

OMBUDSMAN ONTARIO: GENERAL COMPLAINT FORM

First Name: Neil Address: 2721 Caistor Centre Road , RR#1
Last Name: Switzer Contact City: Smithville
Province: Ontario
Postal Code: L0R2A0
Phone No: 905-957-2163
Email: neilswitzer@live.ca

Submission Date: April 28, 2014

The Ombudsman Office hours of work are Monday to Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. (EST). Please indicate the best method and time to contact you:

The most reliable method to reach myself, Neil Switzer is by email but I may be contacted weekdays at work at 905-336-1158 ext 2245 or cell 905-691-3722

1. What government organization or agency is your question or complaint about?

***The Ontario Ministry of Environment (MOE)
Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch***

2. Who have you dealt with in this organization with respect to your complaint?

Issue 1 – MOE breach of duty re: Heritage Comments

Sarah Raetsen, Senior Program Support Coordinator
Victor Schroter, Director Environmental Approvals Branch
Agatha Garcia-Wright Director Environmental Approvals
Paula Kupla, Heritage Planner, MTCS

Issue 2 – MOE Negligence/Abuse of Power

Victor Schroter, Director Environmental Approvals Branch
Agatha Garcia-Wright, Director Environmental Approvals
Sarah Raetsen, Senior Program Support Coordinator
Kim Groombridge, Niagara District Manager
Steve Green, Niagara Compliance Officer.

3. Please summarize the matter you are complaining about and include any relevant dates.

Issue 1 – MOE Ontario Heritage Act Contravention/ Breach of Duty/Misuse of Power re: Heritage Assessment Comments:

The proposal for EBR Registry Number 011-7795 (Vineland Power) was posted to the Registry on December 13, 2013 for a 47 day commenting period. On January 27, 2013 I submitted my comments (see attachment 1) outlining why I considered the submitted Heritage Assessment as incomplete. As I stated in my comments:

“Should the existing Unterman McPhail Associates Heritage Study been conducted in a more comprehensive and professional manner it would have discovered that the proposed 5 industrial wind turbines **are located within 400m to one of Ontario’s oldest and almost forgotten native and Upper Canada Trails** that stretches some 35km (22 miles) from the

Grand to the Forty (Grimsby). A cursory look at the historic and prehistoric context of this trail indicates that **this trail is of major significance from both a First Nations and early Canadian perspective** as witnessed by the direct connection to significant historical figures, events and features associated with this trail and their contribution to the very existence of this country”.

My complaint in this matter is not that the consultant only did a cursory historical assessment that led him to conclude that:

“a review of the historical background of the study areas, the site surveys and municipal consultation information **determined the potential heritage value and interest for the five (5) wind turbine sites was low.** And subsequently since there are no direct impacts and minimal indirect impacts to the five (5) proposed wind turbine sites, there are **no mitigation recommendations in regard to heritage resources,** i.e., built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes for the project”

Nor am I complaining that Paula Kupla, Heritage Planner for the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) took the Unterman McPhail report at face value without closer scrutiny and subsequently concluded that:

“Based on the information contained in the report you have submitted for this project, the Ministry is satisfied with the heritage assessment. Please note **that the Ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of the heritage assessment report**”.(see attachment #2)

My complaint stems from the fact that my submission on the EBR (as per attachment #1) regarding the incomplete nature of the heritage was **given no consideration whatsoever** because my comment was not forwarded on to the proper authority (MTCS) or the heritage consultant for reassessment and **this I submit is a direct breach of duty on the part of the MOE and a misuse of power.** I base my claim on the fact that on June 24, 2013 I phoned Paula Kupla directly to discuss what additional assessment report(s) or revisions were made in response to my EBR comments to which she replied that she couldn't recall any revised heritage assessment or notice of any negative comments received on the report that she had previously reviewed and deemed “acceptable”.

Further it appears that the MOE in their quest to satisfy ministerial directives to implement the Green Energy Act are overstepping their professional training and expertise and making judgement calls on areas totally outside their expertise, knowledge field or professional training. Comments regarding heritage assessment deficiencies should have been forwarded to the MTCS and heritage consultant for review, resulting in report revisions and subsequent revised MTCS comments. Failure to have done such circumvents proper due process and I submit is **breach of duty and misuse of their ministry's legislated power** which also in fact would be **in contravention of the Ontario Heritage Act.**

In addition to my comment to the EBR it should be noted that EBR comment # 154926 (attachment #3) also informed the MOE of this potentially significant native trail which unfortunately likewise was also apparently ignored.

