

Ontario Energy Board File No. EB-2012-0442

The “Group of Intervenor's” is being referred to as the “**group**”.

On reviewing the Applicant's pre-filed evidence, it is noted that they have made 50 points. The format used by the group is to number each of the 50 points to correspond to the pre-filed evidence and would like to question a number of these points as follows:

- (1) Varna Wind, Inc. (the “**Applicant**”) is a special purpose vehicle established for the development, construction and operation of the Bluewater Wind Energy Centre (BWEC).
 - (a) For this specific project, why is the Applicant incorporated under the laws of New Brunswick and not Ontario?
 - (b) Is this following the intent of the Provincial Government mandate?

The copy of the easement agreement submitted by the Applicant, as reviewed by the group, records an address in **United States** (Florida) for signing authority to bind the corporation. In the Open House sheets, provided under Exhibit G Tab 1 Schedule 3, the Applicant boasts that

“Over the next 20 years, we estimate the project will contribute:

\$166 million in corporate income tax

\$10 million in property tax revenue to Huron County

\$21 million in landowner payments”

- (c) Is the Applicant implying that they will be paying income tax on these wind turbines of 8.3 million dollars a year on this project alone **to the Province of Ontario**?
 - (d) Is the Applicant implying that they will be paying \$500,000.00 a year to Huron County on this project? How is this annual payment of \$500,000.00 being allocated between the Municipalities of Bluewater and Huron East?
 - (e) Is the Applicant implying that they will be paying \$1,050,000.00 a year to landowners for the 37 turbines, or \$28,378.38 per turbine per year?
 - (f) With the profits the Applicant reports, how can a small property owner along the proposed transmission line challenge anything against a company of this stature?
- (2) No comment.
- (3) The Applicant is seeking approval to construct and operate a transmission **facility**.

The Applicant has been awarded a 20-year power purchase agreement.
It is understood that the Wind Turbine contracts are also for a 20 year agreement.

 - (a) Why do all of the Option Agreements for the transmission line include for perpetuity?
 - (b) If others have an option to renegotiate, why are the property owners on the transmission line not given equal opportunity?
The turbines are mechanical and so they have a wear factor and a given life expectancy.
 - (c) When the turbines are obsolete or on the termination of the 20 year contract, if the Applicant does not renew the wind turbine contracts, exactly what is the Applicant's decommissioning plan?
 - (d) Does the decommissioning include the transmission line?
 - (e) What funding agreement does the Applicant have set up with the municipalities for the decommissioning?
 - (f) The world is paved with good intentions, but what are the guarantees from the Applicant that the decommissioning expenses are not left to the taxpayer?

- (4) The applicant states that they will be increasing the amount of renewable energy generation being added to the provincial grid. We disagree.

It is understood that when there is excess hydro, whenever there is wind and the turbines are turning, then the other source of green/renewable energy that of water at Niagara Falls has to be turned off or exported. The cheap green/renewable energy is turned off for the very expensive wind energy. So, at the end of the day, the same amount of green/renewable energy has been generated except for a lot more money which all of the people of the province of Ontario have to directly pay for via their hydro bills. We note there was an increase in the hydro bills effective January 1, 2013 to accommodate more renewable energy.

(a) Is the energy from wind turbines actually increasing the total green/renewable energy being used **in Ontario**?

We understand that the stats from HONI support that there is no real increase in any green/renewable energy from wind turbines. The nonrenewable energy generators need warm up time so cannot be turned on and off whenever the winds happen to blow and produce unpredictable quantities of power. Great idea if wind energy could replace nonrenewable energy or if the energy could be stored, i.e. Hydrogen production.

The economic slowdown, the restarting of the last nuclear phase, etc. have left the Province of Ontario with excess hydro at present and for the future. The excess hydro that is produced by the turbines could possibly be beneficial if it could be stored.

(b) Is the Applicant only taking their profits or is Applicant working on technology to improve the system?

(c) If so, exactly what are they doing?

- (5) The Applicant states that the location of the **facility** was determined by a strong interest expressed by local landowners. We very, very, very strongly disagree.

