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project (‘the Project’). The comments provided will be included in the Project’s REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	180	October 25, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted concern with two turbines because they are along the edge of a watercourse that runs all four seasons and a valley that supports a wide variety of wildlife.</li> <li>Correspondents feel that the proposed turbine location does not take into account the wildlife habitat and the potential damage that could be caused by erecting the turbines.</li> <li>Provided additional information about the stream and valley.</li> <li>Noted concern over well-being of their family regarding the high voltage cables.</li> <li>Identified that they spoke to families that had their homes purchased by wind companies because of stray voltage issues.</li> <li>Requested the Project be put on hold until after Health Canada Study was completed, the results released, health issues addressed and proper siting of turbines determined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project (‘the Project’). The comments provided will be included in the Project’s REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	165	October 25, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that they absolutely object to the location of a turbine because in the event of failure of the turbine it will land on their property.</li> <li>They strongly object to the manner in which abutting property land will be impacted by the neighbouring windmills.</li> <li>Noted that they previously advised of a preferred building location for their farm and stated that turbines should not be built on properties that will restrict adjacent landowners’ rights to build on their own property.</li> <li>Noted specific concerns regarding the proposal for two turbines adjacent to their property, including wildlife in the natural treed corridors, the possible removal of trees in the area and effects to drainage.</li> <li>Identified that the noise modeling undertaken for the Project shows that two turbines will produce unacceptable noise levels in excess of 40 decibels on over</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project (‘the Project’). The comments provided will be included in the Project’s REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<p>¼ of the farm. They also object to these two turbines on the bases of complaints regarding noise from the K1 Wind Power Operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that there is no mention of nesting raptors such as owls in the vicinity of their farm and the impact the turbines will have on the species.</li> <li>Identified concern regarding devaluation of properties and noted that assessment data is surfacing that shows massive devaluation.</li> <li>Noted that there is very little support for this Project.</li> <li>Stated that although it only deals with one issue, the proposed Health Canada study is a good first step to address the issues associated with wind turbines; however, there needs to be a much broader review of the issues associated with the placement of turbines in the province.</li> <li>Correspondents strongly object to the Project and to the further development of any wind turbine projects in their community until the issues have been addressed.</li> </ul>	
Received	85	October 25, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form letter Version 1 with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Form letter – Version 1 with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted objection to a proposed transmission station.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>See Form Letter Version 1 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>
Received	166	October 25, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form letter Version 3 with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Form letter – Version 3 with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asked how it is acceptable for residents of the Township to have the value of their most important assets stolen without compensation.</li> <li>Requested specific noise data modelling for their property.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>See Form Letter Version 3 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>
Received	12	October 26, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form letter Version 3 with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a letter of objection.</li> <li>Form letter – Version 3 with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the Proponent intend to compensate property owners who suffer adverse effects from this project if it goes ahead?</li> <li>If the project goes ahead and properties are shown to be devalued, does the Proponent intend to compensate property owners for their loss?</li> <li>How many acres of prime agricultural land will be taken out of production if the K2 Wind Project goes ahead? Requested the sites of all turbines, access roads, transformer stations, substation, transmission lines etc.</li> <li>With respect to decommissioning, where will the waste products end up?</li> <li>What is the accuracy level of the instrumentation which was used to determine noise levels? What is the margin of error for these noise level measurements?</li> <li>Who will be monitoring the turbines for noise compliance and what instrumentation will be used? How frequently will monitoring be undertaken for noise compliance?</li> <li>Will a public meeting be held to advise the public about the design change if a padmount design for turbine tower footings is found to be inadequate during site inspections and a piling system is required? If a piling system is required, to what depth will the pilings be driven and will adjacent landowners be contacted prior to this occurring? There are no draft reports on the possibility of pilings being used to stabilize the turbine bases. If pilings were to be used, would it be necessary to consult with the public at another open house? How would this affect</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>See Form Letter Version 3 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<p>the REA process? If a piling system was proposed, would groundwater studies be completed in the vicinity to ensure there would be no negative impacts on groundwater?