

Response to Applicants application to strike evidence:

The evidence of the Centennial and Hensall Road Group does NOT deal with “information about health impacts of wind turbines, the risks of fallen power lines, and a critique of the wind powered generation” as stated by the Applicant in their application to strike evidence.

The Applicant advised the OEB Board that, the issues in this proceeding, which the Board has reaffirmed on several occasion, most notably in Procedural Order No.1 herein:

“In this proceeding, the Board is required to consider only the public interest, which is defined as follows by subsection 96(2) of the Act:

1. The interests of the consumers with respect to prices and the reliability and the quality of electrical service.
2. Where applicable and in a manner consistent with the policies of the Government of Ontario, the promotion of the use of renewable energy sources.

Board approval of the form of easement agreements is within the scope of the Board’s jurisdiction pursuant to section 97 of the Act. The Board does not have the power to consider any other issues.”

The evidence submitted by the Group does include:

In point #1, the interests of consumers with respect to prices and the reliability and quality of electricity service.

In point #2, the promotion of renewable energy sources “in a manner consistent with the policies of the Government of Ontario.”

The applicant may not like the evidence but that does not mean that the evidence does not directly deal with the relevant sections under the jurisdiction of the OEB.

In addition, we are including the Fraser Institute Study which also addresses these same concerns under the relevant subsection 96(2) of the Act.

We respectfully submit that the evidence submitted by the Group should be given full weight as evidence.

The Municipalities are on record as being unwilling hosts to the Wind Turbines and Power Lines. The policy of the Government of Ontario is that they will not be forced on those who do not want them. We and the municipalities do not want them. Approval of the project would be going against the policy of the Government of Ontario.

The group agrees that the Applicant should be denied, based on the easement agreement, pursuant to section 97 of the Act. We stated our view in point #29 of the previous submission which included,

“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 written 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 same tax liability, agrees to NOT permitting vegetation, not granting any person right of way, without getting written permission of the Grantee(the Applicant) in each instance. Essentially signing such an agreement would cut off access to the rest of the property. 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.

The Grantor must disclose all financial information pertaining to the property only to agree to a GAG ORDER as it pertains to the Applicant.

We agree with the Municipalities and with the HON1 that ALL the Transmission Lines should be buried. The Applicant has indicated that burying the Transmission Line will cost too much. HON1 has indicated that the burying of lines will only cost just over \$300,000.00. The applicant, as we understand, in order to get land for the substation by Seaforth, has paid over a MILLION dollars for an acre of land!

The Applicant is very good at advising the OEB Board what the Board can and cannot do. Is this because the Applicant thinks or knows that the OEB has no power and that the Applicant has all the power under the Green Energy Act?

It is understood that, to date, no wind turbine company has been denied by any government regulatory body. If this motion from the applicant is accepted it would suggest the OEB has no power and is being forced by the Green Energy Act to rubber stamp all application.

All the power has been taken away from the Municipal Government and property owners. The project is being forced upon us. We ask the OEB, who is going to be held responsible for all the negative affects of the project?

Are we all puppets on a string being held hostage by the Applicant hiding behind the Green Energy Act?

Respectfully,

Contacts:

Ed Van Miltenburg

[edsue4@hotmail.com](mailto:edsue4@hotmail.com)

519-522-1853

John and Mary Van Miltenburg

[vanmilt@tcc.on.ca](mailto:vanmilt@tcc.on.ca)

519-235-4315