

**GIVEN THAT WE NOW KNOW THAT THE AESO HAS CONFIRMED THAT THE PROJECT IS NEEDED, WHAT IS YOUR BIGGEST FEAR RELATED TO THIS NEW PROJECT?**

- Alignment: convoluted route (previous project) - 'all over the place', 'jumped around', why?
- Visual, EMF, Width of right of way, smaller 'footprint', recreational and environmental concerns, cost, different format - hear other people, discussion
- Biggest Fear: purpose of project still unclear, who is making the money?
- Fears that the project is not actually required. Will the electricity be used for Alberta - NOT using Alberta infrastructure to ship to US or BC. If infrastructure is being paid for by tax \$ - will the profits go to AltaLink or will it benefit the province/and or lower electrical costs for all Albertans
- Biggest fear that our input will be pre-empted by an agenda already established. For example, we are told that underground is 'not being applied for because it will cost 10x overhead'
- Creating new right of ways and disturbance/impacts. Long term sustainability, low power price! Competing land uses. Tourism, industry, wildlife.
- Not using new technology. Building now when later may be better.
- Lack of believability - don't believe need, don't trust AESO, or the process AESO - no mandate to be fiscally responsible. No cost/benefit analysis. Why did AESO select AltaLink to determine 'reliability' quotient for the 500kV link?
- Presumption that underground is not feasible. Pictures of construction of underground were deceptive - let's see it finished.
- Visual impacts. Property values. If we pay for the line why can't the power stay in Alberta?
- Fear we pay more because we buy BC power at high demand (i.e. high price) & sell to BC at low price when dumping wind.
- Underground get rid of extreme weather and maintenance costs.
- Albertans will pay more for power (rate payers)
- Fear underground option is being vilified. Proposal for previous disturbed corridor has limited environmental impacts.
- Impacts on property values.
- Where is the line(s) going? Not through Bellevue like last project.
- Fears underground is being totally rejected basically due to expense.
- Route. No detail or lack of info on rebuild of line to BC.
- Fear substation location. One of the last routes would have had the station immediately across from Lee Lake - a recreation area.
- Fear we are right back into where we were before - same horse different name. Public meetings, etc. with no results. Worry and despair for more years.
- Visual impact
- Visual impact of windmills is getting huge - let alone transmission lines.
- Fear routing through private property - visual invasive, structure/physically invasive.
- Fears with new project: NIMBY creates friction among area residents. Special interests impose project on those less organized. Decisions aren't based on objective criteria. Cherry picking issues.

- Fears overhead lines & towers will destroy our views & property values.
- Overhead lines will ruin the iconic viewscape
- Biggest fear to date Apr. 10/18 - no application made to AUC. Therefore tonight is not necessary. Also, all this ground covered in past 13 yrs.
- Fear: same project different name. Same issues: aesthetics, native grasslands, noise, home value, construction
- AltaLink will 'divide and conquer' by pitting neighbouring communities against neighbouring communities (similar to CRR-CR) before.
- Visual view. Effect on wildlife, migratory routes of birds, effect value of land, may reroute moose in Moose Meadows
- Thoughtful planning of renewables. Pushing too fast.
- Wind & ice loading levels. Noise information. Comparable DBA measurement on different structures.
- The impact towers and lines will have on wildlife corridors & migration/flight patterns of birds (predatory birds)
- Fear for new project is not being able to protect our environment for our future generations. Not having a voice that is listened to.
- Fear we will be paying for infrastructure to sell power to states or BC, benefiting them not us.
- Fear that rate payers will be on the hook for paying for infrastructure that benefits BC not us. (Then selling us energy not us selling to them)
- Will bridges be installed on critical watercourses & be left for recreation access?
- Greatest fear is no independently verified numbers.
- Fear for no justification for need to disturb previously undisturbed land - keep to established utility corridors.
- Environmental damage to native grass.
- Fears rerouting Elk herds.
- Biggest fear is a decline in property values - not very eye appealing! Why is the project going out of the province? If we pay - it should stay in Alberta.
- This is going to be a bill that will be on our power bill for X number of years? What benefit to use when we are supplying power to BC or the US if we have paid for these lines?
- Landscape spoiling. Alberta paying for export lines. Wrap up old project isn't really changing anything. If Albertans pays for then we should get a rebate on power. Spoiling landscape of Southwestern Alberta.
- Renewable electric (wind power) is not as green as some people would have you believe. A lot of energy is invested into manufacture & installation of the towers & Lines - bird & bat strikes are a HUGE concern. If the oil sands killed a fraction of the birds that wind mills do, the media would have a hay day!
- Fear that lines not needed or used will be left abandoned.
- Greatest fear for moving forward. 1) That there is no real need. 2) My personal space will violated & landscape ruined. 3) This is just a make work project. (Contact information provided) <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Personal information provided has been redacted for privacy reasons

- Fear that AESO is blinded by need to have congestion free supply and therefore over compensates with over build and increase our rate payer transmission & distribution costs.
- Fear AESO is waiting to ask for approval until next election on assumption government will change and be more agreeable to AltaLink building more.
- Fear that AESO is not being fiscally responsible about using existing transmission infrastructure before building more (and charging us)
- Fear of need assumption not true, not proven or approved or fiscally responsible.
- Fear there is assumption this project is a done deal and that AUC will rubber stamp it because so much time and money has gone into planning.
- Fear of AESO ignoring fact that SATR is dead and need has not been approved for this changed intertie.
- All of the concerns previously raised remain valid but project seems essentially same as previous Chapel Rock project, so biggest fear is that it still isn't needed and will still have extremely negative impact.
- New power line 800 metres from all of my main view window. Powerline anywhere in front range valleys - Rock, Connelly, Wildcats, Cow creeks. This project pits neighbour against neighbour. Some profit. Some get the line in their view and no profit. Terrible effect on people, landscape and wildlife.
- Ratepayers have expense, little benefit. Bills will go up.
- Cheap power to other areas on ratepayers backs
- Landscape concerns. Impacts to southern Alberta residents, with little reward
- Visual impact (x3)
- Fears: transmission line will visually impact C.N.P Landscape, wind noise from the towers & transmission lines.
- Routing will destroy views.
- Is there going to be more towers built as more windmills are built?
- Tourism negative on mountain views.
- Structure 6 is ugly. Visual impact is large, more costly and need to pay landowner.
- I fear that you don't hear us, what we say is not important. You have decided.
- Not having enough factual information to make recommendation or decisions.
- Same concerns as listed on slide show, nothing has changed.
- Everything Dave said from the last process.
- Biggest fear: same as last time, all that Dave said. Having to put up with the violation of protocol!!
- Different timelines for different industry.
- So what \$\$ on underground. Can be done!
- Service or power interruptions.
- Fear of underground utility obstruction.
- Health issues? I know that they say not an issue but still scary.
- I fear HEALTH consequences on humans and animals of these gigantic HV electric lines.
- I fear that if line creates induction potential effects on Human/animal health.
- NIMBYism and culture of entitlement will hinder development of infrastructure for economic development.

- Fear: when a power line went through the landowner who agreed to it wasn't warned that his land would be considered as rezoned as a utility corridor. Only municipalities/prov. GOA can rezone.
- Fear of relocation of existing infrastructure.
- Property value
- Fears: more unreliable, windmills, more power lines, no say on private property.
- People's valued property will be impacted and cause pain.
- Intrusive. Land values - resale value of land.
- Fear: I hope it won't be on my land/view BUT then it will ruin someone else's life/happiness. So I find it hopeless.
- Environmental impacts.
- Wind noise?? Birds.
- Disturbance on land.
- Wildlife disturbance.
- Wildlife corridors will be affected.
- Fear: Frustration of process. Hope listening to stakeholders shows in proposal.
- Fear: Project information NOT given to public to make informed choice. No mapping info, size of towers to answer questions. Is this consultation only lip service to process - no old issues resolved.
- I fear that the same issues have not been answered or resolved that existed before.
- I fear that I don't know where the project is going, so I cannot give a clearer answer. I would like to see a map of proposed structure placement. I fear there is not enough factual information.
- As a landowner not being able to say no to project.
- What is the need? Why has the process changed for this project?
- I fear that this project proceeds.
- I fear that AltaLink will be allowed to continue fleecing the people of Alberta who put up all the capital.
- I fear that our needs and wants will be sacrificed to the benefit of the population centres.
- That it will happen without listening to the people who are impacted the most.
- AESO has not yet completed the update to the SATR that will confirm the need and no detailed information has been provided to landowners to indicate that this project is actually required at this time. This needs to be addressed as soon as possible with significant opportunity for community and landowner input. At this time, we object to the statement the need has been confirmed and disagree with the premise.
- we have property near the line now and we are concerned with what this will do to our property in regards to wildlife and construction damage
- I can't really determine if we need new transmission lines in the area
- That opponents will delay or otherwise obstruct the project and/or demand excessive mitigation (e.g., undergrounding), ultimately increasing costs to taxpayers.
- I need to see the details of what the need is based on viable projects that companies are ready to build verses what the Alberta Government wishes that they would develop.
- Increased damage to our property and interference with wildlife
- going ahead and still not making sure that the latest and most improved equipment is used and wrecking more private land.

- I invested nearly \$500,000 in my property. The last time this was proposed, it was going to go right next to my property, which would completely decimate our property value, as well as being an eyesore for the entire community as it would be ruining the scenery of the east half of town. Will AESO compensate me for the loss of value in my property?
- noise and view, we will lose the view we paid dearly for and this is our retirement home. Also the wild life. we have many bald eagles in our area along with moose and lots of mule deer
- That my power bill will look like Ontario's. AESO has been directed by the Government to push this Green energy agenda along. Not because we are short of power! But we are being forced to believe that this is for us. So, I have no confidence that AESO is acting on our behalf. I believe that AESO is wrong and is the face of another group that will benefit and this added capacity isn't needed by us or is for us and we will be left paying for something we never needed! And someone else is getting rich while we are paying for it!
- Visual and environmental impact - not just the transmission line itself, but the land requirement and impact increased approved construction of wind farms will have. We value the land in this area as fertile and bearing for our local economy of farming and ranching.
- Visual and environmental impact

**GIVEN THAT WE NOW KNOW THAT THE AESO HAS CONFIRMED THAT THE PROJECT IS NEEDED, WHAT IS YOUR GREATEST HOPE RELATED TO THIS NEW PROJECT?**

- Hope take cost of line and mostly straight route in consideration. Also use some of existing line.
- That the project will be cancelled or replaced with a less intrusive option.
- Put new transmission lines underground in conjunction with Hwy 3 widening. Avoid area that is Alberta's economic landscape north of Hwy 3. These viewscapes are irreplaceable. Generate power closer to where it is needed. Big transmission lines and substations are a way of the past, not the future.
- The need for the line has not been clearly stated. Why is AltaLink promoting the transmission line when wind generation has been proved ineffective in other parts of the world? The only truly renewable source of electricity is Hydro. My greatest hope is that the project will be rejected.
- Greatest hope, if AUC approved all routes considered following corridors (L.U.F). Then bury all lines. Warren Buffet should be a good corporate citizen.
- Hope the solution respects viewscapes in our precious SW Alberta.
- Hope update existing wires (transmission lines)
- Hope to stay on road allowances.
- Build as friendly as possible. With the least footprint for our area.
- Hope that this project won't get approval. That the route chosen will be along the railroad or Hwy 3.
- Greatest hope, power should be generated close to where it is needed so transmission lines are obsolete.
- Hope project will be cancelled.
- I hope it will not be built.