The Ombudsman Office should **take notice of this fragrant abuse and take immediate action** as the subject wind energy project EBR 011-7795 is **currently under re-evaluation for a potential amendment** to their Renewable Energy Approval resulting from setback contraventions to adjacent properties with four of their five industrial wind turbines in contravention of their Renewable Energy Approval (see amendment attachment #4). Notably for the amendment to be approved it must comply with the Renewable Energy Approvals regulation (O.Reg. 359/09) under which Vineland Power must demonstrate that they have met the applicable cultural heritage requirements and be compliant with the Ontario Heritage Act. If new information comes to light after the MTCS has provided written

comments, the 2011 MTCS “Information Bulletin for Projects Subject to O.Reg.359/09” stipulates that “the heritage consultant shall discuss any changes to the heritage assessment report with the MTCS prior to submitting an application for a REA (or amendment) to determine if further MTCS review is needed and if a new written comments letter will need to be submitted to the MOE”.

Obviously the withholding of pertinent heritage information as formally submitted on the EBR from the MTCS and the heritage consultant by MOE staff previously and currently does not allow either the MTCS or heritage consultant to properly perform their duties and the previous infraction by MOE will be repeated again unless the Ombudsman’s office can call the MOE to account and make them follow Provincial rules and regulations.

Currently Vineland Power’s amendment application was submitted stating that there are no changes to the original application from a heritage perspective and subsequently the MTCS has responded that their comments of March 2, 2011 will still apply. However the MTCS and the heritage consultant still have not been made aware of the previous objections of shortcomings of the submitted heritage assessment and subsequently **I implore the Ombudsman to notify the MOE and the MTCS that the March 2, 2011 MTCS comments regarding** EBR Registry Number 011-7795 (Vineland Power) are under question and investigation by the Ombudsman’s office and MTCS’s previous comments **should not be considered valid for EBR 011-7795 amendment purposes** until the Ombudsman office can complete it’s investigation. The investigation should centre on my submission that the MOE failed to forward pertinent EBR comments to the MTCS or heritage consultant regarding the existence of a significant ancient native and pre-Confederation trail (attachment #1) immediately adjacent to the proposed industrial wind turbine project for due and proper consideration under Ontario Reg. 359/09 and **failure to correct such would constitute a contravention of the Ontario Heritage Act.**

Please note that this complaint recognizes that the aforementioned trail has no official heritage designation at present but if properly screened under O.Reg. 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act as a cultural heritage landscape, it certainly would be deemed a “potential heritage resource” meeting the following criteria based on my initial historical findings (attachment #1):

- The property has historical and associative value as it has direct linkages with historic themes, events, persons and groups and thus contributes to the understanding of the community and Canadian culture.
- The property has contextual value defining and supporting the character of the area and is historically linked to

Hence as a “potential heritage resource” the heritage assessment report should have included a “Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI) in accordance with O.Reg. 9/06 stating why this trail is important and explaining the cultural meanings, associations and connections of the trail to ancestral Canadian and native roots.

Without full disclosure and sharing of information formally submitted to the MOE the present heritage assessment is unquestionably deficient and without such information the heritage consultant falsely concluded that the impact of turbine construction would be “low” and subsequently no consideration was even given to mitigating the impacts on this significant heritage treasure.

Unfortunately the implications of the **MOE’s attempt to withhold and suppress pertinent cultural heritage information** from the MTCS and heritage consultant not only offends and contravenes Provincial legislation it also **constitutes a major insult to our First Nation brothers and co-founders of our Canadian Nation.** Immediate action on this issue by the Ombudsman may avoid an embarrassing situation which otherwise left unaddressed will further inflame and destabilize the delicate balance between the Province and the First Nations of this Province.

Issue 2 –MOE Breach of Duty/Misuse of Power re: Property Line Setback Deficiency:

The Provincial government's much touted "most stringent setback regulations in all of North America" for wind turbines has quietly been abandoned by the Province as proven patently false by multiple examples across Canada and the United States (attachment #5). Nonetheless the MOE still fails to enforce or ensure compliance with their inadequate setback regulations.

