

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Public Involvement Program – Requirements and Guidance	1
1.2	Access Land Services Ltd. – Involvement in Public Involvement Program.....	2
1.2.1	Golder Associates – Involvement in Public Involvement Program.....	2
1.3	Project Website and Contact Information	2
2	AUC 007 Consultation and Notification Process.....	3
2.1	Project Notification Radius Map.....	3
2.2	Notification and Direct Consultation.....	3
2.3	Stakeholder Identification, Land Titles and Mailing Addresses.....	4
2.4	Project-specific Information Package.....	4
2.4.1	Project-specific Information Package Open House #1 Invitation.....	5
2.5	Public Project Open House #1.....	6
2.6	Project Open House #1 Feedback Forms.....	7
3	Project Concerns and Specifics	8
3.1	Common Questions about Wind Development.....	8
3.2	Addressing Feedback and Providing Responses	8
3.3	Project – General Feedback.....	8
3.3.1	Project Open House #1 Feedback Form – Responses	8
3.3.2	Project General Feedback and Responses.....	10
4	Project – Direct Consultation.....	18
4.1	Persons Directly and Adversely Affected by Project – Direct Consultation Log.....	18
4.1.1	Discussions with Participating Landowners.....	18
4.1.2	Consultation with Acreage Owners and Renewable Energy Benefit	19
4.2	Persons Directly and Adversely Affected by Project, Concerns and Responses.....	19
4.2.1	Direct Consultation Common Questions / Feedback.....	19
4.3	Information Sharing and Meetings with Paintearth County	28
4.4	Contact with ATCO Electric	28
5	Indigenous Engagement	29
5.1	Identification, Contact with Indigenous Communities	29
5.2	Discussions with the Alberta Aboriginal Consultation Office.....	31
5.3	On-going Indigenous Engagement and Contact with Alberta Aboriginal Consultation Office	31
6	Consultation with Other Agencies, Additional Stakeholders	32
7	Conclusion.....	33
7.1	Future Activities as Part of the Participant Involvement Program	33

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

7.1.1	On-going Direct Consultation	33
7.1.2	Project-specific Information Package #2	33
7.1.3	Project Open House #2	33
7.1.4	Project information on website	34
8	Reference material	34

List of Tables

Table 1:	Project General Feedback and Responses	10
Table 2:	Directly and Adversely Affected Persons – Specific Feedback and Responses	20
Table 3:	H2 Directly and Adversely Affected Persons – Common Feedback and Responses	26
Table 4:	Contact with Indigenous Communities	30
Table 5:	Contact with Other Agencies, Additional Stakeholders	32

List of Appendices

Appendix C-01	H2 AUC Notification Radius Map.....	35
Appendix C-02	H2 AUC Notification List (Names)	36
Appendix C-03	H2 AUC Notification Mailing Labels.....	37
Appendix C-04	H2 Project Specific Information Package	39
Appendix C-05	H2 OH1 Ads	40
Appendix C-06	H2 OH1 Welcome Sign, Display Boards	41
Appendix C-07	H2 OH1 Maps (Layout, Municipal Constraints)	42
Appendix C-08	H2 OH1 Additional Printed Materials	43
Appendix C-09	H2 OH1 Sign-in Sheets	44
Appendix C-10	H2 OH1 Feedback Form Template.....	45
Appendix C-11	H2 Response Letters	46
Appendix C-12a	CP Contact w. Paintearth (Summary Table)	47
Appendix C-12b	H2 OVERVIEW for Paintearth	48
Appendix C-12c	CP Letter to Paintearth on LUB Changes.....	49
Appendix C-12d	H2 Update for Paintearth	50
Appendix C-12e	CP Feedback on Paintearth LUB Changes	51
Appendix C-12f	CP Intent to Develop H2 (paintearth)	52
Appendix C-13	CP Contact with ATCO (Summary Table).....	53
Appendix C-14	H2 Indigenous PSIP, Letters	54
Appendix C-15	H2 Direct Consultation Log.....	55

1 INTRODUCTION

Throughout the development of the proposed Halkirk 2 Wind Power Project (the Project), Capital Power has sought to develop strong relationships with stakeholders through respectful, open and transparent communication.

Purpose: Capital Power undertook a Participant Involvement Program (PIP) that aligns with Alberta Utilities Commission (AUC) Rule 007 guidelines. The intent of the PIP is to ensure that stakeholders:

- Gain a detailed understanding of the proposed Project;
- Have an opportunity to respond to Project information and provide comments; and
- Are aware of the channels available to provide additional input throughout the development process.

Although the proposed Project Area is located near an existing, operational wind power facility, Capital Power developed the Project PIP on the assumption that stakeholders would welcome general information on wind energy.

Dialogue Opportunities: Capital Power has, and continues to, provide opportunities for open dialogue with stakeholders to better understand issues and concerns, and implement suitable resolutions. The Project PIP includes:

- Direct, face-to-face consultation meetings;
- Phone conversations and email for questions and comments;
- Public open house sessions;
- Project information mailings;
- Website information; and
- Status update letters.

1.1 Public Involvement Program – Requirements and Guidance

Capital Power's PIP:

- Provides opportunities for all stakeholders to express their views and seek information about the proposed Project and/or Capital Power;
- Fosters an engagement process with stakeholders in an open forum to assess input and recommendations;
- Responds to stakeholder inquiries in a timely and transparent manner;
- Considers stakeholder input (landowners and general public) in the Project design, particularly in terms of reducing adverse impacts on existing land uses;
- Acknowledges and respects stakeholder interests, and works to resolve any conflicts as a result of our business activities, prior to any major decisions being made;
- Ensures that municipal Land Use Bylaws specific to Wind Energy Conversion Systems (WECS) are adhered to in project planning;
- Follows all guidelines set out by regulators in an effort to protect and conserve the local environment; and

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

- Complies with all applicable directives and decisions set forth by the AUC Rule 007 – “*Applications for Power Plants, Substations, Transmission Lines, Industrial System Designations and Hydro Developments*” (Appendix A1 – Participant involvement program guidelines – *Power plants, 10 megawatts or greater, urban and rural*), in an effort to foster orderly development of renewable energy in Alberta.

1.2 Access Land Services Ltd. – Involvement in Public Involvement Program

Access Land Services Limited (“Access Land”) is a Central-Alberta based land broker focused on Surface Land Acquisition projects in Alberta.

Capital Power retained the services of Access Land to assist in all aspects of land acquisition for the proposed Project, including: pulling land titles, executing Option to Lease agreements, and communication with landowners for all permits and public consultation requirements (i.e. face-to-face, phone, email, mail and fax communication).

References to Access Land representatives are made throughout the **Attachment C – PIP Report**, in relation to contact and communication with local area landowners and stakeholders.

1.2.1 Golder Associates – Involvement in Public Involvement Program

As indicated throughout this application, Capital Power retained the services of Golder Associates to carry out the environmental studies for the proposed Project. References to Golder Associates are made throughout the **Attachment C – PIP Report**, in relation to contact with stakeholders.

For inquiries regarding topics not covered by specific site studies conducted within the proposed Project Area, Capital Power typically addresses general concerns by seeking out independent, well-researched information on these topics, and provides stakeholders with easy access to third-party, independent and credible scientific sources of information, as well as government regulations.

1.3 Project Website and Contact Information

Capital Power’s Project webpage provides publicly available information on:

- Open house display boards that contain Project details and maps of the general area / wind turbine / substation locations;
- Public notices;
- Capital Power and Project contact information;
- Links to more information about wind and applicable Provincial regulatory sites; and
- AUC public information document “[*Public involvement in a proposed utility development*](#)”

[View the Capital Power Halkirk 2 Wind Project website.](#)

2 AUC 007 CONSULTATION AND NOTIFICATION PROCESS

As outlined in the AUC Rule 007 “Applications for Power Plants, Substations, Transmission Lines, Industrial System Designations and Hydro Developments” (Appendix A1 – Participant involvement program guidelines – Power plants, 10 megawatts or greater, urban and rural), the definitions of “notification” and “consultation”, for the purposes of the Public Involvement Program, are:

- **Notification:** Public notification to occupants, residents and landowners within 2,000 metres (m) measured from the edge of the proposed power plant site boundary. For major power plant applications, if there are populated areas just outside the 2,000 m distance, applicants should consider including those areas in the public notification.
- **Consultation:** Personal consultation with occupants, residents and landowners within 800 m measured from the edge of the proposed power plant site boundary.

2.1 Project Notification Radius Map

Based on the AUC Rule 007 consultation and notification requirements, Capital Power requested Golder Associates develop a “H2 AUC Notification Radius Map” that included:

- An 800 m radius line around the proposed H2 Project Area to indicate “direct consultation”; and
- A 2,000 m radius line for “notification” (i.e. mail-out of the Project-specific Information Package, outlined further in **Section 2.4** of the Appendix A – PIP Report).

The notification map is provided in **Appendix C-01: H2 AUC Notification Radius Map**.

2.2 Notification and Direct Consultation

Capital Power provided public notification to occupants, residents and landowners within 2,000 m from the edge of the proposed Project site boundary. The specific notification is outlined below in the ‘PSIP’ **Section 2.4**. In addition to Project notification, Capital Power directly consulted by-way-of face-to-face contact between representatives from Access Land and Project team members and occupants, residents and landowners within 800 m from the edge of the proposed power plant site boundary. Details of direct consultation is outlined in **Section 4.0** of the Attachment C – PIP Report.

To ensure that structures (i.e. dwellings and non-dwellings) were properly identified, Access Land representatives performed site visits throughout September 2016. As additional stakeholders were identified, particularly in the case of occupants (i.e. primarily individuals farming land owned by other stakeholders) attention was given to ensure that consultation and engagement activities included any newly-identified stakeholders. As well, pulled land titles were compared to consultation records, and any newly identified stakeholders were mailed Project-specific Information Packages.