We agree that for more than a year the Applicant has been relentlessly trying to get all the properties signed, **on both sides** of Centennial Road and Hensall Road, the route determined by the Applicant.

The Applicant strongly suggested to us that the line was going through, on the route that the Applicant choose, no matter what. The landowners were told that they had a choose to sign the agreement and receive some money or the person on the other side of the road would get the money. Some landowners have stated that they signed because they felt they had no choice. It must be said that the properties, the Applicant has been able to get easement contracts on, are on properties where the owner does not reside on the property. One individual signed all of his properties except for the property where he personally resides. When the same person heard that the proposed route would in fact also be going by their home the local newspaper carried the story. The Huron Expositor, on Wednesday November 14, 2012, in the article headed "Tuckersmith family angry transmission lines to be 70 feet from their house" and the article states "We feel we have been deliberately deceived all along as at first they promised that they would never go by in front of our house...."

When Hydro One put up the new distribution line in 2004 on Hensall Road, Hydro One bent over backwards trying to accommodate all of our concerns, the environment, to keep the good farm land, etc. Hydro One worked with each and every landowner to ensure the least amount of impact for everyone.

Unfortunately, our personal experience with the Applicant has been extremely negative and eventually it got to the point that a number of the landowners felt that they had no choice but to ask the Applicant to stay off their property.

The group, in Tuckersmith Township, was started by us the land owners in response to the Applicant's tactics. In Tuckersmith Township, from the total of about 43 properties or so that the Applicant tried to sign, we believe from the pre-filed evidence that maybe 18% signed.

- (a) Is it the policy of the government to force the transmission line on any one person?
 - (b) We ask the Applicant to support their statement that the location was determined by the interest expressed by local landowners?
 - (c) Why was the Applicant trying to sign contracts for both sides of the road?
 - (d) The Applicant was aware that HONI would not allow their posts to be within 50 feet of the existing posts. Why was the Applicant trying to sign properties on the same side of the existing HONI posts with the contract only allowing for a 33 foot easement?
- (6) It is understood that the application to the MOE on June 26, 2012, has not been completed. We appreciated the individual notification to each property owner for the OEB hearings, information, deadlines, etc.
- (a) Why were the property owners **not** notified of the deadlines for submissions to the MOE?
- (7) The Applicant is applying pursuant to Sections 92 and 97 of the OEB Act.
- (8) List of Exhibits from the Applicant's pre-filed evidence.
- (9) Authorized reps for the purpose of serving documents.
- (10) Step up voltage from 34.5kV to 115kV.
- (11) Located in Huron County.
- (a) Could the Applicant please provide a map large enough so we can read all of the details?
- (12) The Applicant states that the BVEC and the Facility encompasses approximately 10,000 acres of privately owned land parcels, of which only 630 acres constitute the potential disturbance area for construction.
- (a) Could the Applicant please provide the evidence and documentation to fully support these figures?
- The Applicant states that the land is predominantly cash-crop agriculture. It however fails to mention the **very high** concentration of dairy farms along Centennial Road. The dairy cow being the most sensitive to ground currents should definitely be considered in this application.
- (b) Is the Applicant willing to take full responsibility for any ground current pollution?
- (13) The components of the Facility.
- (a) Will the proposed transmission line ever exceed the maximum 115kV?
 - (b) Why is this entire transmission line not being buried?
- (14) 37 GE 1.62 MW wind turbines will be constructed on a reinforced concrete foundation.
- (a) What guarantees do we have that the only hydro going through this proposed transmission line will be from these 37 wind turbines?
 - (b) Could the Applicant please advise of any Potential Build Out of the transmission line?

(15) Need for the Project

We feel that the mandate is not being met by wind turbines.