In mid October 2013 Anne Meinen ,an immediate neighbour to Turbine #3 in a conversation and follow-up email of Oct. 22 with Mr Brian Treble, Township Director of Planning, questioned the apparent side yard setback deficiency of turbine #3 to her property line (see attachment #6). Her email reads:

"Section 53 of O.Reg 359/09 re: setbacks of wind turbines.....states " prohibits a proponent to place a turbine closer than the height of the turbine to a property boundary (unless a Property Line Setback Assessment is completed)...I presume that as the owner of the property boundary I would have been involved in the completion of such a property line setback assessment!!".

Mr Treble forwarded Mrs Meinen's comments on to the MOE on November 3rd and on November 5, 2013 Sarah Raetsen, Senior Program Support Coordinator, MOE Approvals Branch replied stating (attachment #7):

"To ensure safety of neighbouring properties, all wind facilities with a nameplate capacity of 50 kilowatts or greater (Classes 3, 4, and 5 in O. Reg. 359/09) such as the HAF Wind Energy Project **must be located a minimum setback distance from neighbouring property boundaries**. This minimum setback distance is equivalent to the hub height of the wind turbine. The hub height of the wind turbines for the HAF Wind Energy Project is 95 metres".

"In their Renewable Energy Approval application, Vineland Power Inc. indicated that all five wind turbines for the project were sited a minimum of 95 metres from non-participating property line boundaries. As the company met the minimum setback distance, it was not necessary to complete a Property Line Setback Assessment."

Mrs Meinen recognized that while the MOE had accepted the wind company's word that the 5 turbines met the required setback of 95 metres, she didn't believe such to be true and with the help of myself and Anita Merritt measurements were taken with a rangefinder clearly indicating that the 95 m setback was not provided on three of the turbines that we had measured.

Owing to the fact that the township had issued the building permit and knowing that under the standard practices of the Ontario Building Code, any non-compliance of approved setback distances triggers the issuance of a "Stop Work Order" until the matter is resolved, Mrs Meinen and the adjacent impacted property owners submitted a letter to the Township for immediate redress (attachment #8). However as the Township had been threatened with a lawsuit for not issuing the building permit as fast as the wind company wanted, the Township sought legal advice on this matter and was told to refer the letter to the Ministry of the Environment for resolution.

Unfortunately and to the utter disbelief of the neighbours the MOE upon learning of this serious potential infraction still allowed construction to continue despite the powers and duty bestowed upon the Director of the MOE to potentially take immediate action as permitted under 47.5 of the EPA which states "If in his or her opinion it is in the public interest to do so, the Director may do any of the following:

- (a) alter the terms and conditions of a renewable energy approval after it is issued;
- (b) impose new terms and conditions on a renewable energy approval; or
- (c) suspend or revoke a renewable energy approval."

The lack of a normal standard response to this non-conforming building construction situation confirms

a clear double standard and misuse of power as practiced by the MOE on behalf of the wind industry that no other constructor in Ontario would ever be able to get away with.

Although the MOE was notified as of the potential setback deficiencies prior to project approval through EBR comments (attachments #9,10) and again on November 3, 2013 with the Meinen email of October 28, 2013,(attachment #6), it wasn't until early January that the MOE finally asked Vineland Power to verify the actual locations with a proper legal survey. Once completed the survey confirmed the setback deficiencies as submitted by the neighbours which thereby verified that four of the five turbines were in violation of the project's REA.

With respect to EBR comments submitted by neighbours regarding setbacks, the MOE justified the subsequent approval with the stated justification as published on the EBR stating:

I recommend the Ombudsman's Office carefully read the letter to Vineland Power dated January 17, 2014 (attachment #20) from Mr Steve Green, Senior Environmental Officer, MOE. This letter I believe accurately describes the situation with respect to the legislation and associated regulations before the Ministry concocted a means to legitimize the offence. Green wrote:

“According to Ontario Regulation 359/09, wind turbines that are proposed for approval that are less than the hub height from non-participating property line boundaries **require a written submission at the time of application** demonstrating that the proposed location of the wind turbine will not result in adverse impacts on nearby business, infrastructure, properties or land use activities. Your email indicated that five distances relating to 4 turbines are being verified to confirm the setback distance to non-participating property line.”

“The approval for REA #1590-979LNP **was issued based on the information that was submitted as part of your company's application**. No written assessment to reduce the setback requirements of section 53 of Ontario Regulation 359/09 was submitted. **The REA application stated that setback distances from non-participating property lines would be equal to the hub height of 95m for all project turbines.”**

“Therefore **the turbines are not constructed as approved and are in non -compliance** with the requirements of s. 53 of Ontario Regulation 359/09. The Environmental Protection Act states:186. (1) Every person who contravenes this Act or the regulations is guilty of an offence. R.S.O. 1990, c. E.19”

“It will be the decision of the issuing director whether or not to approve the amendment **given that the assessments for a reduced setback were to be completed as part of the application for approval**”.