When meeting with landowners for direct discussion on land lease option agreements, Access Land representatives confirmed occupant and resident information. For landowners within the notification area, Access representatives made contact by phone to confirm the occupant, resident and mailing address information.

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

A list of all occupants, residents and landowners on lands within the AUC Rule 007 notification radius is provided in **Appendix C-02: H2 AUC Notification List (Names)**.

2.3 Stakeholder Identification, Land Titles and Mailing Addresses

The proposed Project Area includes a total of 43 potentially occupied dwellings and farmyards. The Village of Halkirk is located approximately 12 km south of the Project Area (population 112, Statistics Canada 2016). Given the proximity of the proposed Project to the Village of Halkirk, effort was made to ensure all stakeholders in the Halkirk area have the opportunity to be included in the Public Involvement Program and to provide feedback.

Capital Power provided the H2 AUC Notification Radius Map (developed by Golder Associates) to Access Land to pull land titles for all landowners within the 800 m (consultation) and 2,000 m (notification) areas, respectively. After all land titles were obtained, Access Land generated a consultation / notification stakeholder list. The list was cross-checked for duplicates (which were removed) and then developed into a Project Area notification mailing list.

The list of mailing addresses (that correspond to the land locations of 39-13-W4M, 39-14-W4M, 39-15-W4M, 40-13-W4M, 40-14-W4M and 40-15-W4M) is provided in **Appendix C-03: H2 AUC Notification Mailing Labels**.

In addition, as per the requirements for this application, two sets of printed mailing labels of those area residents within the consultation / notification radius are provided under a separate cover.

From the stakeholder list, Access Land also created a stakeholder database (i.e. location/address list) that continues to be used as the main contact log (for direct contact) for all residents/ stakeholders within the proposed Project Area notification radius.

The Project Direct Consultation / notification log is an Excel spreadsheet categorized into:

- Landowner, resident, occupant – for the purposes of the delivery and identification of the proper recipient for the Project-specific Information Packages, as well as direct consultation regarding the land option agreements;
- Wind turbine siting and placement – references to specific legal land descriptions, for clarity on which wind turbine the stakeholder is being consulted on; and/or
- Project infrastructure (i.e. collector lines), temporary construction roads (i.e. crane paths) and operational roads – references to specific legal land descriptions, for clarity on which the associated infrastructure the stakeholder is being consulted on.

A copy of the Project main contact log is provided in **Appendix C-15: H2 Direct Consultation Log** and is referred to in **Section 4.2** of the Attachment C – PIP Report.

2.4 Project-specific Information Package

In mid-September 2016, Capital Power mailed Project-specific Information Packages (PSIP) to stakeholders within 2,000 m of the Project Area, based on the stakeholders identified in **Sections 2.1-2.3** of Attachment C – PIP Report.

Stakeholder contact information was updated in cases where stakeholders were identified as missing from the initial mailing list. In instances where new stakeholders are identified throughout the PIP, they are

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

promptly mailed up-to-date information; however, to-date, instances of incorrect contact information have been rare.

The PSIP mail-out formed the basis of the initial comments and feedback on Capital Power’s stakeholder database, in addition to feedback and input provided at the first open house session. The PSIP was the first of two information packages to be distributed; the second is anticipated for distribution *after* the submission of the AUC Rule 007 Facility Application for the proposed Project.

The Project-specific Information Package (PSIP) contained / outlined:

- Proposed Project description;
- Project preliminary area layout and location of the proposed facilities, including site specific map;
- Project proposed technology “ranges” (as technology was not yet selected by the time of distribution of the first PSIP);
- Description of proposed facility infrastructure and equipment (i.e. collector lines, substation, temporary and operational roads);
- Environmental and regulatory considerations, including a list of environmental studies completed or near completion;
- Discussion of the potential restrictions on the development of lands adjacent to the proposed Project, such as regulated setbacks. This included development planning considerations, such as: adherence to both AUC Rule 012 Noise requirements and Paintearth County’s recently updated bylaw requirements (pertaining specifically to Wind Energy Conversion Systems), and included a Municipal Constraints Map;
- Project schedules for the AUC Facility Application submission, Project construction and general timing of wind facility commissioning;
- AUC public information document “[Public involvement in a proposed utility development](#)”; and
- Capital Power contact information for Project representatives for further information, including phone and email contact details.

2.4.1 Project-specific Information Package Open House #1 Invitation

The PSIP also served as an invitation / notification for occupants, residents and landowners within the notification radius to attend a public Project open house, held by Capital Power. The invitation indicated the time, date and location of two Project open house sessions at the Halkirk Community Hall on:

- Oct. 5, 2016 (4:00-8:00 p.m.); and
- Oct. 6, 2016 (8:00-11:00 a.m.).

The PSIP indicated that the open house sessions would be an opportunity for stakeholders to preview details of the proposed Project and provide feedback, as well as pose questions to the Project team, land agents (Access Land representatives) and subject matter experts (E.g. Golder Associates representatives).

A copy of the PSIP is included in **Appendix C-04: H2 Project Specific Information Package**.

The PSIP was delivered via Canada Post between Sept. 23 and 27, 2016. In the event of a postal disruption, Capital Power had a back-up plan in place. In instances where stakeholders’ mailing addresses could not be identified, the PSIP was hand-delivered. Within two weeks of the PSIP mail-out, Access Land representatives were in direct contact with all stakeholders within the proposed Project Area (within 800 m of the outer boundary of the Project Area) to ensure receipt of the PSIP by phone, face-to-face or both.

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

2.5 Public Project Open House #1

To respect the planting and harvesting season, Capital Power selected two Project open house dates of:

- October 5, 2016 – an afternoon/evening session from 4:00-8:00 p.m.; and
- October 6, 2016 – a morning session from 8:00-11:00 a.m.

Stakeholders, including the County of Paintearth, Village of Halkirk, Town of Castor and other local area residents expressed positive feedback in relation to Capital Power’s decision to hold an additional morning session, for those who could not attend the evening session.

Newspaper advertisements for the Project Open House #1 were published at least 14 days in advance of the October 5 and 6, 2016 open house dates, and placed in the following local newspapers:

Local newspaper	Publish dates (2016)
Stettler Independent	Sept. 21 and 28
Castor Advance	Sept. 21 and 28
ECA Review	Sept. 22 and 29

Copies of the Project Open House #1 advertisement, as well as tear sheets of the published advertisements in the Stettler Independent, Castor Advance and ECA Review (respectively) are provided in **Appendix C-05: H2 OH1 Ads**.

As previously mentioned, notification of the Project Open House #1 was also included in the PSIP delivered to all stakeholders within a 2,000 m radius of the proposed Project Area.

Information provided at the Project Open House #1 sessions included:

1. Eighteen display boards describing:
 - a. Capital Power – introduction, background, renewable energy projects in operation and development;
 - b. Public Involvement Program – guiding principles for stakeholder engagement in alignment with AUC Rule 007;
 - c. Project location and description – project size, proposed number of wind turbine generators (WTG’s), general Project Area boundaries, and detailed map showing the location of the proposed Project;
 - d. Technology – range of technology assessed (i.e. output / MW, height, rotor diameter);
 - e. Connecting to the grid – associated Project infrastructure, including: access roads and crane paths, collector lines, substation and transmission line (interconnection) to Tinchebray Substation;
 - f. Information on Alberta’s Climate Leadership Plan (CLP) and the Alberta Electric System Operator’s (AESO) Renewable Energy Program (REP);
 - g. Development schedule and regulatory requirements / approvals;
 - h. Project layout and design considerations, including environmental setback requirements, County of Paintearth bylaw requirements (pertaining specifically to *Wind Energy Conversion Systems*, June 2016) and “Municipal Constraints Map”;
 - i. Project construction activities;
 - j. Environmental program – outline of key elements of the environmental and noise impact studies (completed or near completion), including a noise comparison chart showing the level of noise generated by a wind turbine in relation to other sources of noise;
 - k. Conservation, reclamation and decommissioning planning;

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

- l. Community and economic benefits – general landowner / County tax revenue from a comparable wind facility (Halkirk Wind);
 - m. Capital Power contact information – channels for contacting Capital Power to provide feedback or obtain more information on the proposed Project.
2. Copies of the Project-specific Information Packages.
3. Large-scale (table) Project maps indicating:
 - a. Preliminary Design Layout – with topography (3 maps)
 - b. Preliminary Design Layout – without topography (3 maps)
 - c. Municipal Constraints – Paintearth County bylaw setback requirements pertaining to Wind Energy Conversion Systems (3 maps)
4. Additional printed material:
 - a. AUC brochures: [Public involvement in a proposed utility development](#).
 - b. Halkirk Wind / Vestas wind turbine brochures
 - c. Halkirk Wind Photo Essay

The design materials presented and / or used at the Project Open House #1 sessions are provided in:

- **Appendix C-06: H2 OH1 Welcome Sign, Display Boards** – Welcome sign and 18 display board panels;
- **Appendix C-07: H2 OH1 Maps (Layout, Municipal Constraints)** – three Project maps; and
- **Appendix C-08 H2 OH1 Additional Printed Materials** – AUC brochure, Halkirk Wind / Vestas wind turbine brochure, Halkirk Wind photo essay.

To provide open house participants with access to key members of the Project planning team, the open house sessions were attended by the following Capital Power (CP) and other Project team representatives:

- CP Business Development
- CP Engineering & Construction
- CP Health, Safety and Environment
- CP Stakeholder Engagement
- Golder Associates (Environmental consultants)
- Access Land Services Ltd. (land agents)

A total of 80 public members (combined for both sessions) attended the Project Open House #1:

- **58** at the Oct. 5, 2016 evening session; and
- **22** at the Oct. 6, 2016 morning session.

