

# **Appendix J**

## **Comment-Response Table**

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
<b>Public</b>							
1	Laureen McLaughlin	Telephone	July 22, 2010	Inquired if was allowed to attend the public meeting.	Confirmed that this would be fine.	July 22, 2010	None
2	Harvey Wrightman	Email	August 4, 2010	Inquired about website link, and questions as to OPA contract status, and turbine make, model and capacity	Fixed website link, and emailed copy of the PDR.	August 4, 2010	None
3	Harvey Wrightman	Email	August 4, 2010	Thank you for the information provided. I have briefly viewed the draft report. Please provide this information about the Samsung 2.5 mw wind turbine, the proposed unit: 1) the octave band sound power levels 2) the ovealrral aggregate sound power level 3) the night time wind shear value being used to calculate the sound power levels at the receptors.	Noted that requested information would be available in the upcoming Wind Turbine Specification Report, that he would be notified when the report is released for the 60 day public review, and that representatives from Samsung would be at the upcoming Open House who could answer any technical questions.	August 17, 2010	None
4	Harvey Wrightman	Email	August 17, 2010	In the draft esr, the spec's for the Samsung 25xc state a "nominal" rotation rate of 13.77 rpm. I presume this is considered an "average" operating speed. Is that correct? What is the cut-in speed (for power generation) and the maximum cut-out speed ( for excess wind conditions). Does the turbine have a "speed governor" control such as Vestas uses on its European-market machines?	Attended Open House #1	August 26, 2010	N/A
5	Murray Watson	Telephone	August 23, 2010	Wanted to know where and when the public meeting was. Is in support of the project.	Provided information requested.	N/A	N/A
6	Clare Moffat	Open House #1 Questionnaire	August 26, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would like to review the environmental noise study.</li> <li>Others are planning wind turbine in the area and we would like to see the environment impact study on their cumulative effect.</li> <li>We would also like to review configurations of the turbines to see if layout could be different to minimize current/future effects on nearby landowners.</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you for attending the Public Open House held August 25<sup>th</sup>, 2010 for the Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm at the Brooke-Alvinston-Inwood Community Centre.</p> <p>Zephyr Farms Limited (Zephyr) has been awarded a Power Purchase Agreement with the Ontario Power Authority (RESOP 11836) for the Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm. The basic components of the project include four Samsung Heavy Industries 2.5 MW wind turbine generators for a total installed nameplate capacity of 10 MW, a pad mount transformer for each turbine, electrical collector lines, a transformer substation with associated control room, and turbine access roads. Temporary components during construction will include portions of the access roads, laydown areas and crane pads. The electrical transmission system will transport the electricity generated from each turbine to Hydro One Networks Inc.'s (HONI) Distribution Network.</p> <p>Zephyr has retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) to prepare a Renewable Energy Approval (REA) Application, as required under Ontario Regulation 359/09 - Renewable Energy Approvals under Part V.0.1 of the Act of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> (O. Reg. 359/09). Public consultation is an important aspect of the REA process. All comments that you and/or other attendees provided in an exit questionnaire regarding the project have been noted,</p>	September 21, 2010	N/A

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
					and will be addressed in draft documents to be made available at least 60 days before the final project Open House.  Please note that your contact information has been added to the contact list for this project, to ensure you receive information on future project updates, including notification of the 60 day review period. If you have any further comments and/or questions regarding the Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm please do not hesitate to contact me directly.		
7	Murray Watson	Open House #1 Questionnaire	August 26, 2010	Well presented, knowledgeable staff, questions answered well and in detail.	Ibid.	September 21, 2010	N/A
8	Ruth Leitch	Open House #1 Questionnaire	August 26, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very pleasant people. Answered questions thoroughly. Pleased with Open House.</li> <li>Always need to be considerate of wetlands and the homes of birds and animals as well as the people.</li> <li>Any health issues no matter how small they might be.</li> </ul> <p>Requested health report on wind mills.</p>	Ibid, and emailed Colby report on Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects.	August 30, 2010 (report) and September 21, 2010 (letter)	N/A
9	Shelley Holbrook	Open House #1 Questionnaire	August 26, 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am opposed to these wind farms being put up. I think that they should be looking into the side effects that these wind turbines can cause concerning your health. I think it is all about money and greed and these people (property owners and the owners of the wind farm) should consider their health and well-being, as well as their neighbours before doing something they will regret later.</li> <li>Key issues: health and side-effects, noise, dirty electricity, distance from homes and/or buildings.</li> </ul>	Ibid.	September 21, 2010	N/A
10	Dale Carruthers	Telephone	August 27, 2010	Left message requesting information on project.	Responded with voicemail.	August 29, 2010	N/A
11	Brandon and Clare Moffat	Email	August 27, 2010	As discussed yesterday, we are the adjacent landowner to the west and north of the proposed project. We would like you to keep us notified as documents are posted for public review as we have a keen interest in reviewing the environmental noise assessment, EIS on cumulative effects, the iterations of wind turbine configurations that you looked at to minimize impacts on current and future landowners, and other relevant documents. We've filled out the questionnaire and will be sending it to Stantec later today. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.	Thanks for your interest in the project. When the project documents are completed and available for public review we will notify you where they will be available.	August 30, 2010	N/A
12	Harvey Wrightman	Email	August 26, 2010	<p>I was at the info session for the Zephyr wind project this evening, and had my questions about the Samsung 2.5 wind turbine answered to some degree, by the 2 Samsung reps.</p> <p>I would like to know the average summer night time wind shear values being used to calculate the sound power levels at each receptor. Since the wind mast has been there for a long time, this value should be known.</p>	Mr. Wrightman, thank you for coming to our open house last night and for your emails. Regarding wind shear the exponent typically ranges from 0.10 to 0.40. The low end of the range corresponds to a smooth terrain (e.g. sea, sand and snow from 0.10 to 0.13). A wind shear of 0.25 corresponds to a rough terrain (i.e. with sizeable obstacles). The high end of the range (0.40) corresponds to a project in an urban area. A value of 0.14 is a standard value for rural Southern Ontario.	August 27, 2010	N/A
13	Harvey Wrightman	Email	August 31, 2010	Would you provide the actual data for the summer night time wind shear value that is being used. The generic figure quoted (.14) is far lower than the figure other companies have submitted to the MOE. For example, Golder Associates, in the	See # 18	January 19, 2011	See # 18

