

FRASER MILNER CASGRAIN LLP

Helen T. Newland Direct Line: (416) 863-4471 helen.newland@fmc-law.com

VIA E-MAIL

April 30, 2010

Mr. David Richmond Manager - Electricity Facilities and Infrastructure Ontario Energy Board 2300 Yonge Street PO Box 2319, 27th Floor Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Mr. Richmond:

Subject: Talbot Windfarm, LP; Decision and Order Granting Leave to Construct; Board File No.: EB-2009-0290

I am writing to you on behalf of Talbot Windfarm LP, ("Talbot") and in accordance with paragraph 1.6 of the Ontario Energy Board's ("Board") Conditions of Approval in Appendix A to the Decision and Order in Board File EB-2009-0290. Paragraph 1.6 requires Talbot to advise the Board's designated representative of any proposed material changes in, *inter* alia, the construction of the Talbot Windfarm transmission facilities *vis-à-vis* Talbot's original application for leave to construct.

By this letter, Talbot advises that the Talbot Transmission Line (as that term is defined in Talbot's Application for Leave to Construct) will comprise a series of H-frame poles instead of a series of single poles, as contemplated in the original leave to construct application. Talbot does not consider this to be a material change but is advising you, as the Board's designated representative, out of an abundance of caution.

The use of H-frame poles instead of single poles will reduce the average pole height by approximately 10 metres (from 30 to 20 metres) and eliminate the need to anchor the poles with guy wires. It will also reduce the footprint impact of pole installation. Talbot's environmental consultant, Dillon Consulting ("Dillon"), has confirmed that the switch to H-frame poles will not affect its conclusions set out in the Environmental Screening Report, and may, in fact, reduce the

environmental impact of the Talbot Transmission Line. We enclose a copy of a memo by Dillon to that effect. We also enclose engineering drawings of the proposed new pole configuration.

Talbot confirms that the switch to H-frame poles will not affect neither the width nor the routing of the transmission line easement. Although the easement agreements do not preclude or otherwise constrain such changes, Talbot has taken steps to advise all of the its landowners of the proposed change in pole configuration. From the feedback Talbot has received, it appears that the landowners generally prefer the new configuration because of the increased span between poles and the resulting reduction in the number of required poles.

We would be grateful if you would confirm, as soon as possible, that the change to an H-frame pole configuration does not constitute a "material change" as per Appendix A. If, on the other hand, you should conclude otherwise, we would greatly appreciate receiving the Board's approval of the change described herein, as expeditiously as possible.

Yours truly,

(signed) H.T. Newland

Helen T. Newland

HTN/ko Encls.

cc: Nicolas Muszynski 56630308_1.DOC

MEMO



TO: Nick Muszynski, Renewable Energy Systems

FROM: Don McKinnon, Dillon

DATE: April 29th, 2010

SUBJECT: Revision to Talbot Transmission Line Pole Design

OUR FILE: 07-7382

In conducting the environmental assessment of the Talbot Wind Farm, the effects of the required 10 km 230 kV power transmission line were also evaluated, as documented in the Talbot Wind Farm Environmental Review Report (May 2009). When assessing the transmission line, it was assumed that the conductors would be supported largely by single poles. It is our understanding that due to subsurface soil conditions along the right-of-way, that the use of single poles would require the support of guy wires. As an alternative to the use of single poles and guy wires, double pole structures (H-frame) have been proposed. The use of H-frame structures are preferred over a single pole/guy-wire design for the following reasons:

- the H-frame structure would require a smaller footprint than a single pole/guy wire design and as a result, would be less limiting to the use of the surrounding agricultural land, within which the towers are located;
- guy wires can result in greater impacts to birds (less visible) than an H-frame design;
- with the use of an H-frame design, longer spans can be achieved and thus fewer poles/structures are required (every 300 m instead of every 100 m) as such, footprint impacts are reduced;
- the double pole design is shorter in height (20 m vs. 30 m) and as a result, would be less visible within the community.

Given the above reasons, we are supportive of the use of an H-frame design over a single pole/guy wire design. Further, it is our opinion that the effects and mitigation measures described in the 2009 ERR are applicable to an H-frame design structure. As such, no amendments to the ERR are necessary.

Should you have any comments or questions please do not hesitate to contact us.

Don McKinnon