Sign-in sheets were provided at the welcome table for participants to sign as they entered the open house sessions. Two attendees chose not to sign-in at the front table.

A copy of the Project Open House #1 sign-in sheets is provided in **Appendix C-09: H2 OH1 Sign-in Sheets**.

2.6 Project Open House #1 Feedback Forms

At the Project Open House #1, Capital Power provided feedback forms for attendees to provide feedback on the proposed Project. The responses are summarized in the Attachment C – PIP Report **Section 3.3.1**. A blank feedback form is provided in **Appendix C-10: H2 OH1 Feedback Form Template**.

3 PROJECT CONCERNS AND SPECIFICS

3.1 Common Questions about Wind Development

Throughout development of the proposed Project, Capital Power is gathering feedback from stakeholders to learn as much as possible about their interests and priorities in relation to the Project. Common questions and feedback typically received around wind development commonly fall into these general categories:

- Siting, setbacks and wind turbine placement
- Infrastructure location
- Visual impacts
- Human impacts
- Habitat and wildlife
- Municipal infrastructure effects

3.2 Addressing Feedback and Providing Responses

It is Capital Power's practice to specifically address all questions and concerns raised by stakeholders regarding any Project development, and to respond accordingly and in the preferred method of contact of the person(s) making the inquiry. In addition to documenting all of the questions and responses in relation to the proposed Project, Capital Power has summarized all feedback / input, questions, and inquiries, along with responses, proposed options, alternatives and resolution in its Project PIP reporting.

Prior to, during and following the open house sessions, questions and comments from attendees, as well as general inquiries from members of the public, were (and continue to be) addressed by Project representatives from Capital Power and the associated consulting firms (i.e. Access Land and Golder Associates) in-person or by follow-up phone call, email or follow-up letters.

3.3 Project – General Feedback

This section of the Attachment C – PIP Report summarizes the general public feedback provided at the Project Open House #1 sessions, as well as feedback and input about the Project from public members outside of the regulatory notification/ consultation radius, including input and the specifics of their concerns and Capital Power's response or resolution.

3.3.1 Project Open House #1 Feedback Form – Responses

Of the 80 public open house attendees, eight attendees filled out the Project feedback forms, providing the information on the next page.

For the one comment provided, follow-up contact was initiated to discuss the stakeholders' concerns and input in greater detail (summarized at the end of **Table 1**).

Those attendees who provided contact information were added to the Project mailing list for future information updates regarding the Project.

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

How did you learn about the open house? (*Select all that apply*)

- Mailed project information package **(0)**
- Website **(0)**
- Newspaper advertisement **(5)**
- Word-of-mouth **(3)**
- Other **(1)**

What was your main reason for attending the open house?

- Obtain information regarding project; understand project; project location. **(4)**
- Food. **(3)**
- Contractor information.
- Personal interest.
- Curiosity – looking to see what is new with Capital Power.
- To express strong disagreement with the Project.

Did the open house provide you with the information you were looking for?

- Yes **(8)**
- No **(0)**

Do you require additional project information at this time?

- Yes **(0)**
- No **(6)**

- Excellent feedback.
- If possible, area map of Project.

To comply with legislation, by providing your name and contact information, you consent to be contacted:

- Five attendees provided contact information.

Do you want to be added to our project information mailing list?

- Yes **(5)** – list will be included any future information updates and Project-specific mailings.
- No **(2)**

Questions / comments (If requested, we will contact you as soon as possible):

One comment was submitted in the feedback form:

- There has been no contact with Circle Square Ranch with respect to the ranch operation (see *last item in Table 1 on next page for a detailed summary of Capital Power’s response to this comment*).

- Yes, I want a Capital Power representative to contact me.** (1)

3.3.2 Project General Feedback and Responses

This section outlines general and specific Project Open House #1 attendee feedback, concerns, issues and input. Also included in this section is general feedback regarding the Project from public members outside of the regulatory notification / consultation radius.

For each topic, a brief description of the comment or issue is provided, as well as the associated action, response, resolution or recommendation by Capital Power (or associated representative from Access Land and Golder Associates).

Table 1: Project General Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, Feedback, Issue	Information, Action, Response, Resolution by Capital Power
Visual, siting, turbine placement, Project benefits	Stakeholder email to Paintearth CAO and Councillor (April 13, 2016), forwarded to Capital Power representative: Stakeholder suggested improvements in siting / placement of wind turbines in Halkirk Wind. Referenced the distribution of wind turbines should be spread out amongst landowners, rather than a select few. Suggested a setback of 500 m, with Council input on placement.	Capital Power (“CP” within these tables) responded directly to the stakeholder (via email and at April 5, 2016 Council meeting) indicating the criteria and restrictions the company must observe when siting turbines. CP noted there will be more opportunities to discuss specific layouts at the forthcoming open house. Action: Comment noted; response email sent to stakeholder.
Reclamation	An OH attendee asked several questions on reclamation and liability, including “Who is responsible after the 25-year turbine life span to reclaim?”	CP outlined responsibility for Project reclamation (referred stakeholder to reclamation display board). Reclamation methods – returning the land use back to its original state. Upon final land reclamation, soils that are heavily compacted shall be restored. CP’s reclamation goal is to return all lands to an “equivalent land capability”. At the request of the landowner, CP shall perform a pre-construction soil survey to document pre-disturbance soil conditions and will provide a copy of the soil survey report to the affected landowner. Action: responded to stakeholder directly at Open House.
Reclamation	An OH attendee asked “What can landowners expect regarding reclaiming lands during the decommissioning phase of the Project – specifically, how much of the turbine foundation would be removed during this phase?”	CP indicated a sufficient amount of the turbine foundation would be removed to ensure a minimum of one metre of subsoil would cover the remaining turbine foundation left in place, and the subsoil would be covered with the topsoil (conserved during construction). This would re-establish a soil profile that will allow landowners to resume farming activities on their lands after the Project is decommissioned. Action: responded to stakeholder directly at Open House.
Decommissioning	An OH attendee wanted to confirm the process for Project decommissioning post-Project life (20-25 years), and is concerned this may not	CP indicated that it is a requirement to have a decommissioning plan in place; however, there is no regulatory requirement for it to post a security bond. Unlike oil and gas assets

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 1: Project General Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, Feedback, Issue	Information, Action, Response, Resolution by Capital Power
	<p>occur if CP became insolvent. The stakeholder referenced several oil and gas leases in the Project area not being reclaimed / decommissioned due to companies becoming insolvent from the recent drop in oil prices. The stakeholder expressed her desire that CP post a security bond to ensure that decommissioning of the Project will occur.</p>	<p>in the area, a high probability exists the Project – after its useful life – will have intrinsic value, and could possibly be repurposed for another wind development. Action: responded to stakeholder directly at Open House.</p>
Property values	<p>An OH attendee expressed concerns over the impacts to property values, due to the Project.</p>	<p>CP indicated that studies it is aware of indicate no evidence of negative, lasting impacts to land and home values. A 2010 study in Ontario found no statistically relevant relationship between the presence of wind turbines and property values. The decision to buy or sell a property is ultimately an individual, or family choice. Property values are influenced by a variety of factors: condition of the property, location relative to employment, state of the economy and neighborhood desirability. Action: responded to stakeholder directly at Open House.</p>
Environment	<p>OH attendees: Residents southeast of the Project area had general questions relating to lawsuit in Ontario related to wind turbines affecting aquifers.</p>	<p>CP declined to comment directly on the Ontario lawsuit (does not relate to a CP facility). CP indicated a foundation design typically involves shallow excavation (3-4 m in depth) and past experiences (i.e. at Halkirk Wind) did not result in foundation excavations into (or below) the groundwater table; therefore, potential impacts to groundwater are minimal. CP indicated that it would conduct a geotechnical assessment of each turbine location to develop a suitable foundation design, and part of that assessment will identify the depth to groundwater table. CP expressed confidence that it could design a foundation that will not result in impacts to groundwater. Action: responded to stakeholder directly at Open House.</p>
Environment	<p>OH attendees: Residents just outside the Project area (southeast) had general questions relating to birds / Halkirk Wind mortality rates.</p>	<p>Golder representative referenced past data, and provided general overview from 2016 information; briefly discussed bird and bats, including the post-construction monitoring program that would occur if the Project proceeded. Action: responded to stakeholder directly at Open House.</p>
Archaeology/ palaeontology	<p>OH attendee: Landowner (just outside the Project area) was interested in archaeology / palaeontology issues, indicated there were three bison skulls, and provided specific locations for the archeology consultants.</p>	<p>Golder representative reviewed map with landowner, and noted the location for follow-up. Action: responded to stakeholder directly at Open House.</p>