The article in the National Post dated Nov. 11, 2012 states that on Oct. 28, 2012 it was the windiest day of the year. The Ontario Wind farms were producing approx. 1450 megawatts, about 85% of wind capacity. Ontario was exporting almost that exact amount. At 3:00PM on Oct. 28, 2012 the wind was generating 1432 megawatts at a mandated rate of 13.5 cents per kw/h and exporting 1507 megawatts at less than 3 cents per kw/h. At 4:00PM on Oct. 28, 2012 it was producing 1450 megawatts from wind and Ontario was exporting 1425 megawatts at the same 80% discount.

On the windiest day of the year, Ontario exported all of the wind energy at a substantial cost to each and every Ontario citizen. The wind energy is **not being added** to the Provincial Grid and therefore we feel the project does not meet the need of renewable energy government mandate.

In the high energy demand summer months, wind routinely operates under 10% capacity. Wind is an unreliable source of energy at peak demands. Nuclear and coal hydro generation can not be shut off and started up every time the wind picks up or the wind slows down. We feel that wind energy should not be considered as all green because of all the good farmland being **forever removed** from agriculture. Using the numbers in the Applicant's application, every turbine removes about 4 acres of green space, which is not collecting sun energy via plants.

John Miner in the London Free Press dated Nov. 1, 2012, suggested that there are already 1,200 turbines in Ontario. This calculates that there are already 4,800 acres of farm land forever lost.

- (a) Could the Applicant please show us how does this project add renewable energy to Ontario's grid if it is all being exported?
- (b) How much credit is the Applicant giving for all the green spaced that is being lost forever?
- (c) How will the Applicant deal with the carbon credits to the property owners?

(16) (17) and (18) Project Planning

- (a) Why is the Applicant in such a hurry to push this project through?
- (b) If the Applicant continues to rush this project through, what responsibility will the Applicant take if the Federal Health Study finds negative health affects?

(19) (20) (21) and 22 Project Details

The Applicant states that a mono-pole configuration has been chosen for the Transmission Line.

- (a) Why did the Applicant choose 25 metre poles rather than higher poles to mitigate electric magnetic fields?
- (b) How will this power line affect someone with an autoimmune disease? Will this group member have to give up his/her home in order to maintain health?
- (c) Why does the Applicant include in the Easement Contract offered to the property owners that it may includes lattice or truss towers or structures?
- (d) Do the drawings include a ground rod at every post? Where does this stray voltage go? Is not the private landowners property being polluted with ground current? What compensation is the Applicant offering to the property owners for same?
- (e) Is the Applicant putting in a buried conductor along the entire line to minimize ground current pollution? If not, why not?
- (f) Is the cost of ground current pollution not the responsibility of the Applicant rather

then the innocent property owners?

(g) Has the Applicant considered burying the transmission line? Why or why not?

(23) (24) (25) (26) and (27) Design specifications and operational data.

We have concerns about the location and the staffing of the operation and maintenance (O&M) facility. Specifics are not provided. It is too open ended.

(a) Could the Applicant please provide more specifics on the O&M facility?

Land Matters

(28) (29) (30) (31) (32) (33) (34) (35) (36) (37) and (38) Description of Land and Land Rights

(28) The Applicant states that “The Corridor land rights have been acquired for the construction of the Facility....”

(a) What Corridor land rights did the Applicant acquire?

(b) Did the Applicant acquire all Municipal rights-of-way?

(c) Is the Applicant not being presumptuous here?

(29) Option Agreement – **The Transmission Easement Agreement**

We strongly urge the OEB under Section 97 of the Ontario Energy Board Act to decline the Applicant's application for approval of the easement agreement.

The Applicant states that all affected landowners were offered one or two standard form transmission easement option agreements. **This is not correct.**

(a) Why did the Applicant not provide an option agreement for each property?

Transmission Easements were not offered for all properties, along the proposed route. Some affected landowner's only exposure to the easement agreement was when they were shown a copy of the easement agreement by a neighbour, and now in the copy of “Varna wind Inc.'s Application and pre-filed evidence.”

(b) Could the Applicant please explain why they offer the same for a tract of land 10 metre by 30 metre (300 sq. metres) as for a tract of land 10 metre by 1,000 metre (10,000 sq. metres)?