- Hope for new project: AUC does NOT see a need and that the project does not go through. Wind & solar are NOT green energy.
- Hope poles - monopoles, would be acceptable and better for viewing.
- We need the interties to strengthen the grid. Just get on with it!
- NO FEAR. Let's get the job done.
- Hope more renewable energy.
- Hope benefits Alberta improve Alberta rates.
- Hope that it benefits Albertans or defraying costs of construction & lowering power rates for Albertans.
- Hopes switch to direct current transmission which updates energy to US standards.
- Hopes- local residents should not have to bear the cost of a project for the benefit of Calgary. If constructing here requires additional engineering and cost, then that is the cost to society of the project.
- I don't want to hear 'No'. I want to hear, 'we could do that but it would mean...'
- My hope, you will listen to my concerns & deal honestly with them. Need proof. (Contact information provided).<sup>2</sup>
- Hopes: process is transparent, process is objective and we get to see the trade-offs of each option. Environment affected, cost affected, # residents affected, etc.
- Hope to keep communication open.
- Hope concerns from last round of consultations be honoured. I.e. we've been through before!
- Hope doesn't negatively impact views of Livingstone.
- Alignment - should be the shortest most direct route. The route should be sensitive to environment.
- Keep the 2 circuit on 1 structure.
- I hope that the important visual aesthetics will be taken into account. Don't destroy the view of the mountains!! I hope that the land will be respected. Don't destroy the use of valuable farmland.
- Bury the transmission line
- Hope underground is an option for specific area's (i.e. 1km or less)
- Hope - use of different structures based on landowner needs. Not all one type. Road allowance versus on property.
- Hope: Partial underground sections might make a route possible. Why is that not listed in the speaking notes?
- Hope: Do not have it look like Hwy 3 East of Pincher
- Hope underground
- Greatest hope: NO POWER LINES
- Hope this engagement is meaningful (lack of trust)
- Listen to strong suggestions from AUC
- I hope that you hear us - you haven't so far.
- Hope no/minimal impact to existing utility infrastructure.
- Stay along established corridors & stay off untouched lands.
- Needs of younger & future generations are given highest priority.

---

<sup>2</sup> Personal information provided has been redacted for privacy reasons

- The result of consultation will positively affect the landowners and residents in the MD of Pincher Creek & Area.
- Hope don't turn neighbours against each other.
- Hope provide environmental mapping to be transparent (trade-offs known)
- Project to go away.
- I hope that the citizens of Alberta can benefit financially from this project since they are putting up all the capital.
- I hope that this project fails.
- Hope that any new linear disturbance should be combined with other utilities & corridors.
- Keep same path as existing lines.
- Hope: Structure 4 only way to go. Is the preference less environmental impact (very common in Calgary & other city). Put on road allowance the right way to do it, less cost. Don't need to pay landowner.
- Minimal impact as possible.
- Hope reduced footprint - minimal impact (minimize)
- That you will actually take the time to listen to those of us who are going to deal with the impacts of the project for many many years.
- That the project NOT proceed or if ultimately it is approved that construction follow existing disturbed right of ways, at a significant distance from our property, and that the structures used minimize the land footprint. It is critical that any construction avoid native grasslands, traditional wildlife breeding areas, native landmarks, environmental damage and disruption to viewscapes.
- my greatest hope is that Alberta cuts BC off from power and gas and that this project isn't needed at AI or that we can find out where this line is and what is going to have
- I hope that this project is really needed
- That it be completed, as time/cost efficiently and effectively and responsibly as possible. By "responsibly" I mean environmentally and socially responsibly, including appropriate consultation with Aboriginal groups and reasonable mitigation of adverse effects.
- If the project must be build, I would hope that we would delay construction until we know for sure that we are going to need it.
- Little if any more construction on our property
- That the government uses they parks for the land use.
- I hope that you put it somewhere that doesn't make it an eyesore for our entire community.
- I hope they don't take it down by our place and run it along highway 3
- That we never need to go ahead with it! That new technology will come online once again, changing how we use power. But in the meantime, we use our existing methods of water and coal fired/natural gas generators and stop running from and apologizing for our cutting end technology for both of these methods.
- I guess the greatest hope is to meet all aspirations of relation to the project - both those for and those opposed.
- More renewable energy and power for future generations

OF THE FOUR POTENTIAL DOUBLE CIRCUIT STRUCTURES SHOWN ABOVE, WHICH IS YOUR MOST PREFERRED AND WHY?

- I would chose #5. Less room taken with structure.
- 4, it hurts the view and my eye not so much
- I prefer structure 4 - does not need to use private land - takes up less space - no guide wires; does not need to disrupt environment a second time to just string wires (no construction then so more cost efficient)
- If the 2nd circuit is inevitable this is the only option - more cost effective/less disruptive
- Only #4 if necessary to build line
- If I had to choose one, it would be structure 4. Least invasive on the landscape, one pole with two circuits vs. huge structures, can follow road allowance easily. \*But I really don't want any! \*Would work perfect along the hwy!
- Structure 4 - least visually intrusive; Structure 7 - may also be better than #6 or #5
- More feasible (cost wise) for structure #4, eventually the consumer will pay - so maybe cheaper now than later
- Structure 4 because of less farm land it would take up and it would have a less visual impact
- Structure 4 is least obstructive. Only 1 construction time to disrupt animals & plantings. Native grassland is important and MUST BE PROTECTED.
- #4 - one time construction impact, phased approach, single visual impact
- If I have a choice and have to choose, structure 4 is MOST preferred because it's a 1 time construction for structure to support both circuits. Its right of way & height is the least invasive of all the structures.
- Structure #3 is a clean looking structure, less need of land for the right of way
- Structure 4 is preferred. Farming around 1 pole preferred, can use part of road allowance.
- I cannot state a preference because I do not believe the line is required or ever will be.
- Structure 4 is least horrible, maybe, but I question the need for any transmission lines in area along eastern slopes of Livingston Range. Current 500kV line shouldn't be there. Why compound the mistake?
- #4 Visibility & simple
- Structure 4 - smallest footprint, least visually intrusive (at least in this picture), wires are washed out in photo though, still few poles/kilometer
- #4 only 1 pole put in once, only one ground disturbance, less workers in area (traffic) by doing it once
- None. This line should not be built.
- Structure 4 - one structure both circuits. Only one disruption to the land.
- Structure #4 is by far my preferred option. It fits within existing R/W and significantly minimizes disturbance. I also feel it is the least visually obtrusive.
- Need not established.
- 4. Less of them, most flexibility positioning, narrowest right of way, adding second circuit - relatively low effort & cost compared to other alternatives.
- None. Petroleum companies send directional drills hundreds of feet into the ocean and drill into bedrock and change the direction to horizontal drilling, why can't AltaLink do the same.
- Structure 4. Less obtrusive, neat, tidy look.



- Structure 4. Less obtrusive.
- Structure 4 - less ROW \*can be put in road allowance
- Structure 4 - smaller foot print less future construction
- Structure 4 - less obvious
- Bury the line in the foothills, the land/environment/scenery community is valuable
- Monopole double circuit is preferred - can be placed on row boundaries & least visual impact
- Structure 4 - put it in the road allowance - save money, don't need to pay the landowner - less visual intrusion - ONE LINE, NOT TWO
- My most preferred is structure 4, the Single Tall Metal Pole. It is less invasive to potentially scenic areas of the Pincher Creek area due to its slender design.
- I don't like any of them. They are all intrusive and hard on the environment. There has to be a better option.
- If forced to choose, structure 4 is preferable only because it clearly has the least intrusive impact on land and viewscape. It is also extremely important that the structure can fit on existing road allowance or right-of-way to minimize the disruption to private lands.
- No Answer
- #4 Clean simple look. Can use road allowances
- Structure #4 (monopole), because of its limited visual impact and reduced footprint (both direct physical and right-of-way width). (Structure #7 second choice, same reasons.)
- Structure # 4: It is the least obvious and kind of looks like the wind mill towers. It offers the option of building the single circuit and then adding the 2nd circuit without much change to the profile. It can be built on the road allowance. It should be built with as much underground as possible.
- 4 because it seems the smaller size
- #4 more use in a smaller area
- Structure 4 Visual and you can put it on a road allowance, the price doesn't really matter to me in the long run what will it actually cost me? \$4
- Structure # 4. Not such an eye sore, less material and labor to build, resulting in, less land disturbance, and less of a cost to install.
- Structure 4 - appears to be the less visually obtrusive than the others, less visual space requirement.
- Structure 4, the least obtrusive
- They are all fine if they are out of the way.

#### WHICH IS YOUR LEAST PREFERRED DOUBLE CIRCUIT STRUCTURE AND WHY?

- #5 - visual pollution, more ground usage
- 6, it is simply ugly
- Structure 6 - takes up most room, most visible up close, uses most farm land if going through forest needs a much larger swath cut.
- Structure 5 - takes up too much R/W, unattractive
- I do not like any of the remaining structures - 5, 6 & 7. Hugely invasive on the landscape. Destroys the beauty & the grasslands.