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 1: Project General Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, Feedback, Issue	Information, Action, Response, Resolution by Capital Power
Nosie/ sound	<p>OH attendee: CP representatives had a discussion with Paintearth Councillor re: winter sound levels on Halkirk Wind:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A resident finds sound from a wind turbine higher in winter (i.e. during foggy conditions). This potentially may be a dwelling where post-construction summer time compliance noise monitoring was completed and shown compliant under summertime conditions. 	<p>Golder representative provided general background information about summertime, wintertime and noise annoyance (E.g. summertime outside in yard, sleeping with windows open in summer, closed in winter, and in winter furnace masks indoor noise levels).</p> <p>Golder representative discussed the differences between wintertime, summertime, daytime and nighttime PSL and dBA levels.</p> <p>Action: Paintearth Councillor to have resident contact CP Environment representative directly to request / discuss wintertime noise monitoring.</p> <p>CP was requested to send AUC Rule 012: Noise Complaint Procedure to Paintearth Council. CP provided the requested information to Paintearth Council via the County Chief Administrative Officer.</p>
Land	<p>OH attendee: Discussion with a cemetery caretaker in the NE region of the project area (possibly outside). Caretaker was unsure of the exact location of cemetery on the Project map.</p>	<p>Action: CP to verify name/ location of cemetery in updated Project layout maps.</p>
Development	<p>OH attendee: General comments about development and subdivision of land, adding dwellings and impacts on potential future plans (E.g. visual, reciprocal county setback distances, etc.).</p>	<p>CP referred stakeholder to display boards pertaining to municipal requirements, and outlined Paintearth Land Use Bylaw setback requirements for Wind Energy Conversion Systems (updated June 2016), as well as a municipal constraints map.</p> <p>Action: responded to stakeholder directly at Open House.</p>
Shadow flicker	<p>OH attendee: Inquiry re: shadow flicker (SF).</p>	<p>CP provided general discussion that any instances of SF would be assessed on a case-by-case during operations.</p> <p>Action: responded to stakeholder directly at Open House.</p>
General	<p>OH attendee: A comment about rumours in the community regarding wind farm expansion, possibly a result of: a) lingering / unresolved discrepancies from original (i.e. previous developer) messaging, and b) other wind developers in the area.</p>	<p>CP explained the current process was specific to this Project (i.e. this specific size and location). Any new projects would have to go through an appropriate regulatory process, specific to their size and location.</p> <p>Action: CP to ensure it continues to provide clear Project-related communications, where / when deemed appropriate.</p>
General	<p>OH attendee: Are the green boxes going to be in the middle of the section (of land)?</p>	<p>CP explained the “green boxes” are “junction boxes,” used to connect multiple collector lines to the transmission line, and typically placed on leased land near a roadway.</p> <p>Action: responded to stakeholder directly at Open House.</p>
General	<p>OH attendee: Can you (CP) order an updated Google map anytime?</p>	<p>CP explained that it can only use the most recent Google map available.</p> <p>Action: responded to stakeholder directly at Open House.</p>

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 1: Project General Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, Feedback, Issue	Information, Action, Response, Resolution by Capital Power
Compensation	OH attendee: Requested information on the revenue sharing model for landowners (participating, non-participating).	The attendee spoke directly with Access Land representative and a further meeting was requested. Action: responded to stakeholder directly and scheduled in-person meeting.
Supplier / vendor	OH attendee: Halkirk Wind landowner indicated he has extra storage yard area at his business (Tank Store Ltd.) to rent if CP needs an area to park / store equipment etc. Also indicated the area is level and graveled and there is up to 30 acres available.	An Access Land representative indicated to attendee he would pass on his card and information, and also explained the timing of Project development – would need to wait to see if project gets approved, and if needed it would be next summer / fall. Action: CP compile a list of local people and the services provided, and then provide the list to the Capital Power construction group and EPC contractor when the project is approved. CP has started to compile a list of potential suppliers / vendors, should the Project continue to advance towards construction. A note was provided to the Project team indicating this list was started and to forward any new contractors to add to list.
Project location, employment	OH attendee: Castor Colony member asked if CP was planning any activity near the Colony, and if another developer was proceeding with a project. Also indicated that he had a friend in BC that has construction experience and would like to get a construction job here and asked who he should contact.	An Access Land representative explained to the Castor Colony member where the Project was planned and how it was not near the Colony. To the CP representative's knowledge, was not aware of the other developer's plans, and provided the Colony rep with CP's Stakeholder Engagement representative contact info for his friend who is looking for work. Action: responded to stakeholder directly at Open House.
Potential suppliers/ contractors	OH attendees: CP spoke to three potential suppliers about contracting opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First stakeholder was interested in a business opportunity to sell crushed concrete to CP for access road construction. He expressed its superiority to using gravel. • Second was a representative from a construction company expressed interest in the Project, indicated the company was local and were previously subcontracted to support earthwork activities during construction of Halkirk Wind. • Third was a representative from Burt Construction was interested in business opportunities associated with the Project, and timing of potential construction. 	CP informed of the timing of potential construction commencement if Project obtains regulatory approval and CP decides to proceed, based on various factors such as: market conditions and government policy decisions. CP also described its usual procurement process for constructing large projects, which typically involves entering into an Engineering, Procurement, and Construction (EPC) agreement with a prime Balance of Plant (BOP) contractor, who would then be responsible for road-building, materials and labour procurement. CP indicated it intends to file its AUC facility application by end of 2016, and construction could commence as soon as 2018, if regulatory approval is granted in Q3 or Q4 2017. CP also indicated the start of construction is dependent on market conditions and government policy decisions. CP recorded information, and indicated would contact should the Project advance through development and into construction. Also stated Project website would indicate timeline for advancement of the Project. Action: contact information for these companies was obtained by CP. (*Note: timeline for AUC submission has been updated since the open house).

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 1: Project General Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, Feedback, Issue	Information, Action, Response, Resolution by Capital Power
Potential supplier (bus service), project proponent	OH attendee: Stakeholder (lives in Lacombe) explained he provides a bus service and sometimes brings out groups of senior citizens to show them the wind turbines. He requested information for these tours. Stakeholder also provided his card indicated his support for Halkirk Wind.	Access Lands reps provided stakeholder with all the written materials available at the Open House, and indicated would pass on his information should CP need services in the future. Action: input noted; CP obtained the stakeholder’s contact information.
Employment	Halkirk stakeholder indicated he had worked on Halkirk Wind, and asked if we had chosen a contractor yet.	Explained the proposed Project is still in the early stages of development, and still requires regulatory approvals and to be awarded a contract from the Provincial government. If successful and the Project proceeds to construction, a contractor will be selected at that time. Provided CP’s contact information to check back on Project development timelines. Action: input noted; CP obtained the stakeholder’s contact information.
Halkirk Wind Visual	*Received via phone after the open house. Stakeholder lives in the next County (north) and expressed concerns with the proximity of his house and “resort” (campground) being close to the proposed Project.	CP scheduled a meeting (via Access Land representative) at stakeholder’s residence for Oct. 18, 2016. Distances were calculated and the nearest tower is 2.2 km away. Action: the following response was provided in a letter to the stakeholder on Feb. 7, 2017. Thank you for meeting on October 18, 2016 and taking time to show your residence and campground operations. We understand your concern regarding the blinking red lights on the towers at Halkirk Wind, and want to further respond to this matter. To provide more context, the red blinking lights on wind turbines are aircraft navigation lights, and are a federal requirement to aid the safe navigation of aircraft. Upon commissioning, the Project would comply with all of Transport Canada’s standards and regulations, including the equipment used and its operation. As reviewed at our meeting, the attached map shows the closest visible wind turbine for the Project is located over 2 km away and at a higher elevation. While we understand that the nearest wind turbine(s) would potentially be viewable from your residence and campground, the federal requirement and the overall importance of aircraft safety means that we must adhere to the approved federal permits for the wind facility. We appreciate and thank you for your input and participation in this process, and will continue to provide updates as the project progresses through development. [H2 Project contact information provided]. A copy of the letter response is provided in Appendix C-11: H2 Response Letters . Engagement will continue throughout Project development. Attachment: Graphic of distance from nearest turbine to stakeholder residence/campground (2.2 km)

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 1: Project General Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, Feedback, Issue	Information, Action, Response, Resolution by Capital Power
<p>Project opposition, visual</p>	<p>Stakeholder representing a ranch south of the Project area is opposed to the Project. He expressed concern the construction of a windfarm project would significantly impact the Ranch visually and impact the countryside view to the north of the Ranch.</p> <p>The ranch is a non-profit organization that offers summer camps for children and youth, as well as, a retreat centre from September to June. One of the offerings is horseback riding, which the stakeholder indicated would be greatly compromised due to such potential visual impacts. The stakeholder indicated the purpose of the Ranch is to provide a rural experience to its clientele who usually come from urban centres.</p> <p>The stakeholder also expressed displeasure towards the existing Halkirk Wind Power Facility to the south of the Ranch, and that it compromises the rural landscape view and area setting. The stakeholder noted the flashing of the lights on the wind turbine generators at nighttime. The stakeholder indicated if the Project was to proceed, the Ranch would be surrounded on both the north and south sides and all views (from the Ranch) will have sightlines with wind turbines. He used the term “industrial pollution” to describe such development in a rural setting. The stakeholder also expressed displeasure that CP had not directly engaged the Ranch prior to the open house.</p>	<p>CP explained the purpose of the open house was to engage a broader group of stakeholders, such as the Ranch – beyond the landowners CP has actively engaged within the Project area, to develop the “preliminary” design layout presented at the open house. CP indicated that the Ranch is outside the area (i.e. beyond 2,000 m from the Project area boundary) required by AUC Rule 007 to directly notify. CP indicated this (initial) open house is the start of the process for it to engage the Ranch to understand any concerns, and potentially mitigate them during the development of the Project design. CP committed to visit the Ranch to further understand and discuss their concerns.</p> <p>Action: On Nov. 11, 2016, an Access Land representative met with the Ranch General Manager (GM) to tour the ranch and develop a better understanding of its location in proximity to the proposed Project Area.</p> <p>The ranch’s main concern is with the impact the Project will have on tourism and their core business. The GM stated there was no consultation with the existing Halkirk Wind Power Facility that the stakeholder was aware of. The current towers are very prevalent, and the GM indicates they Photoshop them out when they take pictures of their western town, as the presence of the towers detract from the feeling of going back 100 years to a western town (the nature of the ranch). The GM also mentioned the red blinking lights at night detract from star-gazing, and the country isolation feeling the ranch aims to achieve. It is believed the Project will not be as visible as much as Halkirk Wind, as the nearest Project turbine is over six kilometres (km) away. Potentially, the wind turbines may not even be seen from the ranch, as the land appears to rise to the north, and the Project towers would be placed on the other side of the coulee.</p> <p>At the end of the meeting, Access Land committed to the following actions (on behalf of CP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore mitigation of the red blinking lights at Halkirk Wind (located in near proximity to the ranch); • Review the final wind turbine design layout and sight lines from the ranch, to determine if the proposed Project wind turbines could be viewable from the ranch; and • Explore opportunities for CP to sponsorship and event support the Ranch. <p>CP sent a follow-up letter on February 7, 2017 noting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess the red blinking lights at Halkirk Wind (if not all the lights, the ones directly within view of the ranch). <p>Update: To provide more context, the red blinking lights on Halkirk Wind turbines are aircraft navigation lights, and are a federal requirement to aid the safe navigation of aircraft. Upon commissioning, Halkirk Wind complied with all</p>