Within the group this contract was shown to four different lawyers, all to get the same advice “DON'T SIGN IT”.

The Transmission Easement Agreement the Applicant is seeking approval for, reads more like a **purchase agreement** wrote up to circumvent local severance and zoning bylaws. A Lease Agreement has a time frame and this agreement calls for perpetuity. This agreement grants **zero** rights to the Grantor, making it a purchase agreement and not an easement agreement. The Grantor (current land owner) would still have the tax liability, agrees to **not** permitting vegetation, not granting any person right of way, without getting written permission of Grantee (the Applicant) in each instance. Essentially signing such an agreement would cut off access to the rest of the property. The Grantor must disclose all financial information pertaining to the property only to agree to a **gag order** as it pertains to the Applicant. No where in the agreement does it say that the Grantor has any rights to the property, but because it is described as an easement, the Grantor is still held in a position of **liability**.

(c) The written overrides anything promised verbally. If the farmer is not allowed to grow vegetation, it begs the question who than will assume responsibility for weed and vegetation control?

- (d) With the gag order, what guarantee is there that the easement agreement signed by the property owner is the one approved by the OEB?
- (e) Why does the General Easement Agreement include the entire property rather than the required 10 metre strip?
- (f) Why is there no mention in the contracts for any compensation for the very serious and harmful issues of soil compaction and soil disturbance?
- (g) Why is there no mention in the contracts for any compensation for the destruction of wind breaks?

Paragraph 12 of Easement **must be deleted** because it is a chill on future challenges.

- (h) Is the Applicant willing to delete this paragraph 12?

Paragraph 5.2 of the General Provisions states that “Each Party waives all right to trial by jury and specifically agrees that trial of suits or causes of action arising out of this agreement shall be to the Court.”

- (i) Could the Applicant please explain why this provision is necessary in the agreement?

- (30) The Corridor will have a typical width of 10 meters.
The Applicant states that “Poles placed within the Municipal rights-of-way will be located to minimize impact to landowners”

- (a) Why did the Applicant advise one landowner that if they did **not** sign then there would be 4 or 5 poles on his front lawn but if they signed then there would only be 1 or 2 poles?

- (b) Why did the Applicant advise another landowner that if they signed then they would have 1 or 2 poles in the front but if they did **not** sign then they would have more posts and possibly even one on the driveway?

The Applicant states that they may need temporary construction easements. This was not mentioned to any of the property owners. When the large equipment is in the field it compacts the soil. The wetter it is the more it compacts. Compaction is a major cause in the reduction in yields and it can take years and years to overcome.

- (c) Have any of these temporary construction easements been negotiated with any property owners?

- (31) The Applicant states that they had extensive discussions with all of the landowners. **This is not correct.** Is the Applicant referring to the two **mandatory** public meetings?

The group are the landowners. We feel the Applicant tried to divide and conquer. There were no meetings between the group and the Applicant. We feel that the Applicant used intimidation and many of us felt bullied by the Applicant to the point that we had no choice but to ask the Applicant to stay off our property. On this subject, we could write pages and pages of what we feel were threats made by the Applicant.

At the mandatory public meeting the Applicant's project Team Leaders boasted about their company but did not provide honest, consistent answers to our concerns/questions. They provided no facts, no pertinent information, but we perceived as simple Applicant's self promotion.

The Applicant followed the mandated procedures but from our experience they had no intention of deviating from their original plans. They did not address the expressed concerns of those directly affected along the proposed transmission route. Requested written information was not provided by the Applicant.

- (a) Does the Applicant feel that they accomplished what they

intended?

(32) Construction within the Corridor.

The Applicant states that they will need temporary pull sites typically 30 m X 30 m. Again, this was **not** mentioned to any of the property owners that we are aware of. Municipal right of ways are only 20 m wide.

(a) Does the Applicant plan to perform this within the Municipal-rights-of-way?

The Hensall Road is a major route for farmers with their tractors and wagons from Seaforth to Hensall as there are 3 Grain Elevators in Hensall.