However to accommodate the wind developer and legitimize the non-conforming project, please compare the letter of Agatha Garcia Wright of March 14th (see attachment #11) to the Green letter of January 7th and the actual Regulations to see how the MOE is liberally bending over backwards to assist the wind developer and actually imply that such amendments are commonplace and issued every day.

The grievous nature of the MOE's handling of the Vineland Power setback infractions is amply exemplified by numerous letters to the MOE and responsible Ministers (see attachments 15,16,17) all to no avail. The MOE breach of duty and misuse of power is further highlighted in the formal resolution unanimously passed by the Township of West Lincoln demanding that the four non-compliant turbines be removed and that a moratorium be placed on all further wind turbines until the MOE can ensure projects will only be erected in full compliance with the regulations without exception (see attachment #18). And finally the MOE actions as described above have been noted by the official leader of the opposition as reckless” and “careless” in a recent letter to the Minister of Energy (see attachment #19).

Therefore with respect to the setback infractions and MOE actions **I wish to register six distinct complaints** as set out below as it relates to either and/or breach of duty and misuse of power:

- a) Is it not incumbent upon the MOE to confirm that the proposed turbine locations met the required setback distance before granting approval especially since several comments submitted to the EBR prior to approval specifically stated:
 - “The distances to property lines are not shown on the site plans. Turbines 1, 2 and 3 appear to be within the limit setbacks and therefore a limit setback assessment report is required”. (see attachment #9).
 - We are against this project as the proposed turbines do not meet the official government setback requirements” (see attachment #10)
- b) Why did the MOE not inspect the construction site to ensure that the turbines were being constructed in accordance with the REA similar to the standard practices of every municipal building inspector for a building project and especially one such as an industrial wind turbine where as documented in the majority of comments posted on the EBR was not welcomed as an acceptable development within this community or by the immediate neighbours?
- c) Why is the MOE bending the rules to legitimize this “non-compliant violation” of the REA when the MOE’s letter of January 17th clearly stated that any property setback reductions could only be consideration at the time of the application with submission of a “Property Line Setback Assessment” which was not done because Vineland Power said they were compliant and the MOE just took their word without even checking.
- d) Why has the MOE deemed this amendment request to be so minor that of the four procedural routes for amendments to follow (see MOE “Technical Guide to Renewable Energy Approvals” and as described in the April 10, 2014 letter to Ms. Ortt (attachment # 21), the MOE is permitting Vineland Power to proceed along the easiest route which doesn’t include any real public consultation or posting on the EBR until after the EBR decision is rendered.
- e) The MOE is grossly over utilizing it’s power to safeguard the financial interests of Vineland Power while totally ignoring the increased financial losses to be incurred by the neighbours who now will have an even smaller setback than normally prescribed. The issue of Property Value Protection was repeatedly requested by the neighbours in submissions posted on the EBR (see attachments #12,13). Several professional studies by accredited real estate appraisers clearly show property value losses of 20 – 40 % or in several cases total loss as turbine noise and infrasound makes the house totally unliveable or un-saleable (see attachment #14). How else could you describe this grossly unfair oversight by MOE other than **breach of duty and/or misuse of power** when the MOE has been imposing “Property Value Protection Agreements” as a standard condition of approval for the last couple of decades on any incompatible or contentious development such as landfills etc.
- f) And finally I contend that Mr Vic Schroter, Director MOE in deeming the setback amendment to be of such a minor nature and subsequently only subject to the least rigorous submission and review process to be in contravention of the Public Service Act of 2006, O. Reg. 435/97, s. 7 (2) which reads:

“When performing his or her duties to the Crown, a public servant shall endeavour to avoid creating the appearance that preferential treatment is being given to a person or entity that could benefit from it”.

Issue 3 – MOE Breach of Duty/Misuse of Power re: Miscellaneous Examples:

The following three examples of reported Vineland Power infractions and MOE responses further documents the MOE’s Breach of Duty and Misuse of Power by various MOE staff members.