- Structure 6 - anything but this. These make a natural landscape look like an industrial zone. It doesn't matter that there would be fewer. Worst case scenario. Structure 5 - better than 6 but still very industrial looking. Monopole - if you are going to go this way go with a simple big one. Don't double them.
- Structure #1 because of guy wires - not good for farmers or cattle
- Structure 5 because for farming it would take up way too much space to go around and also it has a more visual impact
- Twin single circuit structure - too wide, too obstructive
- 5 & 6 big & bulky
- Structure 1,2,3,5,6 & 7. All require more construction large right of ways, more impact. To support requests to minimize impact, these do not make sense.
- Structure no.5. It's a horrible looking structure. Visual look & width are a nightmare, must have been drawn up by a grade 8 designer.
- Anything with a large right of way.
- Probably preferred to be hanged than drawn and quartered, but I'd rather not die. I could choose between types of structures, but as the project could ruin my life if it goes through my area, it's small comfort to choose type of structure. 5 is the ugliest!
- #5
- Tie between 5 & 6 - too wide/too tall, large footprint or very high structure, fugly & noisy with wind/ice buzz
- #5 huge ROW obtrusive to view
- All of them. See #1 [question]
- Structure 5 - is too big take up too much land. Not sure of farming restrictions.
- Structure 5 and 6 equally. Too much disturbance and visually obtrusive.
- Need not established.
- 5, 1 guy wires, right of way width. Wind noise, visual impact. (ugly x2)
- Structure 6 (Most) and structure 1 twinned - very ugly and when you drive by one, you can't see anything else
- Bury the line in the foothills
- Lattice tower - largest footprint & offsets required from row
- Structure 5 & 6 - it's ugly
- My least preferred double circuit is structure #6. Although common historically, they appear too large and invasive. Too industrial for this region of Alberta.
- #5 too wide!!!
- Structure #6, because it's visual impact in both size and industrial appearance, and increased footprint.
- Structures # 5 & 6: They have a very large profile and neither one can be placed in the road allowance.
- 5 because it seems the largest
- #5 ugly and too large
- Structure 5 or 6 they are ugly and can't be put on a road allowance
- Structure # 5! Too many structures, more material and labor to build, more land disturbance and more expensive.
- Structure 6, it is old technology and obstructive to and on the view scape when you look at it.
- Structures 5 & 6, the most obtrusive

- They are all unacceptable if they are visible from our community. We are trying to promote Crowsnest Pass as a destination and a great place to live - this is not in keeping with our goals.

**OF THE THREE POTENTIAL SINGLE CIRCUIT STRUCTURES SHOWN ABOVE, WHICH IS YOUR MOST PREFERRED AND WHY?**

- Structure 3 - less room taken up with building
- 3 (see answer)
- Structure 3 - takes up least room
- See previous answer
- Only #3 if necessary to build line
- None, all are invasive - especially if a 2nd circuit needs to be added.
- Structure #3 - least visually intrusive, Structure #2 also better than #1, less industrial looking
- Structure no. 3 preferred
- #4
- I don't support these options as 2 lines are needed regardless, building 2 separate lines doesn't seem efficient of 'costs' that seem to be a priority in conversations this evening. However, with that being said, structure 3, to have an input.
- #3, see answer top of page 2 [double circuit first question]
- Structure 3. Farming around 1 pole preferred, can use part of road allowance.
- Structure 3 - a bit less intrusive, but then if these get twinned not so good.
- 3 Simple & space
- Structure 3 - can be sited on two different alignment routes e.g. same start/end point but tracks along a different route for each line [drawing in booklet]
- See no value to single circuit poles. Do it once with a twinning plan. Less ground disturbance, less traffic in area only in area once.
- None. The line has not demonstrated Need.
- I see no need for single circuit structure if the need is for 500kV. The right of way should grow to be very large after the next circuit was built. \*Less ground disturbance.
- Structure 3 - same reasons as previous page.
- Need not established.
- If there is no further wind power built. The #3 lines is o.k.
- Structure 3. Many of the same reasons as structure 4 but if the second circuit is a certainty, why bother with single structure?
- Structure 3. Less obtrusive visually.
- #3 - least obtrusive
- Structure 3 - can be at least partially in road allowance, less visually obtrusive, less ROW as single pole. No guy wires.
- Structure 3 - smaller footprint, less invasive
- 3 - less ugly, less impact on birds and animals
- Bury the line
- Don't want single circuit. Means two construction disruptions.
- Structure 3 - but structure 4 is the answer - Don't
- (drew a thumbs down on the page)

- None of them are great. Number 3 is possibly best.
- Again structure 3 is the least offensive because of the smaller footprint. It would not be acceptable in any circumstance to build any of these single structure along a right-of-way with the view of subsequently doubling the impact with another set of structures in the same location. Also important that structure can fit along road allowances to minimize the disturbance of new land.
- No Answer
- #3 Again. Clean simple look. can be placed in road allowances
- Structure #4 (monopole), because of its limited visual impact and reduced footprint (both direct physical and right-of-way width).
- Structure # 3: it looks like it would be the least obvious.
- 3 because it is smallest
- # 3 can be placed on road allowance.
- structure 3, visual, it is not as ugly
- Structure # 3. Smaller. Less material and labour to build, therefore less land disturbance equaling a smaller land foot print.
- Number 3, again it is less visually obtrusive and appears to require the least amount of space. What material are these towers made from, are they aluminum? Thinking it would be innovate to recycle plastics and create a mould to build these towers...then it limits a portion of our consumption of wood based products and non-renewable resources like aluminum.
- Structure 3 - the least obtrusive
- They are all fine if they are out of the way.

#### WHICH IS YOUR LEAST PREFERRED SINGLE CIRCUIT STRUCTURE AND WHY?

- Structure 1 - visual pollution/room looking, would it create wind noise?
- 1, see answer 2 [It is simply ugly]
- Structure 1 - most visible, takes up most room
- Structure 2 (same as #5 in previous question)
- See above. Do not like any of them. Highly invasive.
- Structure 1 - impacts too much farm land
- Structure no. 1 - least preferred
- The ones with largest footprint
- #1 - steel doesn't blend in
- Structure 1 - not feasible to support requests to be minimal disturbance/impact.
- #5 see bottom of page 2 [double circuit 2nd question]
- Anything with large base.
- Structure 2 is ugliest, but all this is a fool's choice.
- Eye sight
- Structure #1 - fugly, big footprint, guy wires
- See above. #1 guy wires
- All of them. See #1 [question]
- Structure 1 - guy wires larger. Right of way width.

- Structure 1,2 & 3. If this line is ultimately destined to be a double circuit then build it once, build it properly, and build it with the capacity to add to it. That will simplify all our lives!
- Need not established.
- Structure 1 - guy wires, right of way width, visual impact, wind noise
- Structure 1 - right of way too wide with guy wires.
- #1 Very wide - too many wires
- Structure 1 - large ROW visually large, guy wires = large ROW \*can't be put on road allowance
- Structure 1, safety/very large
- Structure one - takes too much room, landscape problems. View is gone.
- Bury the line
- All are not preferred.
- Structure 1 & 2 - ugly, footprint huge, old style
- Number 1. The wires are too much.
- Structure 1 because of the extensive right of way required and the land impact.
- No Answer
- #1 Because it need guy wires
- Structure #1, because it's visual impact in both size and industrial appearance, and increased right-of-way footprint.
- Structures # 1 & 2: both take up a lot of land.
- 1 or 2 are both bad
- # 1 to large and ugly to look at.
- Structure 1 is very ugly
- Structure #1. It's ugly. It requires more material and labor to build. It will cause a larger land disturbance ending in a larger land foot print.
- Structure 2, old technology and the requirement for lumber to build.
- Structure 2 - the most obtrusive
- They are all unacceptable if they are visible from our community. We are trying to promote Crowsnest Pass as a destination and a great place to live - this is not in keeping with our goals.

**DOES THE POTENTIAL FOR THE TWIN SINGLE CIRCUIT STRUCTURES, AS SHOWN ABOVE, CHANGE YOUR OPINION ON YOUR PREFERRED STRUCTURE TYPE?**

- Would prefer #4, less visual pollution
- not at all!
- No - do not like either 1 or 2 twinned
- Makes no sense! See previous answer.
- No it does not change my opinion on my preferred structure type. I want the least invasive structure and that is structure 4 on page 6. Again though, I really would not like to choose any. We are starting this project all over again!
- I don't like the idea of double up structure 1 or 3. Doubling structure #2 would be less industrial feeling.
- Yes, like Structure 4, it's better to do it all at once with a smaller impact on private land.

- I like the ones that use the road allowances and the least disturbances to wildlife and to grasslands.
- #4
- I would prefer structure 4.
- Prefer #1
- Less land footprint the better.
- Bad to twin later, except if turns out there is no need. Hard to say if worse to have single circuit to start and then double later? Or double from the start.
- No
- Twin structure 3 still is best. Would like to see two routes along with two single circuit structures.
- No still prefer structure 4 as is only 1 pole height difference doesn't make much difference as compared to 2 structures.
- No. Line is not needed.
- If the project requires 2 circuits there is no point in moving forward with single circuit structures. Being side by side is a larger footprint and the area is disturbed more than once.
- No, I believe the stated approach is the least efficient, most costly, & causes the most disturbance and inconvenience.
- Need not established.
- If there is more need for power transmission in next 10 years. Structure #4.
- Structure 4 would seem to be the logical approach. Less visual impact (single pole). No guy wires, more flexible placement and smaller right of way.
- No! Structure 3. Less obtrusive, less right of way width, less agricultural impacts.
- No - less obtrusive.
- Yes. Large increase in R.O.W because of additional structures.
- Not at all, opinion is based on footprint and appearance.
- Yes, uses the whole country side. This is a beautiful part of the province. Windmills take away the scenery and huge powerlines make it.
- Bury the line
- No - means two construction disruptions in a relatively short time frame.
- No - structure 4 is the best
- #4
- No it just makes me not want a single circuit if you would two of them together.
- It would not be acceptable in any circumstance to build any of these single structure along a right-of-way with the view of subsequently doubling the impact with another set of structures in the same location. This means twice the land impact, twice the wildlife disruption and the most visually displeasing outcome. Also important that structure can fit along road allowances to minimize the disturbance of new land.
- No Answer
- NO
- No.
- No.
- 3 again because it is smaller
- no
- NOPE

**AFTER READING THROUGH THE STRUCTURE PLACEMENT COMPARISON TABLE ABOVE, WHAT DO YOU FEEL ARE THE ADVANTAGES OF PLACING STRUCTURES IN ROAD ALLOWANCE?**