(b) How will the Applicant take into consideration these farmers?

(c) Is the Applicant aware of the many inconveniences of any road closures and what are they willing to do about it?

(33) The Applicant states there will be approximately 12 Km of the transmission line located in the Municipal rights-of-way. The reference to Exhibit D, Tab 1, Schedule 2 does not provide Km.

(a) Could the Applicant please provide a map to scale that we can read all of the details.

(34) Interconnection Easement Option for the Breaker

(a) Is this the contract with the farm owner option to sell for the **plus 7 digit dollar amount** for just over **one acre** of land by the railway tracks opposite the Seaforth Hydro Station?

(35) Option to purchase for the Substation

(a) Is this the one located near the wind turbines?

(b) Why was this located on Centennial Road versus some other road?

(36) The Applicant states that care will be taken during detailed design to place the poles in the most accessible, upland areas available.

(a) Exactly who determines this? If an employee or contractor paid by the Applicant, is this not a conflict of interest?

(b) Who determines this excessive land disturbance?

(37) Provides a table of property required for the proposed Facility, the transmission line route.

For over a year the Applicant relentlessly tried to **sign both sides** of the road along both Centennial and Hensall Roads, which are located about 90 properties. It is noted that there are 16 properties signed plus HONI and 28 not signed. It is noted that the bulk of the properties signed are located west of London Road (Hwy. 4) in the Township of Bluewater.

(a) Could the Applicant please provide a more current Table if there were any changes?

(38) N/A

(39) **Alternatives Considered**

(a) Exactly what were the alternatives considered?

(40) The Applicant states that they employed a range of criteria in selecting the route.

We assume that the Applicant's referral to stakeholders are the Property Owners.

(a) Could the Applicant please state exactly, who they consider the "stakeholders"?

Public information meetings are a great public relations gesture but the Applicant's style did nothing to deal with the issues brought forward by the individuals most affected by the Applicant's plans. Self promotion of the Applicant at a public information meeting does little for the people that actually have to deal with the Applicant. The proposed route was predetermined before any public meetings and it just became a strategy to promote the Applicant's route.

We feel that the Applicant should have considered the following:

- i. The proposed line goes right past Huron Centennial School. The playground for the **elementary school children** could be 25 Metres from their proposed 115kV high voltage transmission line. When the Applicant was asked about this concern, they advised us that the school uses hydro too.

The Health Canada pamphlet "It's Your Health" dated January 2010 addressing EMF states, "....Scientists at Health Canada are aware that some of these studies have suggested a possible link between exposure to ELF fields and certain types of childhood cancer. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) has evaluated the scientific data and has classified ELF magnetic fields as being "possibly carcinogenic to humans."

- (b) Does the Applicant think that we are wrong in being concerned about our children's health?

- ii. There are a number of houses along the proposed route that are extremely close to the road. These homes and the trailer park, will have an even greater Electronic Magnetic Field (EMF) exposure than the rest of us. The 2010 Health Canada pamphlet, as referred to by the Applicant, indicates the EMF when indoors is weaker than electrical appliances. EMF is a factor of distance. Who stays within 2 feet of their appliances 24/7? Who locks themselves indoors especially when you reside out in the country? The transmission line does operate 24/7. Increasing the sources of EMF we assume affects health. Denial does not mean it does not exist. Refusal to acknowledge EMF by the Applicant does not maintain our health.

- (c) Is exposure to EMF cumulative since a resident will be directly under the transmission line more frequently the closer it is to their home?

- (d) What guidelines does the Applicant use for maintaining a minimal distance between the transmission lines and a home?