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o With respect to the Kingsbridge I Project, have any recent noise assessments been undertaken to ensure compliance with noise regulations? If so, who has undertaken these assessments?</li> <li>o What was the total amount of power which was produced from the Kingsbridge I Project in 2011? Please provide a breakdown of the amount of power produced during off-peak, mid-peak and on-peak times and please break this down into summer and winter periods.</li> <li>o Who is responsible for providing the Storm Water Management Study for the substation switchyard to the public? Why was it not made available to the public before the final open house?</li> </ul>	
Received	157	October 26, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requested proof that the 550 metre setback for the turbines that will be built around their home.</li> <li>• Asked if the Project Team is aware of an airport on the border of the study area. Provided information about the airport.</li> <li>• Asked who will compensate them for any losses that may be incurred for land value depreciation, medical/health bills for their family, livestock losses and relocation costs.</li> <li>• Expressed how much negative impact the wind turbines will have on their community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	158	October 26, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted she strongly objects to the K2 Wind Power Project.</li> <li>• Identified concerns regarding health and property values.</li> <li>• Stated that her property assessment has already decreased in value.</li> <li>• Asked if there will be compensation for loss of land value.</li> <li>• Noted concern regarding noise levels from the turbine and substation, and loss of valuable farm land.</li> <li>• Requests more studies before the Project is approved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
Received	167	October 26, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted he believes there has to be a moratorium on all development of wind turbines until there has been a complete study on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Economic viability</li> <li>o Legitimate health study</li> <li>o Impact on all forms of life</li> <li>o Loss of prime agriculture land</li> <li>o Loss of tourism</li> <li>o Ruination of underground drinking water</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Correspondent trusts that his input will be given serious consideration by the MOE when considering the proposed Project.</li> <li>• Noted he objects to the Project and asked that it not be approved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	168	October 26, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form Letter with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided letter of objection.</li> <li>• Form letter – Version 2 with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How close are airports and runway permitted to turbines?</li> <li>o Did the K2 Team consider the Wayne Burgma "airport" located on Highway 21 near the intersection of Hawkin's Road?</li> <li>o How close is it to the closest turbine?</li> <li>o How many proposed turbines will be within 2.5 m of the Burgsma's airport?</li> <li>o Please provide a copy of "Schedule A". Schedule A is a listing of all above ground transmission lines.</li> <li>o Why didn't K2 provided ACW Township the "Schedule A" of the "Road</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>• See Form Letter Version 2 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<p>Use Agreement". As of Oct. 26, 2012 ACW had not been provided a copy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Asked if the Project Team thinks it is fair for townships to agree to contracts that they can't read due to incomplete documents provided to them from K2?</li> </ul>	
Received	169	October 26, 2012	November 6, 2012	Form Letter Version 2 with personalized comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted he strongly objects to the Project.</li> <li>• Form letter – Version 2 with personalized comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How close are airports and runways permitted to turbines, including private runways?</li> <li>o Did the K2 Team consider the Wayne Burgsma "airport" located on Highway 21 near the intersection of Hawkin's Road?</li> <li>o How close is it to the closest turbine?</li> <li>o How many proposed turbines will be within 2.5 km of the Burgsma's airport?</li> <li>o Please provide me a copy of "Schedule A", Schedule A is a listing of all above ground transmission lines.</li> <li>o Why didn't K2 provided ACW Township the "Schedule A" of the "Road Use Agreement". As of Oct. 26, 2012 ACW had not been provided a copy.</li> <li>o Do you think it is fair for townships to agree to contracts that they can't read due to incomplete documents provided to them from K2?</li> <li>o I've read reports of dogs suffering mental instability due to the effects/presence of these turbines, what liability does K2 have for any detrimental effects to residential canines?</li> <li>o Does K2 have any plan to mitigate the detrimental effects of the turbines on residents' canines, or farm animals?</li> <li>o What is the average, lifetime maintenance cost for these turbines over their projected lifespan?</li> <li>o Since the presence of turbines has been shown to reduce property value by up to 40%, shouldn't the K2 project be responsible for paying the difference in property value loss due to the fact that it is directly culpable for this decrease?</li> <li>o What is the average projected loss in Canadian crops due to the presence of turbines which are occupying land which would normally have been farmed?</li> <li>o How are these turbines worthwhile if they aren't even projected to pay for themselves over their lifetime?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The comments provided will be included in the REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> <li>• See Form Letter Version 2 response summary for response provided to correspondent.</li> </ul>