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 1: Project General Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, Feedback, Issue	Information, Action, Response, Resolution by Capital Power
		<p>of Transport Canada’s standards and regulations, including the equipment used and its operation. Facility federal approval included the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of a CL-864 medium intensity white flashing beacon; • Turbines located on the perimeter to be painted aviation white; • Lights to be spaced at intervals not exceeding 900 m for given directions of aircraft approach; and • All indicator lighting provided for a windfarm shall flash simultaneously. <p>Transport Canada included direction to place lights on 40 of the 83 Halkirk Wind turbines, and specifically identified which turbines were to receive the lights. While we understand that approximately half of the facility wind turbines are viewable from Circle Square Ranch, the federal requirement and the overall importance of aircraft safety means that we must adhere to the approved federal permits for the wind facility.</p> <p>2. Sight lines for the Project Area location – will Circle Square Ranch be able to view any potential new towers?</p> <p>Update: The attached graphic identifies three lines to the closest towers and corresponding elevation profiles of each line. There is a slight increase in elevation in the first 2,000 m, then the elevation drops towards the towers. Our assessment indicates that the base of the tower will not be within view of the ranch; however, the top of the tower may be within view. The towers would be (at minimum) six kilometres away from the ranch, and therefore will appear much smaller than the turbines at the existing Halkirk Wind Power Facility.</p> <p>3. In an effort to be part of the community, are there ways Capital Power can support the ranch?</p> <p>Update: We are open to discussing potential opportunities for Capital Power’s involvement with Circle Square Ranch. I can put you in touch with a member of the community investment team if you have questions.</p> <p>Capital Power has a well-established community investment program in which we work to foster healthy communities through engaging stakeholders, promoting sustainability and addressing the individual needs of our communities. We work closely with citizens and typically invest in grassroots, citizen-led projects to preserve and strengthen community character, ecology, and cultural heritage in the communities in which we operate.</p> <p>We support programs and initiatives in three focus areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Heritage and Fellowship;

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 1: Project General Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, Feedback, Issue	Information, Action, Response, Resolution by Capital Power
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrichment of Community Character; and • Preservation of Community Ecology. <p>A copy of the letter response to the Ranch is provided in Appendix C-11: H2 Response Letters. Engagement will continue throughout Project development.</p>

4 PROJECT – DIRECT CONSULTATION

This section of the Appendix A – PIP Report summarizes the discussions held with potentially directly and adversely affected persons, the concern(s) raised and how the concerns were / are being addressed, and confirmation of resolution of the concern(s), where applicable.

4.1 Persons Directly and Adversely Affected by Project – Direct Consultation Log

For those individuals directly affected by the Project, Capital Power undertook one-on-one meetings to explain the proposed Project and answer questions or concerns directly.

A record of landowner face-to-face discussions regarding the Project wind turbine locations and associated infrastructure was recorded by representatives from Access Land and provided to Capital Power for the Project PIP Report. A record of all contact with those potentially directly and adversely affected by the Project is provided in **Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log**.

An internal review of the direct consultation log was completed by Access Land and Capital Power to:

- Confirm the regulatory requirements were met to consult, notify or obtain consent for each wind turbine location and associated Project infrastructure;
- Compare each obtained land caveat to the applicable landowner record;
- Match residents consulted and notified with the associated resident's map;
- Double-check accuracy of mailing labels against owner / occupant / resident entries; and
- Ensure all sign-offs were obtained for affected Project Area lands.

Direct consultation with landowners and additional follow-up to specific concerns will continue throughout development of the proposed Project.

4.1.1 Discussions with Participating Landowners

In early discussions with participating landowners, significant feedback was provided pertaining to landowner interests and concerns. In late 2015, Capital Power provided a letter to these landowners to demonstrate its commitment and willingness to build the Project in accordance with the values of the community, including:

- Pre-construction soil survey for the premises.
- Salvage and conservation of various soil / subsoil layers for use in final land restoration.
- Restoration of heavily compacted soils.
- Geotechnical studies at all wind turbine locations to ensure foundations are designed and constructed in accordance with all local, provincial and federal codes and standards.
- Reasonable efforts to consult with landowners on the placement of all above grade electrical junction boxes to ensure the locations minimize disruption to farming activities.
- Asset Retirement Obligations (ARO) aligned with the conservation and reclamation plan approved by the County of Paintearth, along with any environmental requirements by any other regulatory agencies.

4.1.2 Consultation with Acreage Owners and Renewable Energy Benefit

Steps were taken to directly and personally consult with acreage owners in the Project area. This included the owners of eight parcels of land, which are typically two to 30 acres in size. Capital Power proactively developed a specific program to engage this landowner group over the life of the Project.

The program, called the Renewable Energy Benefit (REB), provides financial benefits for landowners in in near proximity to the Project Area, whose land is not large enough to support wind turbines or associated infrastructure.

Information about the REB:

- Provides compensation to acreage owners with residences within one kilometre (1,000 m) of a project turbine, the substation or transformer station, and who have not already been approached by Capital Power to participate in the Project through land lease option agreements;
- Compensation is dependent on the final layout (approved by the AUC) and subsequent wind turbines built;
- The program is voluntary;
- There are no restrictions on how landowners can spend the Benefit;
- Participating in the Benefit program will, in no way, limit an individual’s ability to comment or express opinions on the Project; and
- The Benefit will, in no way, change the stringent provincial and federal regulations the proposed Project must follow in receiving regulatory approvals for developing the Project.

4.2 Persons Directly and Adversely Affected by Project, Concerns and Responses

Specific concerns raised by stakeholders within the direct consultation and notification radius (as well as those discussions that continue to require additional follow-up), are summarized in **Table 2** (see next page) and include an associated Capital Power action, response or resolution.

4.2.1 Direct Consultation Common Questions / Feedback

Table 3 categorizes additional input and feedback received in-person via direct consultation.

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 2: Directly and Adversely Affected Persons – Specific Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, feedback, issue from directly and adversely affected persons	Information, action, response, resolution by Capital Power
Meteorological tower application	Prior to the start of the Project PIP, CP received an objection letter from two landowners related to the company's Paintearth County development permit application for three meteorological towers. The letter referenced features and aspects of a wind energy facility (E.g. wind turbine towers, associated infrastructure, and impacts, etc.).	<p>Action: CP provided a response letter, explaining that the County development permit application was for meteorological towers (with minimal to no associated impacts to the surrounding area), and not for a wind energy facility.</p> <p>Copies of the landowner objection letter and CP's response letter are provided in Appendix C-11: H2 Response Letters.</p> <p>*Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
Siting, turbine placement	OH attendee: Participating landowner expressed disappointment that a wind turbine was not sited on property (LLD's indicated), and wanted to understand the rationale for the exclusion. Two turbines (specific #'s referenced) were sited on a family members land to the east.	<p>CP explained a constraint existed on the land, due to the precluding development in lands designated as "Environmentally Sensitive", or potentially a noise level requirement as per AUC Rule 012.</p> <p>Action: CP indicated it would confirm if constraints do indeed exist to ensure its decision not to site a wind turbine on the property is correct.</p> <p>*Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
Siting, turbine placement	OH attendee: Non-participating landowner (resident west of specific turbine location): wants 1,000 m setback rather than 750 m from proposed turbine location; comments related mainly to visual aesthetics.	<p>Action: CP responded to stakeholder directly at the OH.</p> <p>Golder Associates noise specialist discussed AUC Rule 012 Noise requirements and County bylaw setback requirements. Also explained the noise limits remain the same, the PSL – and it is a cumulative noise limit.</p>
Siting, turbine placement	<p>OH attendee: Participating landowner expressed thoughts / concerns with the Project design layout. Questioned the accuracy of the wetlands map. With several proposed wind turbines on his land, requested further discussion to potentially move the locations and/or crane paths for various reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested a turbine move 300-400 m north to align with an east-west access road. • Indicated a turbine may be in an alkali marsh with soft soils (i.e. very small white spot on preliminary map southwest of location). Requested to move the turbine west, so it aligns with a turbine in near proximity. He farms in a north-south direction, so easier to farm if moved. 	<p>Project team members (CP, Access, Golder) took detailed notes of landowner's concerns regarding the preliminary Project layout, and explained reasoning behind siting / placement of proposed wind turbine locations.</p> <p>Action: Golder investigated this area (i.e. past ground-truthing, map refinements) to confirm landowner comments. Site visits were performed to sample the soils and review the proposed turbine locations.</p> <p>Action: Access Land representatives met with the landowner at home to discuss matters. The landowner indicated three concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Potential severance at tower 89 – Access Lands rep advised the right-of-way could be shifted slightly when being surveyed, which satisfied the concern. 2. Amount and location of the temporary workspace / contouring of the hill when constructing tower site #91 – Access Lands reps agreed to schedule an on-site meeting with a construction supervisor, and a survey crew, to determine the areas needed. This satisfied the landowner's concern. 3. Access road shown running east of Tower 91 will interfere with farming operations – landowner requested the turbine location be removed from consideration, as there is