- iii. The Applicant has not taken into account the many livestock businesses on the proposed route. The Applicant proposed to build and maintain to the standards in place as livestock prescribed by the Distribution System Code & Electrical Safety Authority. We strongly feel that this is not good enough. HONI has **not** been able to eliminate stray voltage. So increasing the amount of transmission lines is likely to increase the probability of stray voltage. There are a number of livestock farms on the proposed route. Animals, especially dairy cows, are very sensitive to any stray voltage, even less than one volt can affect cattle. From what we understand, the Applicant will take no responsibility for any stray voltage. When deciding on the route, the Applicant did **not** take into consideration that there were 4 dairies within a 2 km stretch on Centennial Road. **This is the highest concentration of dairy cattle within the Township of Tuckersmith.**

In the newspaper "Ontario Farmer" dated Tuesday December 25, 2012, in the article headed "Stray voltage: still the sickness few want to talk about" it states that stray voltage affects production and in some cases even kills animals. The issue of stray voltage is so complex and difficult to understand that the general public just looks the other way. We are asking the OEB to please take the problem of stray voltage seriously.

In the newspaper "Rural Voice" dated January 2013, in the article headed "Dancing cows spell trouble" it states that stray voltage is not only restricted to cattle but also affects pigs

and other animals. It also states that a private member's bill was introduced in 2006 in the Ontario Legislature addressing ground current and it made it to second reading but was lost in the shuffle once parliament ended its session.

We have had personal experience with stray voltage and it is real. Our personal experiences are consistent with concerns raised in the newspaper articles.

(e) What will the Applicant provide to those farmers whose livelihood is dependent on the animals or the dairy cows?

(f) Exactly what is the Applicant's position on this very important issue of stray voltage?

(g) Exactly what responsibility is the Applicant willing to take for any complaints on stray voltage?

(h) Will these additional transmission lines interfere with any other electronic devices used in their proximity?, i.e. Cell phone, computer, radio, etc.

iv. The Applicant states that they took the route with the least number of residences. We disagree. The Applicant is rumoured to have had at least three proposed routes. **We were told by the Applicant that the Centennial and Hensall Road is the only route.** If the Applicant had completed their due diligence, should they not have come up with several routes and also shown some flexibility in the route?

In the report, the Applicant claims that they considered the other roads in the study area **between** the Staffa Road to the south and the Mill Road to the north and choose Centennial Road as the best road for the route. We challenge them to find any other direct roads running east west between the Staffa Road and the Mill Road. **Centennial Road is the only road.**

(i) Exactly what other routes did the applicant consider?

v. There are many beautiful mature trees along the proposed transmission line, they are normally found on the opposite side of the road of the existing HONI distribution lines. All of those hundreds of trees are now being threatened by the Applicant's proposed route on placing the transmission line on the opposite side of the road.

The many mature trees in front of the homes provide privacy, shade, wind break, atmosphere, country setting, in touch with nature, etc. Removal of these trees would take years to grow back and devalue our homes and properties. Also, the beauty of these trees is enjoyed by anyone who travels these roads. This is the county atmosphere that the Applicant wants to rob from society and replace it with high voltage poles and lines.

(j) Would the Applicant please explain how they plan to deal with this issue

(k) What proposals is the Applicant considering to minimize the detriment to the visual effects.

Property values are affected by visual affects and by actual and perceived affects of a transmission line even if located on the Municipal -right-of-way.

(l) Could the Applicant please advise how they intend to compensate for same?

(41) Selection Process – through consultations.

(a) Could the Applicant please provide the exact consultations they are referring to?

(b) In this paragraph does stakeholders mean the MOE?

(c) We understand, that the Applicant is saying, that the Applicant together with the MOE determined the route. Is this correct?

(d) If not, could the Applicant provide the exact details of any consultations before the route was determined with any other stakeholders?

We believe the Applicant had consultations with the MOE in order to meet the mandatory

REA approval. It appears to us that the Applicant has glazed over all of the other mandatory approvals to give the appearance that they had community involvement. We as a group feel we are the victims of this public relations exercise to enhance the Applicant's proposal. The message we the group got from the Applicant, is that the line is coming and the property owners have no recourse.

(e) We ask the applicant what they consider is consulting or engaging the property owners?

(42) The transmission line is 23 Km from the proposed substation to the Seaforth TS.

(43) Choosing the route.

The Applicant states that the back routes were disqualified due to unacceptable environmental impacts **OR** disinterested landowners.