Received	21	October 26, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted concern that that not all reports were available to the municipality for 90 days and to the public for the full 60 day consultation report period.</li> <li>• Asked how the Project could have a final open house when all reports were not available to the council or public for the full review period.</li> <li>• Asked who is building the transformer station switchyard.</li> <li>• Noted that the reports do not contain information about pilings being used or the possibility of using larger bases for foundations. Asked how these changes would affect the REA process.</li> <li>• Asked about water well setbacks and monitoring for participating and non-participating landowners. Asked about the monitoring of well records and the results in the draft reports.</li> <li>• Asked about the contacts from RWDI answering questions about the noise assessment when they were not the firm hired to do the studies. Inquired as to how many Zephyr North people were present at the final open house.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ("the Project"). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>

Sent/Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asked about specific receptors being shown as participating landowners when they are not. Requested all correspondence from the MOE REA process regarding the 2 properties. Questioned the noise modeling assessment accuracy when no transformers are listed.</li> <li>• Inquired as to what provisions K2 Wind is making to seek out and mitigate problems with any autistic, developmentally delayed or handicapped children residing within the project area. Noted there are no draft reports dealing with this issue and asked why.</li> <li>• Asked if the draft reports on the Project website are the exact same ones sent to MOE and if the reports to ACW council were the exact same as the ones to the public and to the MOE.</li> <li>• Do the wind turbines being purchases have CSA approval and meet "all CSA requirements" and also meet Canada's electrical safety standards on all parts of the turbine?</li> <li>• Asked about EMF pollution and the standards for measuring and staying in compliance.</li> <li>• Requested more information on the SF<sub>6</sub> gas that the Project Team informed them would be used at the transformer site.</li> <li>• Asked about icing chemicals in the turbine blades being used and how the Project Team will deal with icing on the blades.</li> <li>• Requested all the EMF and vibration calculations (worst case scenario) that are created by the substation proposed for the Project. Asked how far the vibrations will travel and at what magnitude.</li> <li>• Inquired if the Proponent will be monitoring the stations vibration and EMF output if operations start.</li> <li>• Requested a list of all potentially hazardous materials on the transformer switchyard site.</li> <li>• Asked how the substation is grounded and how far could a potential grounding dissipate into the environment. What are the long term effects of this?</li> <li>• Will the Proponent guarantee that the towers, substation and transformer station will not affect a GPS system.</li> <li>• Asked if the Proponent will be providing upgrades along with additional training to the local fire department and emergency personnel to deal with any potential hazards.</li> </ul>	
Received	165	October 26, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided a Letter of Objection noting an Addendum to comments submitted to K2 Wind Ontario on October 25, 2012 regarding the Draft Natural Heritage Assessment and Impact Study.</li> <li>• Noted the wildlife observed on their property during a walk – two hawks, beavers and a migrating flock of woodcock.</li> <li>• Stated that the wildlife in their Township is a broad and diverse tapestry that is constantly changing.</li> <li>• Noted concern regarding the picture that the consultants drew from drive-by looks at the properties and stale reference material.</li> <li>• Identified that the negative impacts of the proposed turbine project will be far greater than stated and will affect their wildlife for years to come.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>
Received	99	October 26, 2012	November 6, 2012	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted concern that the Project as pitted neighbours and families against each other and that the Township is one of the most productive agricultural areas in Ontario and should be used for food production.</li> <li>• Identified that he has asked for his VLSR building sites to be moved. Provided the location he would like it moved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanked correspondent for letter regarding the K2 Wind Power Project ('the Project'). The comments provided will be included in the Project's REA application that will be submitted to the MOE for review. K2 Wind is currently reviewing the questions provided with the Project Team and will be responding shortly.</li> </ul>



Sent/ Received	Correspondent	Date Sent/ Received	Date Responded	Type of Correspondence	Correspondence Summary	Response Summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted his objection to the devaluation of property values in this Township and provided information from Wolfe Island MPAC data.</li> <li>• Stated he is concerned about the health and well-being of residents.</li> <li>• In light of his concerns, he believes that the Project should not be approved or considered for approval until after the Health Canada study on wind turbines has been completed.</li> </ul>	