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
				their ESR for the Adelaide Wind Project, states a value of (.465) from their own wind mast data. The Ontario Wind Atlas rates both sites (Zephyr & Adelaide) as equal in average wind speed at ~ 6 - 6.5 m/sec. They are within 10 km distance. The average summer night time shear value throughout SW Ontario is ~ (.45).			
14	Heather Wright	Telephone	August 31, 2010	Provided information to Heather on the project process. Let her know the reports we were producing etc. Also passed on Brent Hall's contact details. Will send her a copy of the POH boards.	Sent boards	August 31, 2010	N/A
15	Harvey Wrightman	Email	September 11, 2010	The Kent Breeze wind project, near Thamesville, in their ESR of Aug., 2010, have recorded a wind shear factor of (.42). Please forward the factor that has been determined from the wind mast data for the Zephyr wind project, as I previously requested Aug. 31.	See # 18	January 19, 2011	See # 18
16	Harvey Wrightman	Email	January 5, 2011	<p>I have reviewed the PSR of the Zephyr wind project and have these questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise report states the SPL for the Samsung 25xc turbine for wind speed only to 8m/sec at which speed it is only producing 1.072 MW or 43% of nameplate capacity. Tech bulletin 6, March, 2010 states on pg.3, "Specifications for sound power level used for determining setbacks correspond to the sound emitted while operating at 95% of nameplate capacity." That's a huge discrepancy to account for and the SPL should rise accordingly.</li> <li>The rotational rate of the 25xc is stated as a "nominal" value of 14.35rpm - what is the maximum rotational rate? The rotational rate can go higher according to the Pike report, certifying engineer.</li> <li>The octave band sound power levels are not in the noise report - another lapse in documentation as required in "Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms, 2008" Se.6.2.2, "The acoustic emissions of the wind turbine must be specified by the manufacturer for the full range of rated operation and wind speeds. As a minimum, the information must include the sound power levels, frequency spectra in octave bands, (63 to 8000 Hz), and the tonality at integer wind speeds from 6 to 10 m/s. The acoustic emission information must be determined and reported in accordance with the international standard CAN/CSA-C61400-11-07, Reference (5)."</li> <li>Back in August, I enquired about the wind shear factor and was told by Mr. Cobb, 2010/08/27:  <i>"Mr. Wrightman, thank you for coming to our open house last night and for your emails. Regarding wind shear the exponent typically ranges from 0.10 to 0.40. The low end of the range corresponds to a smooth terrain (e.g. sea, sand and snow from 0.10 to 0.13). A wind shear of 0.25 corresponds to a rough terrain (i.e. with sizeable obstacles). The high end of the range (0.40) corresponds to a project in an urban area. A value of 0.14 is a standard value for rural Southern Ontario."</i> <p>This cannot be correct as the nearby Adelaide wind project reports a value of (.46). The Kent Breeze noise report (Hatch Consultants) has a summer night time value of (.42). What's needed now is the summer night time data that Garrad Hassan used to calculate the much lower value of (.26). The anomaly must be explained.</p> <p>It is rather curious that the value stated is higher than the "generic" value that Mr. Cobb quoted in his letter of Aug.27. According to Wm. K.G. Palmer, P. Eng. retired from Ontario Hydro who specialized in risk management had this to say about</p> </li> </ol>	See # 18	January 19, 2011	See # 18

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
 Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
				<p>low wind shear value, "Any firm in Ontario that is using a wind shear of 0.14 for average summer night time values is frankly not telling the truth. This is a significant issue, and should not go unchallenged."</p> <p>I have raised this issue before in a letter to Minister Wilkinson, 2010/08/28. I expect that the subject residents deserve accurate and truthful measurements and statements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. There is no noise contour map provided.</li> <li>6. No "Noise Impact Summary" is provided for the receptors.</li> <li>7. At the August public information meeting, Mr. Cobb personally assured my daughter Esther Wrightman, that a "shadow flicker" analysis would be provided. It is not in the report.</li> </ol> <p>I am displeased that this project report is void of important, mandated information for its noise report. I am incensed that the company believes it can use a wind shear value that all involved in the permitting process know is highly suspect. We have been through this before with the MOE, and I expect that the MOE will insist on proper records and data.</p> <p>Brooke/Alvinston residents deserve accurate, complete, and truthful measurements and statements. I expect to see all the points I have raised to be fully addressed before the next "consultation meeting" on Feb. 17.</p>			
17	Harvey Wrightman	Email	January 6, 2011	<p>Please forward these comments also:</p> <p>From the layout map in the Brooke/Alvinston Wind project PSR (sic), it appears that 3 turbines are less than 300m from the hv lines at distances of 229m, 234m, and 279m. Thus two of the turbines do not comply with the current Hydro setbacks. I would add, that Wm.K.G.Palmer, P.Eng, MIT, retired from Ontario Hydro nuclear division, has previously raised the issue of safety setbacks for wind turbines. Mr. Palmer notes that GE Energy recommends an ice throw setback of 1.5X(hub height + rotor diameter). In this case it would be 1.5 X (80 + 100)m = 270m. As the turbines increase in height and rotor diameter, the problem increases. A rigid, one size standard becomes less appropriate. There are more wind projects planned near this line and the other 230kv line from Courtright through Inwood, Alvinston. The risk will increase. I would strongly suggest that Hydro is not adequately protecting all of its high voltage transmission lines and needs to review the policy.</p>	See # 18	January 19, 2011	See # 18
18	Harvey Wrightman	Email	January 19, 2011	<p>Dear Mr. Cobb,</p> <p>It's been 2 weeks since you promised to "get back to you." The Alvinston meeting is only 4 weeks away (Feb.17). The information I asked for is required for an REA certificate from the MOE, hence in the public domain. I presume your response will come shortly so that I will have some time to review it before the meeting - public consultation is supposed to be an open process.</p> <p>Waiting patiently for your reply,</p>	<p>Dear Mr. Wrightman,</p> <p>This email is a follow up to your request on January 5 and January 6 for more information regarding our project in Brooke-Alvinston, Lambton County.</p> <p>Green Breeze has been diligent in our efforts to be fully compliant with the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) process as mandated by the Ministry of Environment (MOE) regulations. Working with our partners, Garrad Hassan and Stantec, Green Breeze will ensure that we have met or surpassed all the requirements as set forth in the REA. We have and will continue to consult with the appropriate regulatory agencies to ensure that this is the case.</p> <p>Regarding your specific questions:</p>	January 19, 2011	See # 19

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
 Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
					<p>1. SOUND - The project will meet the sound requirements as laid out by the MOE. We are also completing an additional Noise Impact Assessment report that will address additional sound issues. We would be happy to forward a copy of that report to you once it is complete.</p> <p>2. FLICKER - There is no requirement for a flicker study in the REA process. However, Green Breeze believes it is important in our role as a member of the Brooke-Alvinston community to be proactive with respect to this project and how it may affect the community. We are currently doing a flicker study on the area within 1.25 kms of the project.</p> <p>3. TRANSMISSION LINES - Though the MOE and HONI have been in discussions around this issue, there currently are no setback regulations for Wind Turbines from Transmission lines outside of the normal right of ways that HONI has in place now. The MOE is aware of our turbine locations.</p> <p>I hope this addresses your concerns with respect to our project. Please feel free bring to my attention any other questions or comments that you may have. Public consultation is an important part of the REA process.</p>		
19	Harvey Wrightman	Email	January 19, 2011	<p>Dear Mr. Cobb,</p> <p>Your response response is insufficient in detail.</p> <p>1) Where is the noise study? Is this not one of the primary studies that has to be provided? You state that, "an additional Noise Impact Assessment report..." will be provided. This should be available to all residents. Timeline please???</p> <p>Next up, you say nothing about the SPL and the octave band spectra of the Samsung 25xc wind turbine . Read again my query and answer the questions about SPL. You have NOT complied with the MOE's reg's re: the sound output of this machine. Again, this is information that residents have a right to know. Your non-response to me is stonewalling or negligence. <b>I should think that Samsung should have the correct information available for the exact turbine model.</b> Other wind turbine manufacturers are able to provide it. Samsung, please provide the info?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise report states the SPL for the Samsung 25xc turbine for wind speed only to 8m/sec at which speed it is only producing 1.072 MW or 43% of nameplate capacity. Tech bulletin 6, March, 2010 states on pg.3, "Specifications for sound power level used for determining setbacks correspond to the sound emitted while operating at 95% of nameplate capacity." That's a huge discrepancy to account for and the SPL should rise accordingly.</li> <li>The rotational rate of the 25xc is stated as a "nominal" value of 14.35rpm - what is the maximum rotational rate? The rotational rate can go higher according to the Pike report, certifying engineer.</li> <li>The octave band sound power levels are not in the noise report - another</li> </ol>	<p>Dear Mr. Wrightman,</p> <p>In response to your last email, please find the additional Noise Impact Assessment, dated February 15, 2011, attached. We look forward to seeing you at the Open House.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	February 16, 2011	N/A