3a – Gas Well Issue

As stated by Anne Fairfield in an email to the Premier and Vic Schroter on February 5, 2014 (see attachment 22) the issue of the approval and construction of a buried electrical turbine collector line in extremely close proximity to two existing gas wells is not fair or proper and constitutes a breach of duty on behalf of the MOE and the MNR

“It is UNFAIR that your Ministries and Ministers do not enforce their own Policies and Regulations to the letter for all Ontarians, particularly in Environment and Natural Resources. It is UNFAIR that the Minister and Deputy Minister of MNR do not uphold their Ministry's Policies on Natural Gas Wells, wherein there shall be no construction within 75 metres of a Gas Well. It is irresponsible for them to accept a 2012 Engineer's Report that said the Electrical Collector lines would be on the South side of Sixteen Road and still within 75 m. That was before the proponent's Plans changed, and the collector lines have now been laid on the north side of the road WITHIN 5 METRES OF A 1911 GAS WELL.”

Further elaboration on the dereliction of duty by the MOE/MNR on behalf of the wind company is further described in Anne Fairfield's letter to the Ombudsman's office on December 5, 2013 (see attachment #23).

The ability for the wind company to arbitrarily relocate the electrical collector line to the north side of the road not only invalidates the engineer's 75 m safety infringement report upon which the original REA was granted but also now **highlights another error and omission of the current amendment** where Agatha Garcia Wright, MOE Director in her letter of April 14, 2014 stated “**No Modifications are being proposed** to the location of the turbines or **to the design of the project**” (attachment #5). Such careless review and misrepresentation of the built condition contrary to the approved plans further reinforces the Ombudsman's obligation to call for an immediate halt to the current amendment process until the MOE can implement proper due process in compliance with Provincial laws and Regulations.

3b – Asphalt Toxic Waste Usage

Another example of the MOE's “Breach of Duty/Misuse of Power” on behalf of the wind industry is their complicity in allowing Vineland Power to construct their access roads with a designated waste product despite the objections of the neighbours concerned with the potential for well water pollution. Upon review of Provincial Regulations you will find that recycled asphalt millings which if not reused within 120 days of milling **are automatically classified as “hazardous waste”** (Ontario Regulation 347 Section 3. (2) 18 ii A). Neighbours concerned with the potential contamination of their drinking water wells requested the MOE to test the material and adjacent soils for toxic leachate but again with no action from the MOE. Furthermore neighbours reminded the Ministry staff that the transporting of hazardous wastes in Ontario requires a special permit yet despite this obvious violation, no fines or actions were taken by the MOE against the wind company.

The only action taken by Mr Steve Green, MOE Enforcement Officer following inspection of the site was to inform Vineland Power that should they own other properties where asphalt is stored that it should comply with Ontario Regulation 347. Again another infraction by a wind company with total absolution granted by MOE without due process.

3c - Silt Fence

A further simple example of MOE's breach of duty is demonstrated by my complaint to Mr Vic Schroter on July 19, 2013 (attachment #24) regarding improper installation of construction siltation fencing for water quality protection as required under the REA. A reply to my complaint was provided

by Mr Steve Green, MOE Compliance Officer who stated that he had gone to the site and gave directions to correct the particular silt fence that I had notified them of. He acknowledged that it was not only improperly installed but also in the wrong location but that it had now been corrected by the contractor.

I asked Mr Green how many other silt fences were likewise improperly installed but “he couldn’t say as they only inspected the one that I had reported”. I asked who inspects and oversees that all the MOE Conditions of Approval are complied with and he said it was his office. I asked as to the frequency of schedule of inspections and he said **they only inspect upon total completion and commissioning of the wind farm unless a complaint is received!** I said that likely all the other silt and erosion control fences were similarly installed in a similar careless manner but that we the public don’t know or can even inspect them as we are forbidden to trespass on private property. He admitted he didn’t know about the compliance of the other siltation fences as no one had complained about them.

While perhaps minor in the grander scheme of the Provincial billion dollar implementation of green energy it does however further exemplify how the MOE is failing to provide due oversight of construction to ensure compliance with imposed conditions of approval and that I submit is another example of MOE breach of duty.

4. Summarize what steps you have taken to try and resolve your complaint including any grievance, appeals and/or requests for reconsideration you have submitted and what response you received.

Myself and hundreds of local residents have participated and submitted comments during the Vineland Power’s public open house sessions and we also formally submitted 396 comments to the EBR during the 47 day commenting period (attachment 25) all to no avail and apparently to deaf ears. The MOE response to such serious and peer reviewed complaints was a brief and callous posting to EBR which just repeated the standard and extensively disputed government political party line (attachment 26).

