

Subject: **Wind Concerns Kneehill County Questions**
 Meeting Date: Tuesday, September 10, 2024
 Prepared By: Mike Haugen, CAO
 Presented By: Mike Haugen, CAO

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT: (Check all that apply)

	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
High Quality Infrastructure		Economic Resilience		Quality of Life		Effective Leadership		Level of Service	

RELEVANT LEGISLATION:

Provincial (cite)- N/A

Council Bylaw/Policy (cite)- N/A

BACKGROUND/PROPOSAL:

During the Council meeting on August 20, 2024, the Wind Concerns Kneehill County group presented to Council and provided a list of questions they would like answered. Due to time constraints, the Council was unable to discuss these questions during the meeting. As a result, a motion was passed to defer the discussion of Wind Concerns Kneehill to the next Regular Council meeting on September 10, 2024.

DISCUSSION/OPTIONS/BENEFITS/DISADVANTAGES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

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.

Administration Notes: The County regularly allows industry operations in road allowance ditches, such as the installation of water, power, and telecommunication lines.

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?

Administration Notes: The current LUB lists types of renewable energy developments within the Agricultural Zoning. The County sees applications after they have been approved by the AUC. As the AUC has already issued an approval, the County’s zoning does not impact the project moving forward. Forcing a rezoning would provide a venue, through Public Hearing, for affected individuals to speak, but would not impact a decision (the project could move forward even if the County denied the rezoning).



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?

Administration Notes: When a development of this nature is approved, it is normally conditioned that the developer enter into a development agreement, including a road use agreement. For items covered by these agreements, the County oversees compliance. For items conditioned by the AUC, it is unclear what ability the AUC has to ensure compliance. A road use agreement requires a developer to upgrade, repair, or fund the repairs of any road damage. Securities may also be taken to ensure compliance with the agreement.

5. As you can see from the previous PowerPoint, viewscapes 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?

Administration Notes: The County has addressed this in various ways with the AUC. Specifically the disparity between protecting views in some areas (like west of Calgary) and not in others (such as east of Calgary).

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?
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?

FINANCIAL & STAFFING IMPLICATIONS:

N/A

RECOMMENDED ENGAGEMENT:

Directive Decision (Information Sharing, One-Way Communication)

Tools:	Individual Notification	Other:	
--------	-------------------------	--------	--

ATTACHMENTS:

List of questions provided by Wind Concerns Kneehill County during their August 20th Delegation.

COUNCIL OPTIONS:

1. Council may opt to accept for information
2. Council may provide responses to the submitted questions.



RECOMMENDED MOTION:

That Council provide responses to Wind Concerns Kneehill County as discussed.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS:

Administration will send a response to Wind Concerns Kneehill County.

APPROVAL(S):

Mike Haugen, Chief Administrative Officer

Approved-