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
 Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
				<p>lapse in documentation as required in "Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms, 2008" Se.6.2.2, "The acoustic emissions of the wind turbine must be specified by the manufacturer for the full range of rated operation and wind speeds. As a minimum, the information must include the sound power levels, frequency spectra in octave bands, (63 to 8000 Hz), and the tonality at integer wind speeds from 6 to 10 m/s. The acoustic emission information must be determined and reported in accordance with the international standard CAN/CSA-C61400-11-07,Reference (5)."</p> <p>2) Thank you for assuring us that a shadow flicker analysis will be presented - at the 2nd open house or before I presume.</p> <p>3) Re: setbacks from high voltage lines. 2 of the wind turbines are closer than the 250m setback recommended by Hydro. This information I received from Mr. Wm.K.G.Palmer,P.Eng., retired from Ontario Hydro. Mr. Palmer's specialty is "risk assessment."</p> <p>From a letter I sent to Enza Cancilla, Manager of Public Relations of Hydro One in November 2008:</p> <p>"I was encouraged to read in your letter that Hydro One now commits to update Appendix C of the Draft EA Report for the Bruce to Milton Project. You committed to incorporate the information communicated in your letter to me of November 3<sup>rd</sup>, such as to record technical directives for a required wind turbine setback from Hydro One transmission assets – from July 2008 to the present time, of setbacks of 500 m from 500 kV assets, 250 m from 230 kV assets, and 150 m from 115 kV assets. Your letter also states that "In those situations where wind turbines are closer to the right-of-way than permitted by today's technical directives, we have a provision in our operating agreement with the turbine operator that, in emergency conditions, permits Hydro One to order a particular turbine, group of turbines, or the entire wind farm shut down to ensure public safety to safeguard life, property, or the environment. This provision is intended to mitigate a situation in which the risk of turbine failure is higher than what is normally expected or in which a turbine is interfering with maintenance activities."</p> <p>Unfortunately Hydro has never formally upgraded its "technical directive" into a standard. And, Green Breeze and other wind companies take advantage of this regulatory vacuum (and the MOE, which should know better, turns away with a wink and a nod). Of course the risk remains of either blade throw or ice throw that could knock out a line and create havoc with the grid - think the NE blackout of a few years ago caused by maintainance issue in Ohio. - but not YOUR problem, is it? By the way, it is troubling that neither Hydro nor the MOE has taken action on this obvious and preventable risk - you are after all, just following the rules. In this case, you must know the lack of rules needs correction. Details, especially with regards to physical safety, matter.</p> <p>Lastly, I challenge you to produce the data that supports the wind shear coefficient of (.26) being used by Garrad Hassan for the not yet tabled, "noise report." If you are so certain of the provenance of that figure, simply produce the data. I note that no other wind project is claiming a coefficient so low. Today I looked at another ESR for Capital Power's Port Dover/Nanticoke wind project and saw that the author of the noise report, "Zephyr North", is using a wind shear coefficient of (.5) . Low-balling this factor has huge implications for the noise report. Are you not aware of that? So show us that GreenBreeze engages in open discussion. Show us the data records that produced this wind shear value.</p>			

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
20	Brandon Moffatt	Email	February 16, 2011	<p>I wouldn't expect the MOE could issue a REA certificate with such large holes in the information and data package provided. I seek only to help you identify those holes.</p> <p>Rob &amp; Brent,</p> <p>We wanted to provide you with the details of our correspondence with the MOE. We had a conference call with the REA lead this week and we're looking forward to discussing it with you at the meeting on Thursday night.</p> <p><i>Mansoor,</i></p> <p><i>We met previously and we wanted to follow up with you on a few questions regarding a wind farm that is going up next to my family farm in Watford, ON. We attended the first public meeting and have reviewed the REA reports to understand the intentions of the developer as we are the landowners directly adjacent to the facility on the west and north sides. We attempted to set up a meeting with the developer to review the project details (layout optimization while minimizing impacts) however our requests were not responded to. Therefore, we wanted to send you a few questions prior to the final public meeting on Feb 17th. We're supportive of the industry and the government's position on renewable energy and the need for local distributed generation. However, we want to ensure that all of the appropriate studies are completed in accordance with the government regulations/policies.</i></p> <p><i>a) Our main question relates to setback distances in terms of noise setbacks. The developer installed a meteorological tower at a height of 60m and was able to determine that the long term wind speeds at this height were 6.4 m/s and calculated that the long term wind speeds at 80m were 6.9 m/s. Do they need data at 80m instead of the 60m height as they could be wrong on the wind speed and therefore have a higher acoustical output. We tried to find the industry correlations to no avail, what is the industry standards for these calculations? They are also going to be installing the Samsung 2.5MW wind turbines, which produce 103.6 dba at 6 m/s / 105 dba at 7 m/s / 105.4 dba at 8 m/2. Therefore, since they are installing 4 turbines and since the wind speeds (&gt;6.4 m/s) are on average producing greater than 103 dba, shouldn't the study distance likely be increased to 600 - 850 m at a minimum. Also, we haven't seen any data on the top wind speeds which should produce more noise and thought it would require additional details from the turbine supplier, noise consultant and developer. Can you let me know if I'm understanding this correctly? We also know that other developers are looking to build in our area and the setback distances may change based on the number of turbines within 3 km of each other, can you explain how the cumulative effect of these farms are studied prior to installation of the first one and the cascading effect of the additional farms?</i></p> <p><i>b) Our second question relates to setback distances in terms of property line setbacks. In their reports, they state that the lot line setback is the blade length plus 10m (59m). However, we weren't consulted even after we requested a meeting on a couple of occasions. What is the procedure as it states that it can be discussed however we didn't think that the intention was to drop immediately from hub height to blade height plus 10m? It also states that the turbine setback overlaps with an agricultural cash crop land by 46.6 m however it is a pasture where we keep cattle. Is there any differentiation between cash crop and livestock grazing in terms of classification?</i></p> <p><i>c) A few other related questions:</i></p> <p><i>1. The electrical specification report on the Samsung 2.5 MW wind turbine is signed</i></p>	<p>Dear Mr. Moffatt,</p> <p>Thank you for forwarding the email below, for attending the Public Open House held February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 at the Brooke-Alvinston-Inwood Community Centre, and for your completed questionnaire.</p> <p>Please note that we take your statement that meeting "requests were not responded to" very seriously. Unfortunately our records do not contain any requests for a meeting between yourself and Zephyr Farms Limited. If you could please forward any copies of correspondence you have requesting a meeting, we will review our consultation protocols to ensure such a situation is not repeated in the future.</p> <p>Regarding your questions, we are happy to provide the following information:</p> <p>a) As per our conversation at the February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Open House, we understand that these questions have been answered by the MOE. Attached please find a supplementary noise impact assessment conducted for the Project at the request of public feedback. Please also find a Shadow Flicker Assessment conducted for the Project at the request of public feedback.</p> <p>b) Please note that the base of the nearest wind turbine to your property line is further than 100 m, which is outside of the 80 m setback requiring a property line setback assessment. A property line setback assessment has been conducted for a property to the east of the Project Location, which we understand is not property owned by yourself.</p> <p>c)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Samsung turbines will be signed off by an Ontario Professional engineer prior to operation, as per applicable CSA requirements.</li> <li>ii. As outlined in the Natural Heritage Assessment Report, a monitoring program will be undertaken to determine the Project's impact on birds and bats, the outcome of which may include operational constraints.</li> <li>iii. Potential impacts from ice fall/shed are outlined in the draft REA reports available for public review. As discussed at the February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Open House, any claims of damage to properties outside of the Project Location will be directed through Zephyr Farm</li> </ol>	February 25, 2011	N/A

Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm  
Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
				<p>off by a Texas PE. Should it not be signed off by an ON P.Eng?</p> <p>2. Are the turbines allowed to operate in foggy conditions both in the construction phase as well as the operation phase due to the potential impact on migratory birds?</p> <p>3. Any instances of ice fall on livestock?</p> <p>4. We also haven't seen anything in the reports describing the acoustical attenuation around the transformer. Are you able to provide more details on this?</p> <p>We look forward to hearing back from you.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please let us know. Thanks, Brandon</p>	<p>Limited's insurance policy. Please note that, to add clarity to this matter, a similar statement has been added to the 'Public Health and Safety' section of the Design and Operations Report.</p> <p>iv. Please note that no transformers over 50 kV are a component of the Project, and therefore no acoustical attenuation around transformers is required.</p> <p>If you have any further comments and/or questions regarding the Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm please do not hesitate to contact me directly. While it is expected that a REA application will be submitted shortly to the MOE, Zephyr Farms Limited will continue to respond to comments and questions through the life of the Project.</p>		
21	Harvey Wrightman	Email	February 19, 2011	<p>Dear Mr. Cobb,</p> <p>I attended the "2<sup>nd</sup> Open House" for the Brooke/Alvinston Wind Project and have noted that some much need and required information was missing or provided late for the meeting. In particular, I find the company is acting in a negligent fashion in having <b>NO</b> project documents on the tables for review during Open House. I cannot recall this happening at any other Open House for other projects that I have attended. This is contemptuous treatment of this community and the MOE requirements.</p> <p>These comments/questions re: the Brooke/Alvinston (Zephyr) wind project need to be addressed before any REA is issued for the project. Kindly provide the answers in full.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reveal the correct wind shear coefficient or release the mast data to back up the low figure. The stated coefficient (0.22) on pg.25 of the Addendum to the Noise Report is only a value used by the manufacturer, <u>not a real summer night time value for South western Ontario</u>. As I have detailed in previous correspondence, 3 other wind projects provide values greater than (0.40). If this project is truly so different, all the mast data must be made public for review. The stated value (0.22) is not consistent with known values in the same general area. Further to this, why does the main noise report state a value of (0.26)? There in no consistency to this at all, and I remain highly suspicious of the figures being proffered. <b>State the actual night time summer wind shear coefficient per MOE "Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms." - and provide the all the wind mast data to back up any significant variance from what other studies have found.</b></li> <li>2. Provide the Sound Power Level (SPL) emissions of the Samsung 25 XC wind turbine that corresponds to 95% of full nameplate power as per CAN/CSA-c61400-11-07</li> <li>3. Add the vacant lot noise figures to the report. They are not to be found in the original NIA of August, 2010, nor in the NIA addendum, Feb.15, 2011. <b>Mr.Cobb, please explain your assertion made at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Open House, "We don't have to do those."</b> (in reference to including co-ordinates for vacant lot receptors.). This is contrary to what is stated in the MOE's Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms 6.3.3</li> <li>4. Complete the "Wind Turbine Acoustic Emissions Summary Table 3" as per</li> </ol>	<p>Dear Mr. Wrightman:</p> <p>Thank you for your email and for attending the public open house on February 17<sup>th</sup>. With respect to your queries and statements I can provide the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With respect to your queries 1. through 5, and 10, the noise assessment documents are compliant with the noise assessment documentation requirements of the regulation and will be assessed by the Ministry of the Environment. Having said that, we are happy to provide the following answers to your request for additional information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The shear value does not have an impact on the noise as a conservative approach to the maximum sound power level has been taken into consideration for the NIA.</li> <li>2. The 95 % of full nameplate power corresponds to the maximum Sound Power Level as the turbine does not rotate quicker.</li> <li>95 % of the maximum of the Samsung 2.5 MW model 25XC = 2.375 GW which is reached close to a wind of 12m/s (see power curve in section 3.1 of Samsung specification) and the maximum Sound Power Level is reached for wind above 10m/s.</li> <li>3. Vacant lots have not been considered in the NIA as the project is agriculture areas and residential.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>The MOE guideline does not specify dwellings location within the vacant lot but MOE agreed to locate the dwelling in a pertinent location (along the main road for</p>	February 23, 2011	N/A

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
 Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
				<p>"Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms." The table provided is incomplete.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application of the +3dB adjustment factor as is stated in ISO 9613-2 Worst Case Scenario Value of +3 dB is to be applied. It is stated on pg.11 of the NIA, but is not indicated nor applied to the values in Table 7-1: Wind Turbine Noise Impact Assessment Summary - Watford (sic) Wind Farm.</li> <li>A further 60 day penalty should be added to the application as the NIA addendum with the most important, though incomplete noise information was not published until Feb.15, 2011, only two day before the final public information meeting.</li> <li>The applicant should be required to hold another public meeting with a complete information packet available for public inspection and review. <u>NO project documents were available at this meeting.</u> A very important part of the meeting was "unavailable." When asked "<b>why no project documents?</b>" <b>Mr.Cobb stated that, "...they wanted to save trees.</b>" This reply shows contempt for public input. This is more than frustrating because you couldn't even discuss the draft without it present. We were told many times to '<b>view it online</b>'</li> <li>We were told that Green Breeze didn't have to do any bird or bat studies because apparently "no bird or bats live in the project area" (the project area consists of small circles around each turbine).</li> <li>Only after a promise was made by project manager John Cobb and many e-mails to the company, were we able to get rush printed copies of the noise and shadow flicker maps tacked on to a scribble board at the Open House. <b>What happened to the 60 days to review period?</b> People living in the vicinity had never seen these maps before- how were they supposed to comment on something so important in one night?</li> <li>There were no noise representatives available. The only person who we were directed to was a Stantec rep. that nobody finds particularly helpful. I asked Mr. Cobb, "<b>Why no rep from Garrad Hassan, he replied, "...didn't think to ask them.</b>"</li> <li>The location of 2 turbines to the 230 Kv line is closer than Hydro One's "technical directive" would allow (250m). The turbine locations should be moved to respect this directive.</li> </ol> <p>The attitude of Green Breeze/OneWorld displayed before this community has been one of contempt. No REA should be issued until they have fulfilled all their obligations to the community.</p> <p>The MOE is obliged to with hold anREA until these issues are addressed. The municipality is within its rights to with hold approval and issue no building permits.</p>	<p>instance). The project is mainly surrounded by agriculture land so there is a low risk that a vacant lot be zoned as "residential" and more specifically a hypothetical house could be within one (1) of the two (2) iso-contours related to 1.5 and 4.5 m agl.</p> <p>4. Table 3 in the "Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms" filled :</p> <p>Same issue than point1, the NIA is based on the maximum Sound Power Level of the turbine.</p> <p>&lt;&lt;Table Removed Due to Size Limitations – available upon request&gt;&gt;</p> <p>5. ISO9613-2 its title is "Attenuation of Sound During Propagation Outdoors".</p> <p>As mentioned in the section 6 of the NIA report, "The estimated accuracy of the ISO 9613 method, as stated in ISO 9613-2, is <math>\pm 3</math> dB". This is not in the industry standard to include this uncertainty in our propagation model, as it is an uncertainty it can be plus or minus 3 dB.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With respect to your statements 6., 7. and 9. copies of the project documents were present at the Open House but as you assert, not on display. This included the draft REA documents posted for the 60 day review as well as the Shadow Flicker report and the supplementary noise document (supplementary documents that were developed at your request). The draft REA document has been available to the public for over 60 days to review on line and in hard copy at the Brooke-Alvinston Township Office. All of the REA documentation, including all supplementary documents will be available for public review and comment for a period of 30 days following submission of the final REA documents.</li> <li>With respect to your item 8. a natural heritage assessment has been completed for the proposed project and submitted to the Ministry of Natural Resources for their review. We have received written confirmation from the MNR with respect to the adequacy of that report and the natural heritage assessment work completed and discussed therein.</li> <li>With respect to your item 11. as answered in an</li> </ol>		