We have further engaged in telephone and email conversations with various members of the MOE including Mr Vic Schroter, MOE Director but again to no avail or justice to the real concerns of the victims of their actions.

Anne Fairfield and Ed Engel appealed the MOE decision in the approval of this project but it was unsuccessful similar to the twenty other appeals launched against similar wind energy projects across the Province. Undoubtedly in the minds of the majority of citizens in the impacted communities this epic Davis and Goliath battle appears criminally rigged in the favour of the big wind companies. Continuation of this unfair and unjust application of the Green Energy Act threatens by Ministry staff is causing great financial hardship, serious health impacts, home abandonments and irreparable community disintegration which is destabilizing Ontarian’s basic faith in all governments, politicians and their authority to rule.

5. If you have received a final decision on an appeal or request for review or reconsideration of your complaint, please indicate what the result was and why you feel this was unfair.

Most recently with the clear and unequivocal violation of EBR Registry Number 011-7795 (Vineland Power) with four out of the five turbines not being constructed in the proper approved location, Mr Vic Schroter, Director had the opportunity to impose a stop work order typical to what a building inspector under such circumstances to properly investigate and correct the infraction. However to accommodate the “too big to fail” wind developer he has:

- a) Compromised the regulatory process by allowing the developer to merely submit a “Property Line

Assessment Report” **after the fact** when in the Regulation it clearly states that this route is only available prior to final MOE approval.

- b) Deemed the violation to be of such a minor consequence that it need only follow the least onerous amendment submission and public consultation process before approval and final posting on the EBR.

6. If you consider the matter urgent, please explain why.

The apparent impending MOE “rubber stamp” approval by Mr Vic Schroter of the setback violation amendment has been awaiting comments from the immediately impacted neighbours. The date of submission was originally April 14, 2014 but was extended for one neighbour to April 29th due to her heart attack of April 7th and subsequent hospital stay of four days. Is it not a coincidence that this neighbour who’s facing almost insurmountable odds of seeing justice served in her favour and the consequential stress and sense of utter futility that may have brought on her heart attack?

Therefore should my specific complaint of the heritage assessment deficiency and other matters not prompt the Ombudsman Office to immediately notify and demand the MOE delay any further amendments to EBR Registry Number 011-7795 (Vineland Power) then the MOE will undoubtedly approve the amendment almost immediately which for the reasons stated in my complaint this **will constitute a contravention to the Ontario Heritage Act**. Furthermore with the multitude of problems with the MOE’s administration of the Green Energy Act as outlined in this submission together with the numerous previous submissions by others outlining similar gross deficiencies should therefore assist the Ombudsman Office with launching a systemic investigation into this matter.

Complaint c/w 27 attachments submitted April 28, 2014 via email to info@ombudsman.on.ca.

#1 EBR Native-Historic Trail Submission Jan 27 2013 .pdf
#2 MTC5 Heritage Approval Mar 2 2011.PDF
#3 EBR Historic Trail Comment .doc
#4 MOE Admits Setback Deficiency Kidd.doc
#5 False MOE Strictist Setbacks.doc
#6 Meinen Oct 22 Setback Deficiency.doc
#7 MOE Raetsen Setback Requirement Nov 5.doc
#8 Impacted Neighbours Setback Letter to Twp Dec 20 2013.doc
#9 Setback Deficiency EBR comment.pdf
#10 EBR Setback Comment.doc
#11 Agatha Garcia Wright Response Letter Feb 2014.pdf
#12 EBR Property Value Protection.doc
#13 EBR Property Value Protection.doc
#14 Summary of Real Estate Wind Turbine Devaluations Mar 12 2014 .doc
#15 Neighbour Setback Comment to Minister.doc
#16 Neighbour Demand for Stop Work Order.doc
#17 WLWAG Media Release Feb 10,2014.pdf
#18 West-Lincoln-Resolution-Revoke-REA-for-HAF.pdf
#19 Tim Hudak's Letter to Bob Chiarelli.pdf
#20 Green MOE letter re IPC Jan 17 2014.pdf
#21 MOE Setback Amendment Process Ortt April 10 2014.pdf
#22 MOL Gas Well Complaint Jan 5 2014.doc
#23 Fairfield Ombudsman letter.docx
#24 Silt Fence Complaint July 19 2013.doc
#25 EBR 296 Comments Summary Vineland Power.doc
#26 EBR Responses to Public Questions Comments to EBR.doc