- Use of land approved already
- Private property could not be affected that much
- Less impact on farm land or cutting through forests. Easier access for maintenance.
- Build double circuit structures, either build down 1/4 lines or in/adjacent to road allowances wherever possible
- Less invasion on private property. Use right of ways already designed for utilities
- They are there for a reason and should be used rather than ruining the private land. Using the road allowance is less invasive and allows for access to repair the line if needed without wrecking private property. Use the hwy road allowance! We are all paying for this so therefore we should all have to see it along the hwy.
- Following road allowances is a good idea. However, there are a lot of road allowances besides just Hwy 22 and Hwy 3.
- Would be acceptable on road allowance
- They won't take up from land and could be a farm hazard if they're in the road allowance.
- With double single there is less disruption - follow current highway - build
- The land is already disturbed, if this means only disturbed road allowances, infrastructure runs along roads so that's ok, less private land & owners impacted.
- Would have them placed far away from the road allowance.
- Using the road allowance for part of the right of way reduces land required.
- If undeveloped, road allowance is no less valuable than other undisturbed land.
- Save space on private land.
- More route options depending on the structure. Ease of access to repair/build 2nd circuit. Less agricultural impacts to farm land. Follow existing linear features. Can be a single circuit structure. Minimize structure footprint if single structure and stay out of native prairie, cattle range. Less environmental impacts potentially if road allowance is already developed.
- Easier access to line for maintenance. Less impact on farmland.
- Minimal disturbance of natural area.
- Easy access to the line for maintenance. Less impact to farm land.
- Existing road allowances are already disturbed and are land that is taken out of production. Going outside of the existing R/W adds to cumulative effects.
- Need not established.
- Keep power lines on road allowance. Rail way right of ways. Highway right of ways. Not the most direct route thru people fields. The single structure will be the less offensive on looks.
- Additional flexibility. Possibility for routing with minimal impact on private land. Some structures are not possible totally route on road allowance except 3&4.
- Use existing corridor as the AUC said was to be done. The advantages are it would be less costly, wouldn't affect the environment as much.
- Land use, less agricultural impacts.
- Road allowance is land that can't be used for agricultural anyway.

- Less land use & environment impacts. Potentially less agricultural impact.
- Structure 4 could be used. Use of the same structure for both lines. Highway/near road use to prevent loss of Green Space. Crews working off road allowance rather than in fields.
- NO! It's double the work, double the material and double the area needed to build these structures. The only group that will want this is the contractors & engineers. The bigger job the bigger the cost to complete this job; and then this is passed on to us as the consumers!
- No, I still like Structure 3 single and twinned
- Well structure 3 is still the least obtrusive, but out of the other 2 structures it looks like structure 2 would be less obtrusive than structure 1 except that more towers are required. So, structure 3 is still the best option out of all of these.
- No.
- Less of an eyesore.
- Bury the line
- Placement in or on road row to minimize agricultural impacts as well as disruption has usually occurred.
- Put structure 4 in the road allowance, no one can stop you, you're allowed to place structure in road allowance
- Right of way - least disturbance of existing usage, proximity to residential
- Less environmental impacts.
- This is not a reasonable question as of course it depends on which road and the specific impacts in that location. In a very general sense that primary advantage of placing the structure on the road allowance is that it should minimize the disruption to private property and previously undisturbed lands.
- No Answer
- They are crown land. Avoids agricultural land.
- Reduced disturbance of agricultural land use, potentially increased use of or alignment with existing linear disturbance, smaller structures used (monopole), reduced impacts on private property.
- The roadway is already a huge disturbance on the land. I presume that it would be easier to service there and will require the least amount of new service roads. It will not impact areas with native grasslands any more than already has been done.
- Road allowance makes much more sense
- better to get to for maintenance as long as they are far away from any homes
- your not taking up as much personal land
- No additional cost in the purchase/leasing of private land. Agricultural land owners will not have to work around theses structure. Nor will these same land owners have service vehicles drive thru their land, destroying their crops.
- Construction of transmission line will parallel existing disturbance or road allowance, however, when you use the term road allowance does that include all designated road allowances even if that land is undisturbed, as road allowances are designated but do not always contain an established road way. So sensitivity to where these road allowances are located.
- Less agricultural impacts and native vegetation impact.
- The onus is not on me to say what is good about these options.



## WHAT DO YOU FEEL ARE THE DISADVANTAGES OF PLACING STRUCTURES IN ROAD ALLOWANCE?

- None
- the road allowance cannot be used for developing a road if needed
- At corners - many limit visibility and result in accidents. Visible to all while driving detracts from enjoying the scenery.
- None - if there is no road, but if a road exists it is a visual impairment, plus restricts road widening
- None! Use them.
- We must not forget the tourism values identified in the SSRP and the need to maintain visitor experience for those travelling on Hwy 3 and Hwy 22. Creating an industrial zone is not compatible with promoting tourism industry in SW Alberta. Following Hwy 3 or Hwy 22 is a bad idea. It would affect tourist experience and is driven by the NIMBY approach. It is the easiest way to point it towards someone else. We need to use criteria that are adjective. If one road allowance is a good idea, then all road allowances are a good idea and should be considered. We all live next to a road allowance of one form or another.
- That power tower will run right in front of residences who are on the road.
- The last.
- Collisions with vehicles & farm implements in transport.
- Perhaps if it's an actual road it makes some sense, but wouldn't be most important criterion.
- ?
- No payment to private landowner - goes to MD. Depending on structure, may take up all road allowance block future development. May impact viewscales for home owners near a road allowance.
- Individual that has to look at the line doesn't receive any money from the project. Money goes into local MD coffers. Something solid to hit if road gets developed and you hit the ditch.
- People will complain about disturbing their 'views' or concerns about health/safety factors.
- MD gets money but individual does not. Harder to develop.
- Minimal disadvantages. It may interfere with maintenance operations, future developments.
- Need not established.
- May be a little more cost but less rent on land. Keep off private as much as possible.
- Potentially placing in road allowance could create visual impact very close to roads --> tourist 'viewscape'.
- None
- Poor visual effect. Safety concerns with visibility for traffic.
- Road may need to be widened.
- Visual impacts. Unsightly from the road.
- Not if buried
- If not on row then would have costs associated with private land.
- No, the savings speak to it
- Potential vehicle collision?
- I don't see the disadvantage

- Depending on the nature of the structure and the location there could still be huge impacts on the land, wildlife and the viewscape. Must be considered in the context of the specific routes being proposed.
- No Answer
- Not sure Unless Road Allowance is it super rough terrain
- Private landowners would not be compensated for disturbance, making it harder to ensure burden of impacts borne locally are offset by compensation.
- The landowner would probably like to have some compensation for having to look at the structures so perhaps they could be placed just inside of their property line if they agree.
- None
- That they end up in the sight for houses and on undeveloped road allowance and will need to go through private land for maintenance.
- there is none
- In the future will these road allowance be needed to be turned into roads to handle the increase of traffic. Resulting in these structures needing to be moved.
- The visual impact on the land if a resident, as stated most do live close to road allowance, the impact to resident and their land.
- Greater visual impact, which is important to me.
- They run through populated areas. It does not allow you to use the most practical, unobtrusive route if you have to follow a specific road allowance.

**AFTER READING THROUGH THE STRUCTURE PLACEMENT COMPARISON TABLE ABOVE, WHAT DO YOU FEEL ARE THE ADVANTAGES OF PLACING STRUCTURES IN PRIVATE PROPERTY AND GENERALLY ALONG THE QUARTERLINE?**

- It will have to happen, I hope that each negotiations are fair and equal. Consultation, Consultation!!
- Is there any advantage?
- Along quarterline, less disruptive for cultivated land. Not visible to people driving roads or people views in their yards.
- Monopoles have less visual impact, if costs are not prohibitive they should be the preferred option
- Do not put on property privately owned for living residence
- None - why ruin private property, agricultural land, native grass, etc. It is our duty to protect our land for our future generations. If we don't, who will?
- Simpler planning and coordination with other utilities. Opens up more options to minimize impacts on environmental, social and economic values. Sticking to road allowances only may remove options that are otherwise a good option.
- Have to look at feasibility on road allowance or private land.
- No advantages for a farmer, takes up too much land and became a hazard
- Private property should not be used exception rare situations
- This is dependent on route.
- Fence lines make sense for more disturbances if necessary on private land.
- Along the quarterline
- No advantage to putting lines through private land.

- None. The Eastern Slopes are one of Alberta's pristine wilderness areas.
- Depends on viewsapes, native grassland, etc. Not sure it will make much difference.
- Out of road from centre of fields
- Payments to landowners. Less limitations on row size. Possibly fewer visual impacts out in a field.
- Income goes to landowner. Quarterlines in fenced usually have an access road for fencing.
- None.
- Less impact on Farmland close to Quarterline. Owner gets revenue.
- I'm indifferent.
- Need not established.
- Keep structures on main artery rail, highways.
- Placing structures on private land would allow wider right of ways, even though most of these wider structures are much more visually disturbing. Potentially shorter more direct routes could be taken (lower cost) but that assumes the private land owners are on board with the routing.
- Highway safety. Less visible. Less obstruction to agriculture.
- Lines would not be moved in event of road widening. For quarterline it wouldn't disturb usable land.
- Possibly less population to visually see - do not feel this priority over land owner
- Lesser visual impact.
- Money
- None, existing corridors, stick to right of way
- Provides landowner with source of revenue.
- No advantages - it cost more
- None
- This doesn't seem to be an advantage.
- NONE - requires access by heavy equipment across private land, disruption to wildlife, ranch operations and long term destruction of native grasslands which cannot typically be repaired by "reclamation efforts". Impact of equipment rutting and grass disruption is still evident 20 or more years after the disturbance. As land owners we also place extremely high value on the viewscape and wildlife attracted to areas undisturbed by huge structures such as transmission lines. The previous line in the area disrupted eagle nesting patterns, has created huge risk to waterfowl as it goes through natural waterways and has promoted the spread of aggressive non-native plants such as blueweed.
- No Answer
- still like the road allowance idea
- Potential for landowner compensation to offset burden of impacts felt by landowner.
- Perhaps less expensive structures can be used thereby reducing the overall cost of the project.
- Private property is bad but the quarter line better
- none
- No Answer
- I don't know what private property you are looking at, to understand the benefit of these structures on private land.

- All structures could be considered, and running structures along the quarter line, less cost due to adjusting for change in angles, can follow a straight line for a continuous length.
- One main construction time. less visual impact
- The onus is not on me to say what is good about these options.

#### WHAT DO YOU FEEL ARE THE DISADVANTAGES OF PLACING STRUCTURES ON PRIVATE PROPERTY AND GENERALLY ALONG THE QUARTERLINE?