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
					<p>earlier email to you, there currently are no setback regulations for Wind Turbines from Transmission lines outside of the normal right of ways that HONI has in place now. Hydro One representatives have inspected these locations and no interference to the operation of the Hydro One assets is anticipated by Hydro One.</p> <p>We regret that you see our attitude towards the community at large as contemptuous. Notwithstanding we will continue to engage the public and inform them of the progress of this proposed renewable energy project and welcome any and all comments and questions regarding the proposed project.</p>		
22	Ruth Leitch	Open House #2 Questionnaire	February 17, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good – but I'm still not sure this is building a better place for our children and grandchildren.</li> <li>• Never, never build these in our lakes.</li> <li>• Not sure there has been enough independent study of health issues. These require considerable funds and may be a reason that a university or other groups has not done this.</li> <li>• I appreciate the information that has been sent to me since the 2010 open house. I question whether the Green Energy Act really has the best interests of the people of Ontario. Has the coast associated with 'green energy' projects been compared? Is this the best way?</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Ms. Leitch,</p> <p>Thank you for attending the Public Open House held February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 for the Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm at the Brooke-Alvinston-Inwood Community Centre, and for your comments in the Open House Questionnaire.</p> <p>As you are aware, Zephyr Farms Limited has retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) to prepare a Renewable Energy Approval (REA) Application, as required under Ontario Regulation 359/09 - Renewable Energy Approvals under Part V.0.1 of the Act of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> (O. Reg. 359/09). It is intended that the REA Application would be submitted at the end of February 2011.</p> <p>Please note that, after the Application is deemed complete by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE), the Project will be posted on the MOE Environmental Registry. Within 10 days of this posting, Zephyr Farms Limited will send out notifications via local newspapers and the Project contact list.</p> <p>If you have any further comments and/or questions regarding the Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm please do not hesitate to contact me directly.</p>	February 25, 2011	N/A
23	Brandon Moffatt	Open House #2 Questionnaire	February 17, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, the information was helpful however very little info beyond what was shown during initial meeting and limited info on differences from one meeting to the next.</li> <li>• Need details on imperials calcs on wind speeds at different heights than wind test data and impacts on noise assessments. Need disclosure of any other planned with farms within 3 km radius of entire site. Would like section on compensation for damage to crops or livestock if occurred during construction or operation. More details on noise mapping, shadow flicker, ice fall and operation in foggy conditions.</li> <li>• Does electrical spec report require signoff by ON P.Eng.</li> <li>• Does another turbine layout work to maximize electrical output while not</li> </ul>	See #20	See #20	See #20

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
				encroaching on setback requirements and minimizing impacts on neighbours for noise, shadow flicker, etc.?			
24	Clare Moffatt	Open House #2 Questionnaire	February 17, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What affects are on livestock that are pasture, close to the area?</li> <li>• What covers damages or death of these animals if something occurs?</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Clare Moffatt,</p> <p>Thank you for attending the Public Open House held February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 at the Brooke-Alvinston-Inwood Community Centre, and for your completed questionnaire.</p> <p>Please note that potential impacts from ice fall/shed are outlined in the draft REA reports available for public review. Any claims of damage to properties outside of the Project Location will be directed through Zephyr Farm Limited's insurance policy. Please note that, to add clarity to this matter, a similar statement has been added to the 'Public Health and Safety' section of the Design and Operations Report.</p> <p>If you have any further comments and/or questions regarding the Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm please do not hesitate to contact me directly. While it is expected that a REA application will be submitted shortly to the MOE, Zephyr Farms Limited will continue to respond to comments and questions through the life of the Project.</p>	February 25, 2011	N/A
25	Mark Van Lieshout	Open House #2 Questionnaire	February 17, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Stantec people were helpful but did not answer my questions about an independent health study for compensation in property value.</li> <li>• Independent health study</li> <li>• Compensation for loss in property value. If you could address these two issues you would have a lot less opposition to these turbines in Brooke-Alvinston Township and all over Ontario.</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Mr. Van Lieshout,</p> <p>Thank you for attending the Public Open House held February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 at the Brooke-Alvinston-Inwood Community Centre, and for your completed questionnaire.</p> <p>As presented at the Open House in a display board titled 'Wind Turbines and Health', to-date much study has been done on the effects of environmental sound on human health. Government medical agencies have reached the conclusion that while annoyance may be of concern, there does not appear to be a direct link to human health.</p> <p>Regarding impacts to property values, Ontario data to-date suggests that wind plants have a neutral effect on property values, which is consistent with North American and international trends and experiences.</p> <p>If you have any further comments and/or questions regarding the Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm please do not hesitate to contact me directly. While it is expected that a REA application will be submitted shortly to the MOE, Zephyr Farms Limited will continue to respond to comments and questions through the life of the Project.</p>	February 25, 2011	N/A

