

From: [BoardSec](#)
To: [Janet Sakauye](#)
Subject: FW: EB-2012-0442
Date: January-18-13 12:33:54 PM

From: Janet and Jim Papple [REDACTED]
Sent: January-18-13 11:15 AM
To: BoardSec
Subject: Fw: EB-2012-0442

To the Ontario Energy Board re EB-2012-0442

We are writing with respect to the Ontario Energy Board (OEB) approval under consideration for the for the Bluewater Wind Energy Centre Project (NextEra). We would like to submit the following comments within your 30 day timeline and be observers to the OEB approval process, but do not at this time think we will need to intervene.

We understand that the OEB approval process is separate from the Ministry of the Environment approval process, but want to ensure that OEB approval in no way discourages NextEra from continuing to consider making improvements to the routing of their transmission line, and if possible, encourages them to do so. OEB approval should not be granted too quickly as parties are still negotiating and the project proposal has not yet been approved by the Ministry of Environment. If OEB approval is granted, it is our hope that subsequent improvements in routing would continue to be considered and the OEB would encourage cooperation between Hydro One and NextEra.

As property owners along the proposed transmission route, we are still negotiating with NextEra. Throughout the project planning process we had been lead to believe that a transmission route would be used that avoided coming too close to any existing residences. This is not the case. The preferred route included in the application for your approval goes very close to several residences, including ours.

We would like the 115 kv transmission line located 600 feet back further on our farm rather than the current proposed route on the road allowance

which is just 70 feet from our residence (right out our bedroom window) and right on our front lawn. The line is being located on our side of the road as there are existing Hydro One poles on the opposite side of the road. We are concerned about both the potential health impacts related to Electro Magnetic Field (EMF) exposure from having the line located so close to our residence, as well as losing the many old trees along the front of our farm and front lawn. Using the narrow road allowance for the ROW means the triangle configuration of the lines, which would minimize the magnetic field, cannot be used. It has been suggested that Hydro One bury their distribution lines so the transmission line could be across the road. This would save the trees, but since the right of way is only 66 feet and the lines would still hang out over the road, we do not feel the extra distance would be far enough to negate the potential impacts of the EMF.

The following information may help to explain why we are still in negotiations with NextEra and why the project application has not been approved.

Due to a flawed planning process, landholders were not able to make an informed decision about whether to allow/support an alternative transmission route that would have been better for the community. Landholders were not informed before their decision, that if an alternate route could not be agreed upon, the route would be forced along the road allowance which would be cleared of trees and have poles on both sides of the road. The current route on the road allowance is not supported by the many local landowners who believed that the transmission line would simply not go through the community if not allowed on their lands.

Based on the route that is now proposed, that is not as good as the alternative, the landowners may wish to change their decision. The OEB hearing and environmental approval process is preventing the company from re-approaching land owners on the alternate route to see if they would support a better alternative now that the one route option is understood. Given a bit of time and knowledge about the route that is being pushed through, I feel the better alternative route could be agreed upon, that would be less disruptive to homeowners, avoid the destruction of many roadside trees and keep the poles away from the roadside where they will inevitably be damaged by vehicle accidents. NextEra should be forced to revisit the alternative (originally their preferred route) and other

options now that it is known that the road allowance option means a set of poles on each side of the road.

The public process was not transparent nor participatory. The best alternative route at the back of farms was proposed as an option when NextEra representatives talked to property owners individually, but was never presented as an official alternative route for consideration to the public. The public meetings with panels (that NextEra mentioned in their application to you) only displayed a portion of the materials presented to property owners. If addressed as a group (as we asked NextEra to do) we would have all had the same information and answers. Maybe the neighbours would have had less fear of signing contracts and would have all realized the consequences for the community if they did not sign. With more time this probably could be solved but NextEra seems to have a deadline that is preventing the best alternative route from being pursued.

Hydro One has a policy of having a right of way of 50 feet on both sides of a 115 kv transmission line. With this in mind, it seems wrong to allow a company from the USA to construct a 115 kv transmission line on a 66 foot municipal right of way with no right of way on the property owners side of the line and within 70 feet of our home and even less distance from some other residences. There is also a discrepancy in the fact that the transmission lines can be constructed immediately inside the boundary of the municipal right of way even if the adjoining landowner has not signed a contract, and yet transmission lines need to be 50 feet inside the boundary of a right of way on private land in the same circumstance. In Section 41 of the Energy Act it is stated that the municipality has to let NextEra use the 66 foot right of way but we do not think this type of situation was ever anticipated and that this section of the Energy Act may need to be updated.

Lastly, because the strength of the Electrical Magnetic Field (EMF) increases so significantly between 300 feet and the transmission line, we feel sure that the 115 kv transmission line should not be constructed within 300 ft of an existing residence, let alone 70 feet as in our situation. Using the precautionary principle as recommended by the World Health Organization, the government should have been more responsible, looked ahead and insisted that the best routes for transmission lines be chosen to avoid EMF exposure. That would mean that all transmission lines should be 300 feet from residences for precaution even if land needed to be

expropriated or bought from the farmers still able to use it. We were deceived into believing this was the way it would be when we signed the contract for our other farms.

Both the MOE and OEB approval processes should be forcing NextEra to revisit the route alternatives before this less than satisfactory option is approved.

If so, we could possibly have green power with rural resident's support. If not possible could you please support us on rerouting the line to the south of our house to protect ourselves.

Janet and Jim Papple