- Low payment
- Value degradation, problems with future development.
- Can use up more farm land - more difficult to access for maintenance.
- Very little problem along 1/4 lines. Visual disruption along R/A near dwellings.
- Interferes with personal homes, wind causes too much noise. Health concerns due to close proximation of electrical lines.
- Ruining agricultural land, native grass, viewscapes, environment, etc.
- Impacts on agriculture.
- Destroys and spins up farm land value becomes less and there are more restrictions and complications to farming
- This is dependent on route.
- Just don't do it, try your best to push these lines through highway & rail corridors - SPECIFICALLY #3!! NOT THE 507!
- Along the quarterline
- Fracturing farmland into smaller pieces. Danger farming around structures.
- The disadvantage to placing structures on private property is that construction chews up native grasslands. Alberta only has 3.5% of native grasslands left and most of that is in southern Alberta.
- none
- Very likely put through native prairie wetlands or 'undisturbed' cattle range. Payments to landowners not to MD for all rate payers to benefit from linear disbursements via wealthier public coffers for social programs, etc.
- Could be more of a footprint going through private property along quarterlines.
- Potential to disturb natural areas.
- Farmland/grazing land loss. Visual to owner.
- Need not established.
- Avoid private property as much as possible. When it goes through private property there are a lot more chances of shutting project down.
- Agricultural impact - safety. Guy wires on certain structures.
- Agriculture interference.
- Limits use of private property for quarterline can limit getting to parts of property.
- Increase cost (paying land owner) \*access for maintenance could be prohibitive
- Structure choice, repeat construction.
- Spoils more scenery.
- existing corridors, stick to right of way
- Can disrupt land use and make non-productive agricultural land.

- Cost - pay the entry fee & yearly compensation; costs \$98,000 over 70 years, \$1400 x 80 years = \$112,000 for one pole on landowners land; \$112,000 x 54 = 6 million (savings) per pole; \$114,000 x 54 = \_\_\_ if farm card
- Lack of revenue, interfering with existing usage
- This seems like cruel and unusual punishment for land owners.
- NONE - requires access by heavy equipment across private land, disruption to wildlife, ranch operations and long term destruction of native grasslands which cannot typically be repaired by "reclamation efforts". Impact of equipment rutting and grass disruption is still evident 20 or more years after the disturbance. As land owners we also place extremely high value on the viewscape and wildlife attracted to areas undisturbed by huge structures such as transmission lines. The previous line in the area disrupted eagle nesting patterns, has created huge risk to waterfowl as it goes through natural waterways and has promoted the spread of aggressive non-native plants such as blueweed.
- No Answer
- Not sure
- May have higher impacts on land use and environment, may establish new linear disturbance.
- This will disturb more land that is in production, either for food crops or native grassland.
- Intrusion on private property is Bad Quarter line better
- Might have to go through too much private land for maintenance
- Its private land, they own it to do with what they wish not you guys
- We as rate payers, will have to pay these landowners to buy/lease the land these structures sit on FOREVER!
- With private property there is always that impact to land owner, visual health of a change in views cape, not a calming structure. Along the quarter line, there is a good potential for higher impact on landscape as the land requirement for construction could follow a path through native landscapes, ecological impact, and if land is cultivated, hinder utilizing ROW for agriculture needs.
- Might be some agricultural issues and native grassland issues
- It does not allow you to use the most practical, unobtrusive route if you have to follow a specific quarterline.

**PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU WOULD PREFER PLACING STRUCTURES IN ROAD ALLOWANCE OR PLACING STRUCTURES ON PRIVATE PROPERTY AND WHY.**

- Road allowance first, then after all reasonable questions and direction have addressed, then only private.
- See previous answer!
- Along or adjacent to R/A. Less land acquisition and disruption of farming operations. Use same R/W and structures for milestones or follow or parallel existing R/W!
- Use current right of ways only. Railroad, road, exiting utilities.
- Prefer on road allowance along the hwy only! Not road allowances along private property. We need to ensure that the private property is protected for future generations. We are stewards of the land. Road allowance along hwy ensures access for

repair and is less invasive. Follow the linear lanes as outlined in the south SK Regional Plan. Why ruin private property if you don't have to! Go back to the last project and see the comments on this! Where is the need? This is NOT green energy. What are the proposed routes?

- I think that you will have to use a mix of both approaches. Follow road allowances where it makes sense otherwise, but don't be limited by having to stick to that as your only option.
- I prefer placing structure in the road allowance because it is not taking from farmland and not a creating more unneeded disturbance. So put lines with a smaller base with no guidewires.
- Road allowance that property is already disturbed. Grasslands & animals corridor & eagle migration routes protected so away from Livingston Range.
- This is dependent on route.
- Highway #3 & 22 if it is totally necessary to go NORTH, place this on government owned land - PARKS! Why impact PRIVATE LAND?!
- On neither
- Structures are preferred in road allowances because of less land lost to agriculture. Land devaluation where lines are.
- Why are we wasting our time with this over and over. Some road allowances are in most scenic, valuable areas for wildlife, etc.
- Road allowance because less intrusive on the private property.
- Road allowance: Less probably environmental disturbances across native prairie/wetlands, etc. Linear payments to the MD to benefit all in the MD rather than specific landowners. I'm not a landowner - full disclosure. Ease of access for repair and build of 2nd circuit. Makes possible two separate two less intrusive routes. Follow existing features.
- Along road allowance but on private property. Gives landowner some revenue for having to look at line. Leaves road allowance clear of obstructions for future development. Gives legal access to patrol line while being on road allowance but would prefer not to be on a road allowance close to our house.
- On R/A; land already disturbed. Easier access for repair/maintenance & construction.
- Private property - land owners receive revenue. If you have to look at it you might as well get something for it. If structures are on road allowances, right of way still extends to private land, but land owners do not get benefits.
- Need not established. Reams of data already provided!!!
- Already answered question.
- The 'best' answer is likely a combination of the two. Ideally with the least impact/disruptions. Visually - viewsapes, to residences, environmental concerns, minimize impact to private landowners when undesirable.
- Private property and quarterline for safety and to limit agricultural impacts. Limit visual impacts.
- Prefer road allowance to preserve private property.
- "Prefer in road allowance. Primarily because it already follows existing infrastructure (road/highway). Road allowance - undeveloped road allowance in MD - in our place goes and fragments private property. Question - would land owner get paid for an infrastructure on undeveloped road allowance or only R.O.W if needed?

- Large Pictures - helpful to see structures especially all structures one side of road compared to structures on both sides of road - I prefer one side as less visually."
- Road allowance. See comments from previous pages.
- Private property is cost effective for farmers & ranchers.
- Bury the line
- Place in road allowance to minimize need for access and land use loss.
- Road allowance. It's a three way win, legislation allows.
- I would prefer to see placing structures in a combination of road allowance & private property. This would depend on the situation, whether an environmentally sensitive area is being traversed, crossed.
- Prefer road allowance if underground is not feasible
- Road allowance for environmental reasons.
- NONE - requires access by heavy equipment across private land, disruption to wildlife, ranch operations and long term destruction of native grasslands which cannot typically be repaired by "reclamation efforts". Impact of equipment rutting and grass disruption is still evident 20 or more years after the disturbance. As land owners we also place extremely high value on the viewscape and wildlife attracted to areas undisturbed by huge structures such as transmission lines. The previous line in the area disrupted eagle nesting patterns, has created huge risk to waterfowl as it goes through natural waterways and has promoted the spread of aggressive non-native plants such as blueweed.
- No Answer
- Road allowances. Crown land
- I have no preference, but would rather see a routing that strives for the optimum balance between minimizing environmental and land use disturbance and visual impact, cost, and compensation of those landowners directly affected (i.e. who bear the burden of most impacts).
- I would prefer placing the structures along a major road allowance but could live with the structure just inside the landowner's property line along a major road structure.
- Road allowance makes the most sense. That is why the quarter lines were surveyed 150 years ago
- Road allowance only tied to main paved roads or highways.
- Road Allowance, because it is owned by the government not land owners who pay taxes
- The Road Allowances are public lands so there is only one group being negotiated with. Not 100's of individual land owners.
- I would lean towards road allowance as it is a designated ROW for future disturbance if a road was required, and if a road is already constructed, then can limit the land disturbed. However, there is an impact to residents along the routes. But feel it is a better option, than requiring possibly undisturbed land through access across Private Property
- I would lean toward the road allowance with the least obtrusive structure possible.
- This question is leading and I disagree with asking it in this way. You should follow the most unobtrusive route, if the line needs to be built.

PLEASE INDICATE WHICH OF THE THEMES DESCRIBED IN OUR WHAT WE HEARD PRESENTATION FROM THE CASTLE ROCK RIDGE TO CHAPEL ROCK TRANSMISSION PROJECT ARE RELEVANT FOR THIS PROJECT AND WHY.

- Property values, visual impacts, environmental
- All of them, the concerns have not changed!
- I am concerned about the environment and the lines impact on it. Visual impacts would be a secondary concern - especially as far as safety goes at corners, etc.
- Go Castle Rock (closer than Goose Lake) Go straight north across Oldman Reservoir then follow least disruptive route to Chapel Rock. Or: follow existing line west and then North from Castle Rock.
- Routing & siting - concerned - avoid residences; Environment - need to avoid wildlife corridors; Visual - unsightly lines; Property values - values will decrease (acreages); Concern is project not required, no proof that this line is needed.
- All of the themes described are highly relevant! What is the need? Why? This is NOT green energy when transmission lines have to be strung everywhere. Follow the hwy! Avoid wildlife corridors/environment. Avoid native grasslands. I do NOT want this line to go through at all!
- I thought that this was a 'new' project, where you are starting at ground zero? It sure doesn't sound that way. This new project needs to be objective in its considerations, not pushed around by a subset of landowners. An independent 3rd party should be able to follow the logic of the decision. Please produce and share at least cost path analysis for: Environment-which paths would have the lowest impact on environmental values (e.g. env.sig areas), Number of residences with X distance, Acreage resale potential, Construction cost, Engineering constraints. Tourism - last time you allowed us to view anticipated experience while going past crossings on Hwy 3 & 22. This time please ask a set of potential tourists (Edmonton, Calgary, and Lethbridge) to view proposed impacted areas on these highways and rate the impact (before & after construction) These people need to be independent and not influenced by NIMBY.
- This is an undervalued area even though population is all it is an animal corridor & native grassland that is valuable for carbon sequestering. Ranch land must be preserved!! Please - the least disturbance the better.
- Value to be heard considered & followed through. Routing & siting - appropriate & thoughtful choices. Environment. Visual impacts. Property values.
- Follow existing lines. Environment - avoid native grass. No concern for potential resale. Believe project not required.
- Concern with property values. Project not required. Ruin farmland. Lack of compensation for lines.
- Has anyone from AltaLink walked the proposed transmission line to identify heritage sites. I.e. Indian graves & heritage farm/ranch sites. The only people who will profit from the construction of this line is Warren Buffet and the people who agree to have wind turbines erected on their land. The lines scream in the wind.
- What has been listed is valid. Viewscapes, native grass, conservancy lands and wildlife corridors, etc. 1) Follow existing corridors/infrastructure 2) Environment wildlife, native grass 3) Visual impacts 4) Property values 5) Project need - is wind power viable? Here in future?
- Routing & siting. Environment. Project need.
- Environmental, visual impacts & property values, most especially project Need!