(a) We ask for evidence to support the Applicant's statement.

(b) The group are the disinterested landowners. How can the Applicant suggest that the current route has landowner approval?

The Applicant states that there were several other roads considered but they were disqualified due to higher concentration of residences, large amounts of pre-existing infrastructure in the right-of-way **or** unacceptable environmental impacts.

(c) Exactly what other roads were considered?

(d) Was the major distribution line on the Hensall Road not considered?

(e) There is another wind turbine project from the Township of Bluewater also headed towards Seaforth. Why is that one on a different road only ONE road over the Hensall Road?

(f) Why can they not all be put on one line?

We are being exposed to another transmission line the very next road to Hensall Road. All along Lake Huron's west coast wind turbine projects are being proposed. A 500kv transmission line is already present running north south along all these wind turbine projects.

(g) If wind energy is as efficient as the proponents would have us believe, why do they not use this line to collect the energy from the turbines and direct the saved power from the Bruce towards Milton?

(h) Why are we polluting the country side with transmission lines?

(i) Why is our expertise not being used to do the renewable energy initiative right the first time rather than rushing these projects to completion?

We find this so very frustrating.

(44) Closing paragraph – transmission route

(45) After choosing the route they are now forced to deal with the obstacles.

(46) 8.5 km has no hydro structures in the municipal-right-of-way.

(47) 14.5 km has hydro structures in the municipal-right-of-way.

Do we understand this correctly, that it took the Applicant 4 months to determine that they can not co-locate on HONI's poles?

Are not HONI's distribution lines under 50Kv and the Applicant's 115Kv?

The Applicant could very easily not boost their line from 34.5Kv to 115Kv.

We ask the Applicant to provide one example in Canada that co-locates transmission lines and distribution lines.

- (48) The Applicant states that the negotiations continue with the remaining landowners.
(a) We the group are the property owners. We are unaware of any negotiations.
- (49) The Applicant proposes to construct 11.5 km of the transmission lines on private easements.
- (50) The Applicant states that they continue to engage with Adjacent Landowners, community residents, the Municipalities and HONI.
(a) Exactly, which continuing engagements is the Applicant referring to?

Following is the list of the 13 individual names (plus spouses), addresses, telephone numbers and E-Mail address included in the group

Beth Cooper
R.R. # 3, Exeter, ON N0M 1S5
519-235-4593
b.cooper@quadro.net

Matt and Elaine Haney
R.R. # 4, Seaforth, ON N0K 1W0
519-522-1375
matthane@tcc.on.ca

Chris and Angela Maloney
R.R. # 4, Seaforth, ON N0K 1W0
519- 522-0449
amaloney@tcc.on.ca

Darin and Julie McKenzie
R. R. # 3, Kippen, ON N0M 2E0
519-522-0086
dewju@tcc.on.ca

Tom Nolan
R.R. # 4, Seaforth, ON N0K 1W0
519-522-1648

Bill and Carol Stephenson
74362 Parr Line
R.R. # 1, Varna, ON N0M 2R0
519-263-5324
hollywoodstar40@hotmail.com

Ron and AnnThompson
R.R. # 1, Brucefield, ON N0M 1J0
519-263-2319
annthompson@tcc.on.ca

Arnold Van Miltenburg
R.R. # 4, Seaforth, ON N0K 1W0
519-522-0580
vanmilt@tcc.on.ca

Ben and Rose Van Miltenburg
R.R. # 4, Seaforth, ON N0K 1W0
519-522-2113
benrose@tcc.on.ca

Ed and Sueanne Van Miltenburg
R.R. # 4, Seaforth, ON N0K 1W0
519-522-1853
edsue4@hotmail.com

John and Mary Van Miltenburg
R.R. # 1 Hensall, ON N0M 1X0
519-235-4315

Tony Van Miltenburg
R.R. # 3, Kippen, ON N0M 2E0
519-522-2109

Al and Francis Wynja
R.R. # 4, Seaforth, ON N0K 1W0
519-522-0711

afwyja@tcc.on.ca