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 2: Directly and Adversely Affected Persons – Specific Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, feedback, issue from directly and adversely affected persons	Information, action, response, resolution by Capital Power
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advises that crane path to a turbine needs to be changed, and should come from an alternate turbine if CP cannot use his bridge. • Indicated there are some highlighted wetland areas that are actually hills in the desktop mapping (faint sliver running NW-SE north of connector line between two turbines). • Requested locations marked in the field so he can see where they are in relation to landscape features (E.g. hills and wet lands). 	<p>another access to Tower 92 on a nearby property. Access Lands explained the road is a “Plan B” option, in the event that the bridge on neighbouring land cannot be used. The landowner confirmed was okay with the location indicated as ‘alternative’ and provided written confirmation – consenting to the location of all activities upon applicable lands.</p> <p>*Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
Siting, turbine placement	OH attendee and non-participating landowner: Provided comments on placement of turbines (specific #'s indicated). CP acknowledged the location of the turbines referenced were revised several weeks after the initial discussion was held with the landowner.	<p>Action: CP responded to stakeholder directly at the OH.</p> <p>CP and Access Lands explained the reasons for the revised siting decision, noting that the County’s approval of Bylaw 593-09 clarified a number of setbacks. CP confirmed that the siting of these turbines exceeds the Bylaw’s requirements.</p> <p>CP will continue to ensure that the siting of these turbines is in full compliance with the County’s bylaw and applicable provincial regulations.</p> <p>*Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
Siting and setbacks, future development	CP received email from landowner (NE 23-39-14-W4) requesting information on setback from wind turbine locations to the property line on NE 23-39-14W4, for turbines: T086A, T115, T085A to the north of property line, and how turbine placement could potentially affect resident development in the future.	<p>Action: CP provided the following response via email:</p> <p>Please see the attached section 49 (pages 62-64) of the County of Paintearth Land Use Bylaw NO. 593 - 09 (June 2016), as well as a graphic showing the proposed wind turbine locations for T085A, T086B, T115 and T088.</p> <p>The yellow circles are a 750 m radius from the proposed wind turbine locations, and the pink lines indicate the distance from the proposed wind turbine location to the NE-23 property line:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T115 is ~360 m from the quarter section property line; • T086B is ~580 m from the quarter section property line; and • T085A is ~515 m from the quarter section property line. <p>The proposed GPS wind turbine locations have been verified via “Aba Data” (an energy industry mapping tool). The actual location dimensions may change slightly (up to five metres) when the final wind turbine locations are surveyed for construction.</p> <p>*Note: The proposed Project layout still requires AUC approval and is not yet considered final.</p>

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 2: Directly and Adversely Affected Persons – Specific Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, feedback, issue from directly and adversely affected persons	Information, action, response, resolution by Capital Power
		<p>The landowner indicated receipt of the response, and indicated appreciation for the info presented in a readable and understandable way.</p> <p>*Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
Siting, turbine placement	<p>OH attendees: Non-participating landowners. Provided views on the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP could have picked a less populated area of the County and should move the Project to an area where there are few to no residences. • Indicated the landowners who signed up are all “Absentee landowners” (i.e. people who own land in the area, but do not reside in the area and do not care about the land). • Disappointed the County did not change the regulation to 1,000 m setback from all residences. • Asked about the collector lines within the road allowance along TWP RD 400, and asked responsibility for maintenance and the cost to the tax payers. • Asked about the setback from the transmission line, and if there was enough room for the T-line to be twinned (planned). 	<p>Action: Access Land rep explained the area was chosen for its wind resource and transmission interconnection location.</p> <p>Explained that all landowners were contacted for options and there was no selection of absentee landowners during the process.</p> <p>Explained that CP and the County are in direct communication with each other throughout Project development, and there will be further discussions regarding the placement of collector lines in TWP RD 400. More information on collector lines would be presented at a future open house.</p> <p>Setbacks regarding the “future transmission line” was not addressed at the time of contact (during open house).</p> <p>*Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
Setbacks, municipal bylaw requirements Siting, turbine placement	<p>OH attendee: Acreage owner asked about the County’s new rules regarding setbacks. Wanted specific distances from our activities to his home. Inquired about the Renewable Energy Benefit compensation and if it would be indexed with inflation like the landowner’s rents. Did not like the legal description reference on the letter provided to him, as he felt it should be NE-27 only.</p> <p>He also noted that the setback circle for residences on the CP maps was the wrong radius. Also asked for additional copies of maps, as he collects maps.</p>	<p>An Access Land representative explained the updated Paintearth County Bylaw requirements – 500 m for participating landowners and 750 m for non-participating landowners. Explained that the nearest tower would be at least 750 m away, indicated that would discuss with the company further “inflation increases”. Explained that since his parcel is actually “Lot, block, and plan” number, the legal reference is only for helping someone find a land parcel; therefore, his parcel is actually part of both quarters. Confirmed CP will fix the map before submitting AUC application.</p> <p>CP will confirm distance between the residence and T144A (to be verified if distance is greater than 750 m). A setback revision from 500-750 m should not be an issue, as the constraints mapping includes the residence as a non-participating landowner.</p> <p>Action: CP reviewed the request for “inflation increases” and provided a written response indicating the REB will be adjusted for inflation. CP fixed the map (increased radius around the residence to 750 m), and provided the stakeholder with a copy of the new</p>

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 2: Directly and Adversely Affected Persons – Specific Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, feedback, issue from directly and adversely affected persons	Information, action, response, resolution by Capital Power
	<p>CP potentially used 500 m setback instead of 750 m setback (for further review and investigation). Landowner owns ~3-acre home site (non-participating), but not the surrounding three quarter sections (signed as participating).</p>	<p>map. Also provided stakeholder with a sketch showing the exact distances to the nearest towers, referencing applicable quarter sections in correspondence. A copy of the letter response to stakeholder is provided in Appendix A-11: H2 Response Letters, and engagement will continue throughout Project development. Action: a follow-up letter to acreage owners was sent on Feb. 23, 2017 with an information update regarding the Renewable Energy Benefit (pertaining to “inflation increases”). *Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
<p>Siting, opposition</p>	<p>OH attendee: Non-participating landowner indicated objection to the Project and sought information on where to file the objection. Main objection was the distance from residence, noting that Ontario’s setback is 1.5 km.</p>	<p>Action: CP responded to stakeholder directly at the OH. An Access Land representative provided stakeholder with the AUC public involvement brochure and explained the process. Stakeholder indicated already had the brochure. There was a short discussion on set-backs, Access Land representative attempted to explain the Ontario setbacks were not 1.5 km. Stakeholder did not believe this to be true, and left when the Access Land rep indicated he was from Ontario. *Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
<p>Noise/ sound</p>	<p>OH attendee: A non-participating landowner in the Project area asked about the process for filing a noise complaint if the turbines are operating over their noise level limit, and which organization regulates this.</p>	<p>Action: Golder’s noise/ sound subject matter expert responded to the stakeholder directly at the OH, providing the following information: The Permissible Sound Level (PSL) is an energy equivalent sound level (average over the daytime and nighttime periods). The AUC is the authority regarding the PSL, via Rule 012 that contains a noise complaint procedure (section 5) that involves first contacting the facility operator with various information requirements (E.g. facility / equipment operating conditions, time(s), environmental conditions, etc.) and next steps. *Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
<p>Noise/ sound</p>	<p>OH attendee: Non-participating landowner referenced noise and / or frequencies less than 32 dBA. Attendee noted other jurisdictions where this is addressed.</p>	<p>Action: A Golder representative responded to stakeholder directly at the OH. Golder attempted to clarify whether the inquiry was regarding a potential lower noise limit (i.e. PSL or project noise less than 32 dBA) or rather low frequency noise and / or infrasound (i.e. noise below 32 Hz). CP will look at providing more information on low frequency noise and / or infrasound if there are further inquiries on the topic. To-date, no further inquiries have been received. *Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
<p>General, benefits</p>	<p>OH attendee: Non-participating landowner reiterated concerns about participating landowners not living in the area.</p>	<p>Action: CP responded to stakeholder directly at the OH. CP representative showed attendee the “Community Benefits” display board, and spoke about Project benefits in addition to landowner compensation such as municipal taxes. *Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 2: Directly and Adversely Affected Persons – Specific Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, feedback, issue from directly and adversely affected persons	Information, action, response, resolution by Capital Power
Groundwater, foundation design	<p>OH attendees: Non-participating landowners within the Project area expressed concerns with the Project.</p> <p>Their primary concern was the potential impacts to groundwater and surface waters, due to excavation of foundations during construction.</p>	<p>Action: CP responded to stakeholder directly at the OH.</p> <p>CP indicated the foundation design will likely involve shallow excavation (3-4 m in depth) and past experiences at Halkirk Wind did not result in foundation excavations into or below the groundwater table; therefore, potential impacts to groundwater are minimal.</p> <p>CP indicated that it conducts geotechnical assessment of each turbine location to develop a suitable foundation design, and part of that assessment will identify the depth to groundwater table. CP expressed confidence that it could design a foundation that will not result in impacts to groundwater, including the potential movement of a turbine foundation so as to not impact groundwater tables.</p> <p>With respect to surface water, CP expressed that it would minimize surface water flows into the foundation excavations by constructing subsoil and topsoil berms from the soils conserved during construction of the turbine pads. These berms will deflect water movement away from the excavation. If water does collect in the excavations, CP will release the water in a controlled manner using pumps and geo-socks to prevent sedimentation and erosion to eliminate any impacts to any nearby waterbodies.</p> <p>*Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
Fly ash (from nearby mining operations)	<p>OH attendees: These stakeholders also expressed concerns on how fly ash blown from the nearby coal mine would impact wind turbine generators located in the vicinity of their property.</p>	<p>Action: CP responded to stakeholder directly at the OH.</p> <p>CP indicated that there would be no such impacts to the proposed Project area, operations or infrastructure.</p> <p>*Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
Project opposition	<p>OH attendee: Comments from non-participating landowner: opposed to project, not happy that participating landowners live outside the project area, while non-participating landowners live in project area near proposed turbine locations.</p>	<p>Action: CP responded to stakeholder directly at the OH.</p> <p>CP acknowledged the stakeholder feedback and indicated would note in the open house consultation record.</p> <p>*Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
Siting, wind turbine placement	<p>OH attendee: In-person discussion with participating landowner (son is also involved).</p> <p>They requested the field not be sectioned off with a road. With all the water features, it's hard not to create small severed parcels with any routing. There could potentially be another local landowner (non-participating) who rents the land. Landowner requested to re-route the road</p>	<p>Action: CP is continuing to make reasonable efforts to accommodate the landowner requests, within the Project constraints.</p> <p>*Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 2: Directly and Adversely Affected Persons – Specific Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, feedback, issue from directly and adversely affected persons	Information, action, response, resolution by Capital Power
	East, towards another participating landowner who is amicable towards the Project.	
Siting, wind turbine placement	Paintearth County Development Officer met in-person with couple and their son to assess former residence location. County confirmed a Development Permit has been issued to rebuild the house that previously burned down. The County representative suggested CP consider moving both turbines.	<p>Action: Based on stakeholder feedback and County input, Capital Power removed two turbines from the proposed Project layout.</p> <p>*Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>
Collector lines	<p>Call from participating landowner regarding the information provided in an email re: setbacks, etc.) and a concern with the change in communications. In an initial visit, it was communicated that collector lines would be run in the access roads and down the municipal roads. In an updated communication, the collector lines are to be routed via the shortest distance across fields. The landowner had no specific concerns regarding the right-of-way location, but indicated the compensation would need to reflect the changes.</p> <p>The landowner also inquired about employment opportunities during construction.</p>	<p>Action: An Access Land rep explained that CP was making a list of local service providers, which would be provided to a general contractor if the project proceeds. The rep assured the landowner his name would be added to the list and requested the landowner email his company name and contact information.</p> <p>*Stakeholder feedback included in Appendix C-15: Direct Consultation Log.</p>