- Project need has not been demonstrated. 2) Minimal impacts to natural environment (land, water, fish, wildlife, species at risk, etc.)
- All except for the line placement underground.
- All of the values, interests & priorities are still very much relevant in this proposed development!
- Input given numerous times in previous years.
- Your old project was going from A & B, all private property. Property values going up.
- I think the statement that 'underground' is not an option limits some of what you may be able to achieve. In my former one-one consultation (and expressed by many others) considering this for at least part of the routing could reduce the visual impact, and potentially address some of the opposing concerns. While it may not be practical for all of the routes, portions of it could potentially be. Not convince about the need of this grid. Microgeneration & storage will make these grids obsolete. Concerns about current grid being overbuilt. Needless additional costs to consumers.
- All 5 themes.
- All are most relevant. Would be nice to have underground but would be very expensive to do and more expensive to maintain. Sounds like power (extra) is needed with growing demand.
- All are relevant.
- Follow existing corridors/infrastructure. Avoid wildlife/corridors. Impacts along highway 2. Concerned with impact to natural beauty & wildlife and tourist viewpoints.
- Native grass, scenery, animals & birds, Need - is there any?
- Routing & siting. Following existing corridors where possible. 2) Shortest route impacting least no. of landowners and least visual impact.
- Need approval, property value - no applicable, visual impact - structure 4, routing - impacts landowners only if you place on landowners land.
- We have provided hours of route-selection & alternative routes which provide less visual impact & environment impact. Any suggestions that we have made were responded similar to we will not entertain this (basically thanks for your lip service)
- Environmental - to avoid wildlife corridors, environmentally sensitive, significant areas. 2) Visual impact. 3) Property values
- Routing & siting, environment, visual impacts, property values (perceived??), policy on renewals to more realistic - need may not be there
- All of the themes are still relevant. I would like there to be a clearer understanding of why this has to happen here. Where else could this possibly happen that would have less impacts?
- All of the same themes are relevant. From the information provided there is virtually NO difference between the two projects in terms of the potential risks and impacts that were discussed in detail during the last iteration. These concerns must be addressed and so far none of the information provided as generated any confidence that this is possible.
- No Answer
- As per project need I think we are all still sceptical
- Routing and siting that makes use of existing linear disturbances where feasible while minimizing impacts on environment and land use remain relevant. Concerns regarding visual impacts remain relevant. IF there are measurable impacts on property values attributable to the facilities, then it would be a relevant issue, but I am not convinced

that is the case; once route refinement is advanced to the point of being able to assess actual impacts on actual properties, compensation for the affected landowners should be considered (probably cheaper than under grounding!).

- Project Need: I need to be convinced that there will be enough new wind development planned in the next two to three years that cannot be sent out of the area, if required, by any lines that are already in place. This should not be based on the wish list of the government to increase renewable energy production but actual and credible wind or solar company plans. Routing and Siting: (as per the themes on the list)
- I AGREE WITH ALL THESE CONCERNS
- ALL of the above.
- Yes all of the above, same thing as last project and that was also a waste of tax payers money. All I here is this is more money and that is more money. Well the last proposal was a waste of taxpayers money and know we start again
- All these themes are still relevant, with this Chapel Rock to Pincher Creek Area Transmission Development. Changing the label/name doesn't mean these goals have changed. \* Also the order in which you place them is very misleading. The concern which is stated last is First in all of our minds.
- They all are important themes and must continue to be relevant to the project. Ensure you continue to engage and inform the public so the best route and site can be considered.
- They are all relevant except for the project need concern and the underground option which has already been decided it looks like.
- I agree with everything on the list. The least of my concerns would be wildlife as they do not obstruct animal migration.

**PLEASE INDICATE WHICH OF THE THEMES DESCRIBED IN OUR WHAT WE HEARD PRESENTATION FROM THE CASTLE ROCK RIDGE TO CHAPEL ROCK TRANSMISSION PROJECT ARE NO LONGER RELEVANT FOR THIS PROJECT AND WHY.**

- concerns about the need
- None!
- Concerns about perceived reduced resale values.
- Cost needs to be a consideration because every consumer is paying for it.
- They are all still relevant! None are no longer relevant! It has not changed.
- We now know that the recreation area around the Oldman Reservoir is not a no go zone, so needs to be equally considered along with everywhere else.
- Didn't live here at that time.
- Can't go underground, stay off cultivated land. Cows can graze around powerlines. Machines damage lines.
- Nothing has changed. Routing & siting stills pits neighbour against neighbour. The environment is key to the health of the planet. Scenic impact - the lines are a blight on the landscape. Property values will be affected if you try to sell a property with the view of a transmission line cutting across the Livingston Range. The project is unneeded.
- All are still relevant.
- Visual impacts. I live in Bellevue and my sense is this isn't tracking 170L but if that changes then visual/resale values becomes significant.

- Only theme not relevant is underground.
- The whole assumption is that the need has been approved & so we must do that. In light of AVC registration, that is not a valid assumption. If 240kV is needed, why limit to 500kV project. They are not indivisible.
- Underground - costs too much, up to 10 times as much.
- None of the concerns are diminished. It would be short sighted & naïve to believe they have at all.
- Input given numerous times in previous years.
- I think all concerns expressed in the former project are still relevant. We stakeholders did not go anywhere. Single pole double circuit structure seems to be an improvement over CRR-CR project. Less objectionable. A lot of people spent a lot of time providing individual consultations (400+) and a lot of time at community presentations.
- All 5 themes totally important.
- Same as page 8.
- All still relevant.
- N/A
- All relevant
- Environment - route proposed is on disturbed farming & grazing land.
- Property value - does not feel there is an impact
- Not applicable.
- NONE
- No Answer
- I think they all remain relevant
- I do not think that under grounding is a feasible option (too costly for taxpayers, relative to benefit gained). I think the need is already adequately demonstrated and need not be re-examined.
- Concerns for potential impacts along highway 3 and 22: we already have main roads, the towns, houses, sub-stations, railways and large double circuit structures (in some places) there already.
- I think all are important
- THEY ARE all importance.
- all are of concerned
- All of these points are important/necessary so none of them should be removed from the List.
- None. They continue to be relevant until completion.
- They are all relevant except for the project need concern and the underground option which has already been decided it looks like.
- All are relevant.

#### ARE THERE OTHER INTERESTS OR PRIORITIES THAT NEED TO BE CONSIDERED?

- road twinning Hwy 3
- In general: Power should be generated close to where it is needed. That make overhead lines obsolete and saves a lot of public money.
- Inter ties are necessary to strengthen the grid - just do it.

- Do not place transmission lines near any homesteads, personal residences due to health concerns, wind noise concerns, visual impact.
- Yes, why the need? How is this green energy? It is NOT! No more windmills - no more transmission lines. Wind noise - how to overcome this?
- Crowsnest pass is now even more invested in attracting tourists. Those people must travel on Hwy 22 & Hwy 3. We need to make the approach from Pincher Creek and Maycroft as unaffected as possible. We need to have a discussion about options to run along the bottom of the reservoir. This covers half of the study area length and would drastically reduce the number of residences affected, tourist traffic affected and would have minimal impact on the environment (it's the biggest anthropogenic disturbance that we have)
- Will accept what AESO does on project, wish all luck
- Need to minimize new disturbances to land. So put the lines in the road allowance.
- Following existing major corridors - #3 Hwy
- Heritage sites, bird deaths due to flying into the lines such as what happened on the Snake Trail line which resulted in the deaths of hundreds of ducks, geese and swans.
- Take down 500kV line - don't fix it up? How many times do we do this? Three already, we've been to open houses, had AltaLink at our homes. We've been there, done that. Are we starting from scratch again? Do we go through it all over? Why? Very stressful. Ruining our lives. Need has NOT been proved. Wind blows at non-peak times. Concentrate power close to larger centres that need power. Pitting neighbour against neighbour. Don't put more transmission lines and a substation on the eastern slopes of the Livingston Range. Go under Hwy 3 expansion.
- Weed control/ecological restoration of disturbances out in native prairie. Clean equipment in/out. Soil conservation during build. Minimizing wildlife impacts long term not as concerned in short term construction impact.
- Close to already established homesteads.
- Start with a realistic re-assessment of transmission lines that are actually needed. Rigorously assess realism of wind proposals when doing this. Separate 500kV project from 240 line. Get an independent assessment of options (Do not ask the corporation that benefits from building if it should be built) When maps are done, they should be accurate!
- Impacts of project on homesteads. How close?
- Rare or species of special concern (i.e. Westslope Cutthroat trout, rough fescue grassland, limber pine). Breeding sites for upland birds. (i.e. sharp tail grouse, turkeys)
- I feel this AltaLink has listened from last proposal & is a better plan for a new transmission.
- I think it is rather unfortunate that you chose to split the group and took the 'why is this needed group' away from the discussion - you could have been more open.
- Alignments for this new project.
- All covered.
- N/A
- Animal routes
- No, as above.
- Climate change, emissions
- Economic impacts to the community.

- It is important to delay building this type of massive infrastructure as long as possible given that many factors (economic, political and otherwise) can significantly change the assumptions around future wind development in this area. Renewable energy should focus on access to baseload energy only (e.g. hydro perhaps from Site C in BC) NOT intermittent energy such as windmills which require massive new transmission investment (when NO new load growth exists in the region being affected), require full backstopping by new gas generation to prevent blackouts when the wind stops blowing and create such significant negative impacts on local landowners.
- No Answer
- Just the concept of NEED?
- Consultation with Aboriginal groups and assessment of impacts of the facilities on Aboriginal rights, title, and other interests, including potential effects, if any, on traditional use of land and resources and on archaeological and heritage resources.
- The added costs to the Alberta taxpayers for: - building structures based on government targets vs industry plans. - expanding wind energy production during periods of low demand and price then importing power at a higher price during peak demand periods.
- NO
- It should going along highway 3.
- I think you should run it down highway 3, it's already an eyesore anyways.
- This cry for added transmission lines has been voiced with urgency for 10 yrs. If this was based in Truth we would have felt the negative effects of it not being in place by now. We have not!, so I just don't believe AESO's talking head when he does his presentation any more.
- What investment potential will this line create? Who gets to buy into the line, is it for Canadian consumption or will it be shipped out of country?
- We see so much of our beautiful landscape already ruined by industrial development, we hate to see it continually be decimated by progress. We generally all love the modern conveniences of power but If there was another way, that would be awesome.
- This list reflects my concerns.

