

Questions for Council that we would like to see addressed after the Power Point presentation.

1. What is Kneehill County's position on collector lines with regards to renewable energy?

It is our understanding that the MD of Willow Creek changed their LUB to prohibit companies from putting 'collector lines' along municipal road allowances (improved or non-improved) and the company then had to re-route collector lines. (Willow Ridge wind project Proceeding 27837 at AUC). Additionally, in the Prominence solar project (27769) the AUC acknowledged that they do not have jurisdiction over land access and the County would have full authority to deny access for the collector lines on the road allowances.

2. Why is the Land Use not required to be redesignated from Agricultural to Industrial when in essence that is what these projects are: Industrial Power Plants?

3. Is Council aware that there is a private airstrip within the bounds of the proposed wind project? If the project is to proceed the program would have to eliminate a portion of their training that utilizes the airstrip. We have attached a letter from Prairie Aviation Training Center and their opposition to the project. When projects such as this start to interfere with existing business such as crop spraying and in this instance flight training, what recourse does the County have?

4. There are a lot of concerns regarding the construction phase of the project should it proceed. Who is responsible for making sure the company stays accountable for such things as dust control, traffic control, bus route protection, soil degradation, weed control; the list goes on. Who is responsible for road repairs after the inevitable damage that will be done? The County? So then in essence the ratepayers?

5. As you can see from the previous PowerPoint, viewsapes are an important concern to address. We are not in the coveted 35km buffer zone regarding pristine views. What constitutes a pristine view? Will Council be addressing this with the AUC?

6. We appreciate our Councils work regarding setbacks from WECS to 1.6 km. (Recently at a Town Hall Meeting in Olds our Premier suggested that the AUC is looking at setbacks from residences of 3-5 km. This would be most welcome. ) Would our council agree to look at increasing the setbacks to adjacent land as at present the setbacks are not nearly large enough?

If time allows:

7. We know that our Municipality has been frustrated by previous proceedings with the AUC. We are also aware that you are in the process of drafting a document for the AUC Rule 007 Review. We understand you have this on the agenda for later today but could you please clarify for us where you stand at this time?

If we are short on time, I can summarize this for our group after attending Council later in the day!

Additional information:

Recently our group invited Daryl Bennett to talk to our group to give us an idea of what to expect at the AUC proceedings. At that time, he indicated the following regarding the Three Hills Solar as well as the Capstone wind project. Please find the Proteus Decision attached. I have also included the Halkirk Decision in regards to the airstrip along with the letter from Prairie Aviation.

From Daryl Bennett

“... the Proteus Decision (Proceeding 28325) where the AUC comments on the jurisdiction of the municipality (paragraphs 40-42 and 56-62) to impose weed, soil erosion and other issues where they may be subject matter experts which is quite different from what they stated in the recent Proceeding 28086 solar project in Kneehill County. The County should also have authority over road use, fire safety and road safety.”