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 3: H2 Directly and Adversely Affected Persons – Common Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, feedback, issue	Information, action, response, resolution
Setback distances from residences.	During the process to secure the land base for the Project (i.e. through lease option agreements) information was requested by landowners on distances of turbines from various places, particularly residences.	<p>In discussions with landowners, CP noted the requirements of the AUC Rule 012 regulation, proposed sound modelling by third party consultants, and specific factors pertaining to location of individual turbines.</p> <p>As discussed in greater detail in PIP Section 4.3 of this Project PIP report, Paintearth County held public meetings to gather feedback and update its Land Use Bylaw regulations pertaining to Wind Energy Conversion Systems (Bylaw No. 593-09). The updated regulations outlined two categories of landowners: participating and non-participating, with specific setbacks defined for each.</p> <p>Capital Power has developed the current Project Area layout to be fully compliant with Bylaw No. 593-09, and continues to engage both participating and non-participating landowners.</p>
Location of Project infrastructure (i.e. access roads, junction boxes) and use of road allowances for collector lines.	<p>In developing a project layout for a proposed wind facility, when all development restrictions are considered, there may be very few suitable locations for the placement of wind turbines and associated facility infrastructure, such as access roads, junction boxes and collector lines. Landowner feedback for the Project layout included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for extensive consultation for the placement of wind turbines and access roads prior to construction, so small parcels and severed portions of land are mitigated (hard to farm with large equipment); and • The placement of junction boxes to avoid farm equipment and farm operation disruption. 	<p>In determining the best locations, significant input and involvement was required from landowners (E.g. proper understanding farming practices) to mitigate potential disruption to existing operations, and minimize impact to valuable farmland.</p> <p>CP specifically incorporated this feedback into the design of the proposed Project in the following commitments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting of access roads and wind turbine locations are reviewed with area landowners, with specific care to minimize disturbance, reduce any adverse effects and accommodate farming practices, where reasonably possible. • Junction boxes placed either: on the wind turbine location site leases, or against fence lines to minimize the impact upon farming operations.
Reclamation during construction, operations and decommissioning.	Concerns were expressed regarding soil conservation and compaction.	<p>CP’s reclamation goal is to return all lands to an “equivalent land capability”. Upon initial construction, the top two soil horizons are stripped, conserved, and stored on site for future use in final reclamation, and any compaction issues will be remediated as needed. In addition, at the request of the landowner, CP shall perform a pre-construction soil survey to document pre-disturbance soil conditions and will provide a copy of the soil survey report to the affected landowner.</p> <p>CP notes that soil conservation during operations and construction is addressed in Paintearth County Bylaw No. 593-09 and that the company will comply with the Bylaw’s requirements.</p>

Attachment C –Participant Involvement Program

Table 3: H2 Directly and Adversely Affected Persons – Common Feedback and Responses

Topic	Comment, feedback, issue	Information, action, response, resolution
Lack of project fund for decommissioning and abandonment.	In addition to reclamation concerns, some landowners have described comparisons to the Oil and Gas Conservation Act, where by the Alberta Energy Regulator (AER), by regulation, prescribes an orphan fund levy among licensees and approval holders. No such fund exists within the Alberta wind industry for developers to contribute to, in the event of an abandoned wind turbine, or associated infrastructure (access road, collector line, etc.).	This issue was indicated to Paintearth County, and was addressed in their updated Land Use Bylaw No. 593-09 regulations pertaining to wind energy development. As part of the regulatory requirements (and approvals) for proposed wind power facilities, developers are required to have a decommissioning plan in place. As well, in the unlikely event that a Project would be abandoned, the current salvage value of a wind turbine could potentially be economic, and the infrastructure would already be in place allowing for repurposing of a project facility (with newer technology), as the industry continues to advance.
Proximity to transmission line that may be paralleled.	Some landowners expressed concerns that proposed wind turbines located adjacent to ATCO's Eastern Alberta Transmission Line would potentially prohibit future construction of an additional paralleling transmission line (if additional capacity is needed).	Access Land contacted ATCO via email and received a reply that there are no plans to twin the line at this time (see PIP Report Section 4.4 – Contact with ATCO).

4.3 Information Sharing and Meetings with Paintearth County

Since late 2015, Capital Power has been in regular contact with Paintearth County (“the County”) regarding the proposed Project. Capital Power has frequent, ongoing communication with Paintearth County Development Officer and Chief Administrative Officer, mainly pertaining to County development and permitting in relation to the Project. This includes engagement with the County during its process to update its Land Use Bylaws (June 2016), specifically pertaining to wind energy conversion systems.

Capital Power’s Project updates to the County Council have – and will continue to be – scheduled via the County CAO, with meetings, phone conversations and emails continuing with the County Development Officer (and other municipal staff), as required throughout the Project development process (i.e. design, regulatory / permitting applications and construction phases).

A record of email correspondence, phone conversations and meetings between Capital Power and Paintearth County representatives (and Council members) is provided in **Appendix C-12a: CP Contact w. Paintearth (Summary Table)**. Presentations and letters provided to Paintearth County are referenced in the summary table, and provided in **Appendices C-12b-f**.

4.4 Contact with ATCO Electric

Since January 2016, Capital Power has consulted with ATCO Electric on the following matters and considerations:

- Meteorological tower construction / operation in proximity to nearby substation;
- Tinchebray substation setback and existing 9L16 transmission line;
- Point-to-point communication between Tinchebray and Cordel substations;
- ATCO’s plans to potentially twin the EATL transmission line; and
- Coordination of a new line between the Goldeye and Tinchebray substations.

A summary of contact between Capital Power and ATCO Electric is provided in **Appendix C-13: CP Contact with ATCO (Summary Table)**.

The transmission line and any proposed changes to the existing substation are subject to a separate application to the AUC by ATCO Electric, the intended Transmission Facility Operator. The transmission infrastructure, including any potential environmental effects, is outside the scope of the Public Involvement Program (PIP) for this Facility Application, as it is directly assigned by the Alberta Electric System Operator (AESO) to ATCO Electric for planning, construction, and operation.

5 INDIGENOUS ENGAGEMENT

Recognizing that the proposed Project is in proximity to both Treaty 7 and Treaty 6 territory, Capital Power took the following steps to engage certain Indigenous communities regarding the Project:

- Initiated contact with Treaty 7 and Treaty 6 communities (the company believed) may have an interest in the Project, based on past engagement regarding the existing Halkirk Wind Power Facility;
- Held discussions with the Alberta Aboriginal Consultation Office (ACO) regarding provincially required consultation activities; and,
- Continued to adapt and refine its Indigenous engagement efforts based on input from both the Indigenous communities and from the ACO.

Sections 5.1-5.3 of the Attachment C – PIP Report provides background on Capital Power’s engagement with Indigenous communities and the ACO regarding the Project.

5.1 Identification, Contact with Indigenous Communities

In September 2016, Capital Power commenced its communication with a number of Indigenous communities through an addressed cover letter and Project-specific Information Package (PSIP), developed in plain-language. This plain-language package was mailed / emailed to seven Indigenous communities identified during the previous consultation process for Halkirk Wind (see **Table 4: Contact with Indigenous Communities** on next page).