**PLEASE LIST THREE OR FOUR KEY CONSIDERATIONS YOU FEEL SHOULD BE KEPT IN MIND DURING THE ROUTING SELECTION PROCESS AND INDICATE THE CORRESPONDING AREAS ON THE MAP**

- What effect would a new line have on the airport & future growth of the airport
- Go north before Lundbreck, follow Highway 3 till go north.
- Don't go anywhere west of Burmis (even Hwy 22)
- Talk honestly to each landowner & address all concerns; North Burmis Road Area - stay away from this 1) bird nesting sites 2) private residences 3) wildlife - habitation, bear, moose, elk, deer, birds
- Come meet with us! (Contact information provided)<sup>3</sup>
- Following within the reservoir (or even the banks of the recreation area) needs to be on the table, to be evaluated in terms of what minimizes impacts on environment, residences and tourism value. Going along the bottom of the reservoir will likely address a number of issues that people have. 2) Paralleling a highway is not compatible with

---

<sup>3</sup> Personal information provided has been redacted for privacy reasons

tourism. It suites a few but affects a lot of people that aren't here. 3) Everyone has a NIMBY bias. You need to sort through the noise and decide what is an objective argument and what is a cherry picking issues. The whole area must be reviewed and considered based on actual merits. 4) Why is the area east of the Oldman River not on the table. That significantly undermines the argument that this is a new project.

- Take look at best route least affected for residents, cheap route
- Crossing the Oldman dam will be costly, ugly and permission would be hard to get considering that a wildlife sanctuary borders the dam. I think Goose Lake route and a lower route beside the existing powerline.
- Conservation areas protected; tourism; native grasslands
- Environment, visually, use existing right away - South Sask Regional Plan
- Existing & proposed windfarms. Elk corridors & migratory wildlife. Certified organic land. Conservation lands. --- all important factors to me
- Stay away from populated areas like Cowley & Oldman Reservoir
- [drew on map where the eagle migration flight path is and animal corridors]
- Conservation easements on Rock Creek and Wildlife corridors. Native grasslands. Eagle migration along Livingstone Range and ridges immediately to the east. Largest eagle migration in the world! Cowley glider strip - fly west over Livingstone Range, more power lines are a hazard.
- Stay out of elk hunting, native prairie if at all possible on the west side of Hwy 22. Consider routing two circuits along two separate rows from Chapel Rock to Picher area (use structure 3). If only one route possible use structure 4 along road allowances or cultivated fields, not through native prairie or rangelands. If crossing through native prairie then minimize disturbance methods mandatory. I.e. tracked vehicles/timed rig mat placement, screw piles to anchor towers on Q & midspan structures. Heli-stringing or Frozen dry ground conditions.
- Not following Hwy 22. Minimize West of Hwy 22 not parallel with road if have to cross it going East & West. Migrating bird paths.
- Start with an accurate map. A reservoir is not an ecologically significant area. Co-ordinate this exercise with the Hwy 3 upgrade project. Do not build lines that will replicate the 'Dead Duck Café' events on the line along the highway to the dam. With changing climate, ensure lines can withstand increasing winds & ice storms (remember the Quebec/East ON events). Do environmental assessment on the ground & over full year. Ensure any line avoids conservation easement lands. Explain why lines that we were initially necessary by 2014 +/- are now needed for 22-23.
- Proper consultation. Don't run parallel to Hwy. Minimal impacts to wildlife - birds, eagles, etc.
- Copious quantities of data already given.
- I have drawn a route from Goose Lake to north of Bellevue.
- Visual impact to our area. Impact on wildlife & natural vegetation. Residential impacts. Consider portions underground or submerged. (Contact information provided) <sup>4</sup>
- North Burmis Valley is a song bird nesting site federal law forbids disturbing song bird nest sites.
- Existing infrastructure, towns, rail lines, recreation areas, Lee Lake, Castle Park.

---

<sup>4</sup> Personal information provided has been redacted for privacy reasons

- Areas requiring special consideration. Use existing infrastructure. Protect recreation areas, ex. Lee Lake, Castle Mt. & wildlife. Use most direct route taking in consideration of points above.
- Key areas - that require special consideration. 1) Existing infrastructure - Hwy 3, 22, power lines. 2) High density populations - Lundbreck, Cowley, etc. 3) High use rec. areas - Castle Park, Lee Lake. 4) Environment - Nature Conservancy Lands, Parks
- Wilderness areas - Oldman River; Native grass 8-1-W5th; Scenery - everywhere
- Stay off of the Livingstone Range; Considerations - Environment, avoid wild life corridors/rutting & culling, native grass; Co; Economic - tourism & scenery have significant value to the region, respect the landscape & environment, this is what creates the value; Psychology, I really can't think about these powerlines. The prospect is too disturbing to me. It must be for everyone here too.
- The Cowboy Trail (Hwy #22) should be avoided because of value of tourism travel. Native grass areas should be avoided because the loss of this resource is continuing on a limited resource.
- Suggest reviewing the MD#9 Map - which shows all the road allowances; follow road allowances & row's; rip out old structures - replace with 240-Under Strung; missing wind farms on the map
- Please contact CALUA on the various routes that they have provided. Has it ever been presented to AESO? Will be presented in hearing.
- Prevent obstructions of important views. 2) Avoid being built too close to villages. 3) At least visible to tourists as possible, visiting areas. 4) Avoid acreage yards, Farm/Ranch yards, places of residence by at least a half mile approximately.
- Follow road allowance - need a MD#9 map - road allowances are clear; Heritage windfarm, windy point, welch - are missing on map; follow Row parallels 170C; Only one house on this (RR#15) route;

#### GENERAL QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

- What about newer & cheaper underground methods?
- Pictures of undergrounding based on old technology not new technology
- Alberta needs to be a leader in doing things better.
- What effect would a new line have on the airport and any future growth? Would this help local folks with jobs?
- Do proposed generation facilities require capitalization (\$\$) prior to being included in AESO need & assessment?
- Underground is more progressive - the future.
- It doesn't make economic sense to put it underground.
- Before new - reduce, reuse, recycle.
- When the wind tower are moth ball the underground concrete stops the area from being used for farming. Hay require 36 in. & the concrete is buried 30 in.
- What is the cost comparison between the various structures?
- Not in favour the overhead liens and tall structures near my property.
- Still not convinced there is a need. (NID)
- We do not need the line.
- Structures - choice between bad and worse. Can't we just say NO! Like choice between hanging vs. gunshot to head vs. drawn and quartering. I'd rather choose not dying.

- Why would you even consider the twin single circuit option? Monopole seems to be the logical choice from a visual impact perspective but what is the cost differential?
- Has AESO considered repairing the 138kV line south (then north) of Hwy 3 to a 240kV single pole line with a substation in BC?
- Why has AltaLink acted outside the AUC's precious direction to limit the study area & gone back to it's original map with potential routing along the western flanks is the Porcupine Hills?
- How will the export of power from Alberta to BC and beyond, affect Alberta power consumers?
- Why are we planning to improve BC intertie when we also are talking about not buying BC power?
- Have we considered connections to SK/MB instead of BC? (EIA done on Nelson R to Calgary Line about 1982)
- Has the AESO considered cost/benefit of selling electricity to SK via Lloydminster vs selling power to BC? Once BC builds the site C dam, it will not be buying any power from Alberta.
- The substation will be an Alberta side rather than 1/2 way to the Cranbrook ever. Would make more sense to have it 1/2 way along - i.e. in BC.
- Concern - potential unwarranted costs are an addition financial load (costs of project are borne by us) that is not truly necessary. Current system overbuilt
- Concern - trashing our natural viewscapes. Livingstone Range is world famous. It does not need to be an industrial landscape.
- Concern with the emergence of renewables/microgeneration large scale grid development is becoming obsolete & unnecessary expense.
- New technologies are developing so fast that make this forecasted transmission read wrong.
- If petroleum companies can directional drill for miles to tap into a petroleum source why can't AltaLink do the same for powerlines?
- What is the business case for the increased capacity? What is the current usage of existing infrastructure?
- What is the timeline for needing the increased capacity?
- BC line - is it twinned? 4 Stream crossings - Morin Ck, Gold Ck, Green Ck --- all critical WS CTRR habitat
- At this point, where are we in terms of hitting that 1st generation target for circuit #1?
- How can we trust AESO/AL after all the falsehoods over past 10 years?
- AltaLink has never revealed it's 'crystal ball' analysis of how it weighs criteria - in other words, it obviously made up the outcome as it goes, seemingly being the benevolent all-seeing reviews.
- Why are we being asked about poles/placement when we have not even been told how we decided it was needed?
- "1) What additional equipment will be under the 500kV line?
- 2) How much disturbance is expected with 500kV renewal?
- 3) What about burying line in conjunction with Hwy 3 expansion project?
- 4) Has need been proved? Has need been accepted by AUC?"
- "5) Why is power transmission in Alberta so much more costly than in other provinces?
- 6) \$750 million is an overbuild, increases electricity costs. Why do this?
- 7) Is this fiscally responsible? Is it in society's best interests?"