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
<b>Agency</b>							
1	Mario Lavoie, DND	Email	July 20, 2010	I have reviewed your proposal in respect to DND radiocommunication systems, and I have no objections. Our folks in Trenton will be reviewing in respect to DND radar systems. Thank you.	No response required.	N/A	N/A
2	Lillian Yao, EC	Email	July 20, 2010	<p>Thank you for contacting the Meteorological Service of Canada regarding your Brook-Alvinston wind energy intention.</p> <p>Our preliminary assessment of the information you provided to us via your email indicates that any interference to the nearby weather radar(s) that may be created by your project will be minimal. As a consequence, we have no concerns at this time.</p> <p>If you change your plans regarding turbine number, height, placement or materials, please contact us at: weatherradars@ec.gc.ca.</p>	No response required.	N/A	N/A
3	Chris Durand, SCRCA	Email	July 20, 2010	<p>A search of our files has resulted in very little that intersects your project study area (no benthic sampling sites, fish sampling sites, ESA's, ANSI's or Wetlands). In terms of Species at Risk, we would recommend you contact the NHIC for more detailed information. As for significant woodlots, this information should be available in the Municipal Zoning By-laws.</p> <p>The only information of interest would be our regulation mapping (Natural Hazards) that delineates areas where you would need a permit for development. This information can be provided through our inquiry service for \$100.</p> <p>Let me know how you would like to proceed and please forward your billing information if necessary.</p>	Obtained hazard lands shape file.	July 20, 2010	N/A
4	Sean Fraser, OHT	Letter	July 23, 2010	We have reviewed the study area site map that you provided and advise that, as per O. Reg. 359/09 s. 19 the Trust does not protect any property through a conservation easement on lands that will be directly impacted or visually affected by this renewal energy undertaking. However, we encourage you to contact the Ministry of Tourism and Culture, if you have not already done so, to confirm if there are any other cultural heritage interests noted in s. 19 which are affected by this project.	Contact list updated. Notice to Engage and Public Open House #1 forwarded to the MTC.	July 27, 2010	N/A
5	Janice Zeitz, INAC (on behalf of Don Boswell)	Email	July 29, 2010	Form email. Provided advice on identifying First Nations.	No response required.	N/A	N/A
6	J. Andrew Risk, DND (for +WindTurbines@forces.gc.ca)	Email	July 29, 2010	<p>Our responsibility is to assess the impact of wind turbine projects on Air Defence; Navigational Aide and Major Military Installations. In order to complete this in a timely efficient manner we request that certain/specific information be provided to us.</p> <p>As project planning progresses for each site we require certain information to conduct a proper assessment. In your first submission some of the key info relating to your site was not available and so we were unable to complete this assessment. We request that companies forward the following information when available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Name</li> <li>- Proposed location (e.g. Lat, Long) of each turbine, or Lat, Long of opposite</li> </ul>	Provided requested information.	August 3, 2010	N/A

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
				<p>corners of the area (assuming a rectangle);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ground height above sea level for turbine location(s);</li> <li>- vertical distance from the base of turbines to the centre of the nacelle; and</li> <li>- the length of the blades (to determine the disc diameter and maximum turbine radar height).</li> </ul> <p>For sites that do not impact any DND Radar or Nav Aids, you can usually expect an answer within five working days. Sites that require deeper study due to potential interference, usually take two to five weeks to assess.</p>			
7	Jen Long, Hydro One	Email	July 29, 2010	<p>In our initial review, we have <u>confirmed</u> that Hydro One Transmission facilities are located within immediate vicinity of the proposed site in your study area. Please allow appropriate lead-time in your project schedule in the event that proposed development impacts Hydro One infrastructure which requires relocation or modifications, or needs an outage, that may not be readily available.</p> <p>In planning, please note that developments should not reduce line clearances and limit access to our facilities at any time in the study area of your Proposal. Any construction activities must maintain the electrical clearance from the transmission line conductors as specified in the Ontario Health and Safety Act for the respective line voltage.</p> <p>The integrity of the structure foundations must be maintained at all times, with no disturbance of the earth around the poles, guy wires and tower footings. There must not be any grading, excavating, filling or other civil work close to the structures.</p> <p>Note that existing rights of ways may have provisions for future lines or already contain secondary land uses (i.e. pipelines, water mains, parking, etc). Please take this into consideration in your planning.</p> <p>Once details are known and it is established that your development will affect Hydro One facilities including the rights of way, please submit plans that detail your development and the affected Hydro One facilities to:</p> <p>Kent Taylor, Hydro One Real Estate Management 185 Clegg Road, Markham L6G 1B7 Phone: (905) 946-6230, Fax: (905) 946-6287 <a href="mailto:kent.taylor@hydroone.com">kent.taylor@hydroone.com</a></p> <p>Please note that the proponent will be responsible for costs associated with modification or relocation of Hydro One facilities, as well as any added costs that may be incurred due to increase efforts to maintain our facilities.</p>	Contact list updated.	N/A	N/A
8	Caitlin Scott, NRCan	Email	July 30, 2010	Noted that will become involved if a federal assessment under the CEA Act is required.	No response required.	N/A	N/A
9	Janet Drysdale, OGS	Email	August 10, 2010	<p>Regarding the proposed Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm Project in Lambton County, south-western Ontario, we have conducted an investigation and conclude the project is sufficiently distant from our seismo-acoustic installations to pose no concerns.</p> <p>Please note that Mr Jim Lyons has retired and future correspondence can be sent</p>	Contact List updated.	N/A	N/A

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
				or emailed to me or Dr. David McCormack instead.			
10	Lee Goldberg, Canadian Coast Guard	Email	August 13, 2010	Based on the information you provided, I can tell you that the proposed location of the wind farm is not located near any Coast Guard communication or radar facilities. Therefore, we do not expect any problems.	No response required.	N/A	N/A
11	Generic EnviroOnt Email, Transport Canada	Email	August 16, 2010	Noted that the proponent should determine where CEAA and the NWPA may apply to the project. Recommended that the Aeronautical Obstruction Form be completed.	Aeronautical Obstruction Form forwarded to project engineer, to forward on to Transport Canada	August 28, 2010	N/A
12	Heather Riddell, MNR	Email	September 3, 2010	Provided information on Natural Heritage, Post-Construction Monitoring, APRD Requirements and the Water Bodies Report.	No response required.	N/A	N/A
13	Paul Pinard, NAV Canada	Email	September 11, 2010	We are currently in the process on conducting an assessment of this preliminary study area but require the following information?  - maximum height of the turbines (including blades) - coordinates & ground elevation of each turbine (if available)	Provided requested information.	September 13, 2010	N/A
14	Linda Boeheim, CEAA	Letter	September 20, 2010	Form letter. Provided advice on when the CEAA would be triggered.	No response required.	N/A	N/A
15	Doris Dumais, MOE	Letter	January 4, 2011	Provided list of aboriginal contacts.	All contacts on existing Project Contact List – no action required.	N/A	N/A
16	J. Andrew Risk, DND (for <a href="mailto:+WindTurbines@forces.gc.ca">+WindTurbines@forces.gc.ca</a> )	Email	January 5, 2011	The results of our detailed analysis have shown that there will be no interference with DND radars.	No response required.	N/A	N/A
17	Paul Pinard, NAV Canada	Letter	January 19, 2011	We have evaluated the captioned proposal and NAV CANADA has no objection to the project as submitted.  In the interest of aviation safety, it is incumbent on NAV CANADA to maintain up-to-date aeronautical publications and issue NOTAM as required. To assist us in that end, we ask that you notify us at least 10 business days prior to the start of construction of the attached 4 turbines. This notification requirement can be satisfactorily met by returning a completed, signed copy of the attached form by e-mail at <a href="mailto:landuse@navcanada.ca">landuse@navcanada.ca</a> or fax at 613-248-4094. If any locations changes or additional turbines are added, a new Land Use Submission will be required as we will need to re-evaluate the file. In the event that you should decide not to proceed with this project or if the structure is dismantled, please advise us accordingly so that we may formally close the file.	Noted construction notice request.	N/A	N/A
18	Marc-Andre Millaire, INAC	Letter	January 14, 2011	Noted active litigation in the vicinity of the Project.	All aboriginal groups noted are on existing project contact list.	N/A	N/A