The plain-language package included all the information contained in the public PSIP, including:

- Project description;
- Project preliminary area layout and location of the proposed facilities, including site specific map;
- Project proposed technology;
- Description of proposed on-site infrastructure and equipment (collector lines, substation, etc.);
- Environmental and regulatory considerations, including a list of environmental studies completed or near completion;
- Discussion of the potential restrictions on the development of lands adjacent to the proposed Project, such as setbacks. This included development planning considerations, such as: adherence to both AUC Rule 012 Noise requirements and Paintearth County’s recently updated bylaw requirements (pertaining specifically to Wind Energy Conversion Systems), and included a Municipal Constraints Map;
- Project schedule for the AUC application, Project construction and facility commissioning;
- AUC public information document “[Public involvement in a proposed utility development](#)”; and
- Capital Power contact information for Project representatives, including phone and email contact details, for further information.

A copy of the plain-language Indigenous PSIP, as well as a cover letter specifically addressed to each of the seven Indigenous communities (to accompany the PSIP), is provided in **Appendix C-14 H2 Indigenous PSIP, Letters**.

A summary of contact with Indigenous communities to-date, regarding the Project, is provided in **Table 4: Contact with Indigenous Communities**.

Attachment C – Participant Involvement Program
Table 4: Contact with Indigenous Communities

Indigenous Group	Contact	Project Contact, Follow-up
Ermineskin Cree Nation (Tribe)	Ermineskin Cree Nation Attn: Carol Wildcat, Director of Industrial Relations PO BOX 219 Maskwacis, AB T0C 1N0 carol@ermineskin.com Ermineskin Tribe website	Sept. 27, 2016 – sent Project Information Package (cover letter, info package, preliminary wind turbine layout, wind turbine sketch and AUC Public Involvement brochure). Nov. 25, 2016 – sent follow-up email to Carol Wildcat confirming receipt of package. No response.
Louis Bull First Nation	Louis Bull First Nation PO BOX 130 Maskwacis, AB T0C 1N0 780-585-3978 Website not active; no contact or department	Sept. 27, 2016 – sent Project Information Package (cover letter, info package, preliminary wind turbine layout, wind turbine sketch and AUC Public Involvement brochure). Nov. 25, 2016 – follow-up call to confirm receipt of package; left voicemail. No response.
Montana First Nation	Montana First Nation Attn: Vicki Wetchie, Community Development PO BOX 70 Maskwacis, AB T0C 1N0 gina@montanaband.net	Sept. 27, 2016 – sent Project Information Package (cover letter, info package, preliminary wind turbine layout, wind turbine sketch and AUC Public Involvement brochure). Nov. 25, 2016 – sent follow-up email to Vicki Wetchie (at Gina's email address, contact on file) confirming receipt of package. No response.
Samson Cree Nation	Samson Cree Nation Cree Tribal Administration Building c/o Lands Department PO BOX 159 Maskwacis, AB T0C 1N0 780-585-3793 Samson Cree Nation website	Sept. 27, 2016 – sent Project Information Package (cover letter, info package, preliminary wind turbine layout, wind turbine sketch and AUC Public Involvement brochure). Nov. 25, 2016 – follow-up call to confirm receipt of package; left voicemail. No response.
Kainai Nation (Blood Tribe)	Kainai Nation (Blood Tribe) c/o Lands Management Department PO BOX 470 Standoff, AB T0L 1Y0 btlm@btlands.com ; 403-737-8151	Sept. 27, 2016 – sent Project Information Package (cover letter, info package, preliminary wind turbine layout, wind turbine sketch and AUC Public Involvement brochure). Nov. 25, 2016 – sent follow-up email to LMD confirming receipt of package. No response.
Piikani Nation	Piikani Nation Attn: Byron Jackson, CEO PO BOX 70 Brocket, AB T0K 0H0 403-965-3940 No website	Sept. 27, 2016 – sent Project Information Package (cover letter, info package, preliminary wind turbine layout, wind turbine sketch and AUC Public Involvement brochure). Nov. 25, 2016 – follow-up call to confirm receipt of package; left voicemail. No response.
Siksika Nation	Siksika Nation c/o Siksika Lands and Resource Management PO BOX 1100 Siksika, AB T0J 3W0 403-734-5240 Senior Manager: Lars Duck Chief Siksika Nation website	Sept. 27, 2016 – sent Project Information Package (cover letter, info package, preliminary wind turbine layout, wind turbine sketch and AUC Public Involvement brochure). Nov. 25, 2016 – follow-up call to confirm receipt of package; left voicemail. No response.

5.2 Discussions with the Alberta Aboriginal Consultation Office

On August 15, 2016, Capital Power contacted the Alberta Aboriginal Consultation Office (ACO) indicating the company was commencing stakeholder engagement regarding the Project, and that the company was seeking direction regarding Indigenous engagement (with respect to the Project). In several e-mails and phone conversations in August and September 2016, the ACO indicated a difference in the process by which the ACO worked in providing direction to proponents to consult, based on the nature of the regulatory application. Capital Power scheduled a phone conversation with an ACO Consultation Advisor seeking clarity on the ACO role and its processes. The ACO Consultation Advisor indicated that it is involved when a Project requires approvals/dispositions (e.g., *EPEA* or *Water Act*) issued by Alberta Environment and Parks. Based on this feedback, Capital Power will engage the ACO in the future when *Water Act* approvals are applied for the Project due to disturbing select wetlands in the Project Area.

On Feb. 8, 2017, Capital Power representative J Tusor) emailed the ACO contact to advise on the company's efforts to date.

5.3 On-going Indigenous Engagement and Contact with Alberta Aboriginal Consultation Office

Capital Power continues to be open to further engagement and consultation activities with the Indigenous communities contacted to date. The company will continue to inform the ACO of its work and new developments regarding the regulatory process, particularly future regulatory steps that may trigger further consultation activities, including when it files its *Water Act* approval applications.

6 CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES, ADDITIONAL STAKEHOLDERS

In addition to contacting landowners, residents and occupants in proximity to the Project, Capital Power has also consulted, and is in direct contact with, organizations and other parties (identified by the Project team, Access Land and Golder Associates) as potentially affected by the Project, outlined in **Table 5**.

Table 5: Contact with Other Agencies, Additional Stakeholders

Agency, additional stakeholder	Reference
Paintearth County	See AUC Rule 007 Application – PP.5
ATCO Electric	See AUC Rule 007 Application – PP.6
Transport Canada, NAV Canada	See AUC Rule 007 Application – PP.7
Environment Canada	See AUC Rule 007 Application – PP.8
Alberta Transportation	See AUC Rule 007 Application – PP.9
Alberta Environment and Parks	See AUC Rule 007 Application – PP.10
Alberta Cultural Resources	See AUC Rule 007 Application – PP.11
Alberta Electric System Operator	See AUC Rule 007 Application – PP.39

7 CONCLUSION

Capital Power has received comments, questions and concerns about the Project and incorporated this feedback into the design through the adaptation or modification to Project design, movement of wind turbines or associated Project infrastructure, and other considerations / actions undertaken on behalf of Capital Power where appropriate. In instances where a concern or request could not be accommodated, an explanatory response has been provided.

7.1 Future Activities as Part of the Participant Involvement Program

Capital Power plans to continue its PIP activities throughout 2017 and Project development, following the submission of its Facility Application to the AUC. **Sections 7.1.1-7.1.4** outline the anticipated activities.

7.1.1 On-going Direct Consultation

Capital Power's team, including members from Access Land, will continue to directly engage stakeholders throughout development, with a focus on:

- Direct meetings with stakeholders, or stakeholder groups, who request meetings.
- Personal contact with landowners living within 800 m of the Project Area (by phone and in-person, when requested or appropriate).

7.1.2 Project-specific Information Package #2

Capital Power will undertake a second mail-out to the Project stakeholder list, which will include those who requested information following the first Project mail-out and open house in October 2016. The second mail-out is anticipated for early April 2017 and will include:

- A letter from the Project lead, highlighting updates on the Project;
- Supplemental information, including: updated wind turbine design layout, specifications of the selected technology, results of the Environmental Evaluation Report (i.e. studies, conclusions), construction activity and updated project schedule/ timeline;
- AUC brochure: [Public involvement in a proposed utility development](#); and,
- Contact information related to the Project.

7.1.3 Project Open House #2

Capital Power intends to hold a second Project open house post-submission of the AUC Rule 007 Facility Application. The date for this event is anticipated in late April or May 2017.

The objectives of the second open house will be to:

- Share additional technical information and the results of air, noise and water studies;
- Gather additional questions and comments from stakeholders;
- Provide an additional opportunity for the public to have direct discussions with Project team members;
- Provide an additional opportunity for personal consultation for residents living in near proximity to the Project Area; and,
- Provide an additional opportunity to comment or provide feedback on the Project, whether directly to Project team members or on a comment form provided by Capital Power.

Attachment C – Participant Involvement Program

Topics covered in greater detail during the Project's second open house will include: updated wind turbine design layout, specifications of the selected technology, results of the Environmental Evaluation Report (i.e. studies, conclusions), construction activity and updated project schedule/ timeline.

Similar to the Project Open House #1, public notification for the Open House #2 will include:

- Advertisements in local newspapers, at least two weeks prior to the open house date;
- Mailed invitations to occupants, residents and landowners within the regulatory required notification radius, via a second Project-specific Information Package;
- Information posted on the Project webpage; and
- Email invitations to municipal Council members and staff.

All activities related to the Project Open House #2 will be documented, similar to the format completed in this submission, and provided in an addendum to the Project AUC Rule 007 Facility Application.

7.1.4 Project information on website

Capital Power will continue to update its Project webpage with relevant information as it becomes available. This will include:

- Copy of the Project AUC Rule 007 Facility Application;
- Notification of the Project Open House #2;
- Display boards from the Project Open House #2 (post-event); and
- Additional information, as applicable.

8 REFERENCE MATERIAL

The following appendices are the materials that Capital Power provided to the public as part of its Participant Involvement Program for the Project.