- "8) Is it in Albertan's best interests to sell wind energy at a low price and buy BC Hydro at a much higher price?
- 9) Why doesn't BC build lines and substation and pay for it?
- 10) Can't Alberta generate it's own power?
- 11) What about AB/SK power exchange?"
- "12) Why not create a 240kV intertie near Peace River?
- 13) Why not upgrade existing 138kV line to 240kV single-pole line with a substation in BC?"
- Why do they believe there will be wind or solar to connect? Many proposals, but very little new projects.
- Where are all the applications to connect all the 'renewables'? Not convinced there is a real demand for this.
- Do we really need the line? Stats, #people.
- How has a 10 year old NID been updated to say same old thing?
- Why are we helping power to BC?
- Are they going to provide an impact matrix this time around? Hard to assess 'least' impact claims with no matrix.
- Who did the studies that determined the need for more power lines?
- Where does cost/benefit analysis come into the whole NEED determination?
- AESO has been unable to predict wind generation in the PC area - but is now reporting need with no rationalizing data. How can the AESO expect the public to have faith in its projections?
- DO NOT BELIEVE IT IS NEEDED! NOT NEEDED!
- What is the point of starting over? The end points are the same. You had consultations in 2014, now you are starting over. Why? Waste of consumers money!
- Since the proposed intertie is of benefit to BC, as the benefactor in electrical sales, why would Albertans pay \$750 million to serve the BC economy? Has the AESO considered a 240kV intertie near Peace River?
- How did AESO confirm NEED? They were rebuffed last time & what has changed so they can come back?
- Not needed. Government waste of taxpayer money on green energy.
- More clarity needed on why overhead transmission.
- Structure - no thoughts, no comments at this time.
- Keep hearing the word 'Need' but no definition. Define the Need.
- Big concern about need - not justified. AESO is not trustworthy. Extreme frustration. Being railroaded by AESO and AltaLink - working together without due process to approach others. 'several people'
- "AESO Questions:
- Competitive renewal process references need for generators to connect to 'existing' transmission. Has AESO identified optional locations POPS for new generation to minimize need for net new transmission? If so, where?
- Can intertie upgrade be done in another way (without new substation at Chapel Rock) if this project does not proceed? Why are they linked?
- How much excess capacity is available with current line (+minor upgrades) for new generation?"
- "AESO Questions:

- What is process to align the various applications and the timeline? Will they be in parallel? 1. Update to SATAR re: need. 2. AltaLink applications."
- If must choose (although they feel cart before the horse) Structure 4 would be the choice - least amount of impact (but impact is impact)
- Can we combine the Hwy 3 twinning and burying the line? There will already be a huge disturbance.
- Parking lot: Wants more clarity on the purpose of the line. Would prefer a conversation with AltaLink on the need & hopes & concerns. Would have liked to talk to AltaLink about the project. Why not use existing utilities line? More clarity on siting.
- In regards to wind towers...why is this concentrated in Southern Alberta?
- What is the advantage to staging? As a landowner what is the advantage? What about new technologies?
- How will use of highways impact self-driven cars (in a few years)? Given the same issues involved in using railway right of way.
- "AltaLink Question:
  - Is the Goose Lake substation option a viable alternative to building a Chapel Rock substation?"
- Honestly it's the exact same concerns as last time around. Feels like the same.
- Existing ROW's - heard this before and wasn't used in the route - why will this time be bigger?
- Table common theme: regarding structure - use road allowances as much as possible.
- When a landowner has gone through the process of going off-grid, being environmentally aware this goes against our values.
- Would this project create employment for the local residents?
- What effect would a new line have on the Pincher Creek airport and any future growth & local industry?
- Wind noise through the lines - which line is the best to sustain major wind. The quietness in the wind?
- Induction shock from tower of private property wire fence - what do we do?!
- How do you handle the visual pollution?
- Who is AltaLink? Why does the information package not clear that AltaLink is owned by Berkshire Hathaway a US company owned by Warren Buffet! Buffet owns electrical generation and transmission in the Northern US. What guarantees can be given that his US generation will not be transmitted through this project line?
- Presentation - skipped over the most important step, that is need. Do not agree that there is a need. 2007 identified need, decrease coal, increase renewables is the real impetus.
- An impact is an impact. We are arguing the scale but we should be arguing the need.
- Group feels like the cart is before the horse in choosing structure before the need is clear.
- Pros and cons of towers were not presented. Cost of towers were not presented.
- Values: Cost should be shared with taxpayers versus individuals carrying the impact of powerline. Interest - what we can see, hear, protecting wildlife. Priority - use existing route (Hwy 3) or land disturbances/railway. Like structure 4 the best.
- Dissing the underground option as a viable alternative because of cost, on a long term project, seems short sighted. I realize that there is initial land disturbance, but it is not

long-term. Given a short term environmental impact on the one hand, and a long term environmental and aesthetic impact on the basis of economics is false valuing.

- AltaLink needs to ask the locals who live and work in the area about environmentally sensitive aspects - Flora, Fauna, archaeology, the Alberta/Federal info is not complete. Engage more one on one to gather LOCAL KNOWLEDGE.
- Why is this project called Chapel Rock? (scares the stakeholder people that live, play, recreate there)
- Structure comparables on impacts - noise, birds & bats
- For AESO: What is being done in the area of storage of wind energy?
- For AESO: When will the transmission capacity be exceeded in this area?
- Why aren't other areas being considered?
- How many years will it take to pay off this project?
- How will US benefit from this project?
- Who is AIMCO & how much money are they making from this project?
- Naming is important \*learn the history. You will look smarter & reduce confusion to public. \* Be consistent.
- How will the new AltaLink Project really benefit the local community, economy?
- Who is ENEL & how many windmills will be built?
- Value, interests and priorities all still relevant. Nothing has changed!!
- Common theme: Picking a preference (on structure type) is endorsing something we don't want.
- Value - wildlife corridor, aesthetics/sensitivity to people on landscape
- Issues - Application process; hearing for need. Lack of benefits for Albertan's. Cost to rate payer. Hydro & natural gas better options.
- Priorities - more information on website, mapping out environmental sensitive areas
- I appreciate the opportunity to give input and hope it will actually be considered.
- So far none of the most critical questions have been answered and it appears that this level of information will not be available until the actual hearing process. Given that AESO and AltaLink plan to apply in tandem this creates significant additional work and cost for landowners who are seeking to protect their interests in this process. We believe the issue of need should be addressed prior to any application for new transmission development.
- No Answer
- (Contact information provided) <sup>5</sup>
- No Answer
- I generally do not want any more linear disturbances if at all possible, especially in areas of native grasslands. The line should connect to the most southerly part of the inter tie which should allow for the route of the new line to go as directly west from Pincher Creek as possible and hopefully reduce the overall cost of the project.
- (Contact Information provided) <sup>6</sup>
- It looks like you are worried about the cost of other ways of keeping the lines out of sight on private land areas and not the private land owner rights on what goes on their land. (Contact information provided) <sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Personal information provided has been redacted for privacy reasons

<sup>6</sup> Personal information provided has been redacted for privacy reasons

<sup>7</sup> Personal information provided has been redacted for privacy reasons

- just keep me informed, I want to know what is going on. (Contact information provided)<sup>8</sup>
- This process is backwards. You don't even have a route for this transmission wire approved, so to have an open house to talk about structure choices is like building a town in the middle of no-where with no way of accessing it via road, rail, or boat and asking people to come live there. We are not all completely asleep at the wheel.
- No Answer
- No Answer
- Contact information provided<sup>9</sup>
- Felt like a forced march to slaughter; workshop contrived & delivered to promote AltaLink's predetermined grab/vision for implementation; needs for project never 'sold' to participants
- I thought it was going to be an open house like previous sessions.
- I think it is unfortunate that you split the group to address 'the need' resulted in less feedback on the work books and the discussion from this 'other' session was not shared
- I am absolutely positive the decisions have been made long ago!
- Felt a little rushed. Understand this was the first meeting. Talk about additional windmills.
- Would like to have an indication where the line will be placed
- Maintain a neutral standpoint, some of the AltaLink people where to bias towards building vs. listening
- Pay attention to established homesteads
- No
- No
- It seems money is an object, but that's a small thing when it comes to our land. That is our retirement home. We bought it for the view and beauty.
- Trust will need to be built. Much more info to public is necessary, from why now/here to how discussions were made about everything
- Not now, will see how things progress
- It seems that our input will have very little impact on the decisions that have already been made and the ones that will be made in the future. AESO is convinced that there is a need and is determined to proceed. I don't think anything we said today can change that. Progress at any cost.
- Listen to use the stakeholders
- Would have been helpful to split session over 2 nights (need on 1st night and project on 2nd). Was difficult to get full value when group had to split off to discuss need. However, greatly appreciated Jerry Mossing taking the time to meet and field questions - his open and honest feedback was appreciated.
- More open houses/workshops are necessary especially when it comes to routing options
- Good work with initializing consultation early on & communicating; everything is on the table at this point
- How can you assure us we will not have another mass killing of water fowl such as that which occurred on the Snake Trail line?

---

<sup>8</sup> Personal information provided has been redacted for privacy reasons

<sup>9</sup> Personal information provided has been redacted for privacy reasons

- Did not feel this format was useful for me. I wanted to hear more opinions than people just at my table. Other people in room more passionate/informed and could of gave more insight for me \*felt a little like I was in grade 5 doing these workbooks
- Not at this time. Concerned about the need of project.
- Nobody was able to answer my questions, they were not prepared for them.
- yes, going forward
- defects the solar world
- Too many to list
- Not now
- What good are more questions? The path seems clear to AESO and AltaLink. All we can do is provide input on what kind of towers we want. We don't want any towers.
- Please keep me informed as you continue to explore routes and project. Concerns are unchanged and it was unclear how any of these will actually be addressed. Thank you.
- Not enough information was provided on the routing options that are being considered for this development. I certainly believe that there are at least preferred and alternate routes that are already planned. This information should have been here.
- If routing goes through Bellevue I will be very keen to know about that route selection. If routing through area south Chapel Rock , east of North Burmis, north Hwy 3, west of Hwy 22 again will be interested to know/input
- The workshop was held so AltaLink can claim it did community input. Has anyone from AltaLink walked the proposed lines to identify heritage sites, i.e. native graves? It feels like everything has been decided.
- We were on a previous route proposed. There has been a significant change in our lands. Now has a Nature Conservatory Easement on these lands. – (Contact information provided)<sup>10</sup>
- Routing proposed in workbook is same as last time. Still the shortest least impactful.
- No
- The facilitators were great. I spoke to Sami Abdulsalam and he gave me great information. On the other hand, I felt that some of the info by the speakers, I wasn't sure I understood. The explanation while I looked at posters was clear and wonderful.
- Additional discussion about 'need' was appreciated. Should expand that part of the presentation. Better explanation of whose 'needs' should be clarified.
- Pay attention to involved people.
- Not until I see proposed routing
- No
- I would like to thank whoever is responsible for us getting more choice in how the structures look. I think all of them are better than the ones we were offered the first time.
- Would like to be kept informed on progress & proposed placement, etc. \*Can you alternate structure types in the project based on location potential or is only one structure type used for the entire project?

---

<sup>10</sup> Personal information provided has been redacted for privacy reasons