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
 Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
<b>Municipal</b>							
1	Jason Cole, Lambton County	Email	December 20, 2010	<p>The County of Lambton, Public Works Department has received the Notice of Final Public Meeting for the proposed Brook-Alvinston Wind Farm Renewable Energy Project. The Public Works Department is responsible for all County operated roads and publically owned land fill sites within the County of Lambton. In general, our department is responsible for permitting any entrances, right-of-way usage/crossings, oversize loads, or roadside advertising signs on the County Road network.</p> <p>Based on a review of the key map included with the notice, the Study Area does not directly impact County of Lambton Public Works facilities. However, the proposed project has the potential to influence the operation of nearby facilities, including the following in the vicinity of the study area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brooke Landfill Site, located at 4403 Walnut Road</li> <li>- County Road 79 (Nauvoo Road)</li> <li>- County Road 8 (Forest Road)</li> <li>- County Road 22 (London Line)</li> <li>- County Road 4 (Petrolia Line)</li> </ul> <p>Can you please identify and outline any impacts that the proposed project may have on these facilities, including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposed transportation and delivery routes of oversize/overweight equipment or material</li> <li>- Proposed location and type of transmission lines from the Transformer Substation to the greater network</li> <li>- Potential traffic impacts during construction or operation</li> </ul> <p>Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding this request.</p>	<p>Hello Jason:            A more detailed review and discussion of the project is provided in the Municipal Consultation Form and the accompanying documents sent to the County on September 29th, 2010 (see attached email). We will review the information you have provided below and be in touch soon to discuss the County's concerns.            Thanks and happy holidays.</p>	December 20, 2010	See #2
2	Jason Cole, Lambton County	Email	December 21, 2010	<p>Thank you for the information provided in your attached e-mail response. The following comments are offered based on our review of the Stantec Draft Renewable Energy Approval Reports for the above mentioned project, sent out to the County of Lambton on December 15, 2010 and distributed to the Planning &amp; Development Services Department:</p> <p>General            The project study area does not directly impact County of Lambton Public Works infrastructure based on its location, i.e. the project is not adjacent to County Roads or Landfill Sites. Therefore, it is not anticipated County permits will be required for entrances or roadside signage.</p> <p>Traffic Impacts            Access to the site will be obtained from the Township Road network. The largest potential for traffic impacts will be during construction of the Wind Farm. Traffic impacts to County Roads from construction supplies and equipment transportation will identified in a Traffic Management Plan, as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to be prepared by the Construction Contractor. Based on the proposed timeline, construction will be carried out over one construction season. Oversized and/or overweight loads will be required for</p>	<p>Thanks for this Jason. We will likely be in touch early in the new year to set up a face to face meeting with your department to discuss permitting requirements and timelines.</p> <p>&lt;&lt;Meeting conducted January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2010 with planning and public works staff from the Township and County – see Section 5.3 of the Consultation Report&gt;&gt;</p>	December 21, 2010	Meeting Required

**Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm**  
 Comment-Response Table

Record	Correspondent	Type	Date	Subject Matter	Project Response	Date of Response	Follow-up
				<p>delivery of the wind turbines and possibly other equipment. The report indicates that transportation routes will likely be directed from Highway 402 to the site. Any oversize or overweight loads requiring access to County Roads will require permitting as per County of Lambton By-Law 88 of 1998. The report indicates that any alterations or repairs to existing roadways as a result of construction traffic or to accommodate oversized deliveries will be the responsibility of Zephyr Farms. In addition, it should be noted that all contractors and subcontractors shall be made aware and abide by Seasonal Half Load Restrictions (County of Lambton By-Law 40 of 1998) and Heavy Truck Restrictions on County Roads (County of Lambton By-Law 39 of 2009).</p> <p>Pipeline/Utility Agreements on County Right-of-Way            Based on the Design and Operation Report, Transmission and communication lines will be located on private property or township right-of-way. The substation, located at Ebenezer Road, south of Churchill Line, will be connected directly to the Hydro One Network. It is not anticipated that any County of Lambton Pipeline or Utility Agreements will be required for this project.</p> <p>Please note that these comments pertain to items and requirements identified by County of Lambton, Public Works Department. Other County Departments and Local Tier Municipalities may have further comments and/or requirements regarding the proposed project. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or require further information.</p>			
3	Rick Holland, Township of Brooke-Alvinston	Letter	February 15, 2011	<p>Municipal Consultation Form Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Request for agreement on road use</li> <li>- Hydro poles to be located to the extreme side of road allowance, as to not impact on road maintenance</li> <li>- Building Code permit is required</li> </ul>	Information noted – no direct response required. Will continue consultation with both tiers of municipal government.	N/A	N/A
<b>Aboriginal</b>							
1	Raymond Deleary, Chippewas of the Thames	Letter	August 9, 2010	Provided thanks for the letter. Noted that their consultation staff will review the project and follow up with a letter indicating their interest.	No response required.	N/A	N/A
2	Suzanne Bressette, Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point	Letter	November 30, 2010	Introduced herself as the primary contact for the proposed project.	No response required, as already on Project Contact List.	N/A	N/A

# **Appendix K**

## **Agency Information Requests**



**Stantec**

**Stantec Consulting Ltd.**  
Suite 1 - 70 Southgate Drive  
Guelph ON N1G 4P5  
Tel: (519) 836-6050  
Fax: (519) 836-2493

---

July 19, 2010  
Stantec File: 160960567

Ministry of the Environment  
Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch  
12 A Floor, 2 St. Clair Avenue West  
Toronto, ON M4V 1L5

**Attention: Doris Dumais, Director, Approvals Program**

**Reference: Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm, RESOP CONTRACT 11836  
Draft Project Description Report**

Dear Ms. Dumais:

Please find enclosed the Draft Project Description Report for the proposed 10MW Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm.

This document provides a summary of the Project as required by Ontario Regulation 359/09 – Renewable Energy Approvals under Part V.0.1 of the Act of the Environmental Protection Act (“the Regulation”).

In accordance with subsection 14.(1)(b) of the Regulation, we respectfully request that you provide a list of aboriginal communities who have or may have constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights that may be adversely impacted by the project, or otherwise may be interested in any negative environmental effects of the project.

In the event that you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned. We look forward to your response and look forward to working with Ministry staff throughout the permitting and approvals process.

Sincerely,

**STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.**

Robert Rowland  
Senior Project Manager  
Tel: (519) 836-6050  
Fax: (519) 836-2493  
Rob.Rowland@stantec.com

Enclosure: Draft Project Description Report

CC. Brent Hall, Zephyr Farms Limited

## **Knight, Mark**

---

**From:** Knight, Mark  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 15, 2010 3:46 PM  
**To:** 'Heather MacKenzie'; 'heather.riddell@ontario.ca'  
**Subject:** Re: Zephyr Farms Limited Wind Project: Data Request  
**Attachments:** 60960567\_NHIC\_20100713\_CEW.pdf; NHIC\_SpeciesList\_CLIP\_20100712.xlsx; 60960567\_Fig1\_0\_ProjectLocationStudyArea\_20100715\_CEW\_lowres.pdf

Hello Heather and Heather,

Zephyr Farms Limited is proposing the development of a wind project which falls within your district.

The Project is located within Brooke-Alvinston Township, Lambton County. The Study Area is generally bounded by i) Churchill Line to the North; ii) Ebenezer Road to the West; iii) Old Walnut Road to the East; and iv) the mid-concession to the South. I have attached a Study Area map (which also contains any identified natural features and wildlife habitat indicators). Attached also please find a map of the NHIC grid and a list of identified species.

The Project was approved under the RESOP program and Zephyr is currently undertaking the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) process according to Ontario Regulation 359/09. Stantec has been retained to complete the Natural Heritage Assessment.

Stantec has initiated a records review to identify natural features and potentially present significant wildlife habitat in the vicinity of the project. The purpose of this note is to formally request any relevant data available for the Study Area. For SCRCA, as in the past, I assume you can simply invoice me for the Level 1 & 2 request?

We would appreciate receiving any available information (as relevant to your organization) related to:

- Info re: species at risk or their habitat: terrestrial and aquatic
- Fish and fish habitat data, thermal regimes
- Known seepage areas
- Other water bodies
- Any features that may be considered significant wildlife habitat (known bat hibernacula, raptor nests etc.)
- Wetlands: PSW, Non-PSW, unevaluated
- Any other natural features within the study area
- Hazard lands

We would also welcome any other relevant data. In addition, the above excel document contains one unidentified 'sensitive species' – if you could please ID for us.

Thanks so much. Please call/email if you have any questions.

Regards,

**Mark Knight, M.A.**  
Environmental Planner  
Stantec  
70 Southgate Drive Suite 1  
Guelph ON N1G 4P5  
Ph: (519) 836-6050 Ext. 218  
Fx: (519) 836-2493  
[mark.knight@stantec.com](mailto:mark.knight@stantec.com)  
**stantec.com**

The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately.

 Please consider the environment before printing this email.



**Stantec Consulting Ltd.**  
Suite 1 - 70 Southgate Drive  
Guelph ON N1G 4P5  
Tel: (519) 836-6050  
Fax: (519) 836-2493

**Stantec**

January 24, 2011  
Stantec File: 160960567

S. Mansoor Mahmood, P. Eng Ph. D.  
Supervisor, Renewable Energy Approvals  
Ministry of the Environment  
2 St. Clair Avenue West, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, ON M4V 1L5

**Reference: Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm, RESOP CONTRACT 11836  
Crystallization Date**

Please accept the following as information regarding the Crystallization Date for Zephyr Farms' Brooke-Alvinston Wind Farm Project in the Township of Brooke-Alvinston, Lambton County, Ontario. A Notice of Final Public Meeting (the Notice) was published in the Watford Guide Advocate on December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2010 and the Sarnia Observer on December 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>, 2010. The Notice provided a Site Plan which included all components required under s. 54 of the amendments to Ontario Regulation 359/09. Based on our understanding of the crystallization process, the turbine locations are now officially registered as being crystallized on December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

In addition to the Notice, a letter dated December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2010 was sent by email (to those for whom we had email addresses) or via Canada Post to all stakeholders on the Project contact list: federal agencies, provincial agencies, elected officials, municipal staff, special interest groups, Open House attendees, members of the public who provided comments, aboriginal contacts, and landowners within 120 m of the Project Location. The letter also included a copy of the Notice.

The letter to adjacent landowners included the UTM coordinates for the turbines. Please note that, since the time of this letter, micro-siting has adjusted the easting of Turbine #3 by 5 metres and the northing by 11 metres.

We trust that the information provided meets the intentions of the crystallization process, and appreciate your time and your staff's efforts on this matter.

Sincerely,

**STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.**

**Robert Rowland**  
Senior Project Manager  
Tel: (519) 836-6050  
Fax: (519) 836-2493  
Rob.Rowland@stantec.com

Enclosure: Notice of Final Public Meeting  
Sample Notification Letter

Cc. Brent Hall, Zephyr Farms Limited

**Stantec**

**BROOKE-ALVINSTON WIND FARM  
CONSULTATION REPORT**

# **Appendix L**

## **Meeting Notes**

## **Meeting Notes**



**Stantec**

### **MOE/REFO Meeting, Green Breeze Energy Inc.**

RESOP Contract: 11836

---

Date/Time: November 15, 2010 3:15 PM  
Place: EA Branch, 2 St. Clair Ave West, 12A Floor Boardroom  
Attendees: Mansoor Mahmood, MOE  
Narren Santos, MOE  
Samira Viswanathan, MEI/REFO  
John Cobb, Green Breeze Energy Inc.  
Brent Hall, Green Breeze Energy Inc.  
Mark Knight, Stantec Consulting Ltd.  
Rob Rowland, Stantec Consulting Ltd.  
Distribution: ALL

---

#### **Item:**

#### **Action:**

##### **Overview of REA Application Review Process**

MOE provided an overview of the REA application review process. It was noted that an initial review occurs to ensure the application is complete. Currently there are two evaluators on-staff. It was recommended that Green Breeze review their REA application against the 'Checklist for Requirements under O. Reg. 359/09'. It was recommended that Green Breeze inform the MOE of their intention to submit the REA application.

Green Breeze to include completed Checklist in REA application, and inform MOE prior to submitting REA application.

It was noted that, after being deemed complete, an application is posted on the EBR for typically 30 days. Concurrently, the MOE will begin their 6-month review guarantee. Currently there are six engineers on staff to undertake the review (noise, air, waste and wastewater).

MOE has agreed to expedite the review process as possible.

##### **Overview of Technical Reports**

Stantec advised that the Heritage Assessment is complete and has been accepted by MTC. It was noted that no impacts to protected properties, built heritage features or cultural heritage landscapes will occur.

Stantec advised that the Noise Assessment is complete. It was noted that all noise setback requirements have been met.

## **Stantec**

November 15, 2010 3:15 PM  
MOE/REFO Meeting, Green Breeze Energy Inc.  
Page 2 of 2

Stantec advised that the Natural Heritage Assessment (NHA) has received comments from the MNR, and a re-submittal is expected shortly. Concerns were expressed by Stantec regarding the timeframe for receiving original comments, and the timeframe for receiving the final acceptance letter. The MOE noted that RESOP projects should be given priority when under review by an agency.

MEI/REFO to facilitate a teleconference with Green Breeze and MNR to accelerate final acceptance. Green Breeze to advise MOE and MEI/REFO when revised NHA submitted to MNR.

Stantec advised that the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment has been submitted to the MTC, and that Stage 2 fieldwork is underway.

MEI/REFO to facilitate a teleconference with Green Breeze and MTC. MOE requests that MTC provide an acceptance letter allowing the Stage 2 work to be completed prior to construction; MOE would place a condition on the REA approval.

### **Consultation**

A discussion occurred regarding the importance of consultation in having a REA application be deemed complete. Stantec provided an overview of the status of public consultation and aboriginal engagement.

MOE will provide list of aboriginal communities shortly.

### **Crystallization Date**

A discussion occurred regarding the crystallization process. It was noted that the Project is not facing immediate landowner pressure. The MOE indicated that the crystallization process will follow the proposed amendments to O. Reg. 359/09.

Green Breeze to provide formal notice to MOE when crystallization has occurred.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 PM.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

### **STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.**

*Original Signed By*

Mark Knight, MA.  
Environmental Planner  
[mark.knight@stantec.com](mailto:mark.knight@stantec.com)

One Team. Infinite Solutions.