



February 26, 2010

Via Email and Canada Post

Mr. Harold N. Kvisle
President and CEO
TransCanada Corporation
450 - 1 Street SW
Calgary AB T2P 5H1

Dear Mr. Kvisle:

Re: Proposed Oakville 975 MW Natural Gas-Powered Electricity Generating Station

Further to our February 9, 2010 letter, it remains clear that **the proposal to build a massive gas-powered electricity generating station only 320 metres from a school and 400 metres from homes in Oakville does not make sense and should not proceed.** This is obvious to any reasonable person looking at the proposal from many different perspectives, including planning, safety, land use compatibility and air/noise emissions. The lack of buffer zones alone puts residents and school children at significant risk.

We don't fault TransCanada for the situation at hand, which resulted from a flawed process in which the OPA selected a site based on infrastructure and cost, which is **unacceptable given how close it is to schools and houses.** This process, which was flawed both in substance and execution in light of the result, must be rectified. **We request that TransCanada hold true to its stated core values of integrity, collaboration and responsibility and not proceed with the proposal.**

Now is the time for TransCanada to show that it stands behind its principles and not proceed with the proposal at this unique location. We understand that TransCanada would have preferred to build the plant at another location, which was confirmed by a TransCanada representative to one of our members at TransCanada's February 10 meeting. This makes good sense, including in light of the recent tragedy that occurred in Middletown, Connecticut, which showed the difference between theoretical studies and real world experience. The smaller Middletown plant was being built on a much larger remote site with very significant buffer zones from schools and houses. It is important to compare that to the proposed Oakville site, which **cannot and does not pass the "real world" reasonableness test given its close proximity to schools, houses, rail lines and major roads. The proposed Oakville site provides no margin for error or deviation from the theoretical scenarios that TransCanada puts forward.**

We trust that the Ontario government will not allow the proposal to proceed, and instead will reconsider the need for the plant, appropriate alternatives that should have been considered (at private and public properties) if the plant is even needed, as well as the proper location of a plant with buffer zones to protect schools and houses. Even if the Ontario government doesn't require that the appropriate process and considerations be undertaken, we request that TransCanada follow its own stated principles and values to ensure this is done, at a minimum, even if just to protect TransCanada from the significant damages, costs and claims that would inevitably arise were the proposal to proceed.

The **draft Environmental Review report is wholly lacking in information about critical issues**, including the need for the proposal, alternatives, safety, and important cumulative effects beyond the few that were briefly considered, just to name a few. In addition to being a one-sided, proponent-driven document, the draft report fails to provide basic information about the proposal, other than in a superficial and cursory manner. For example, the report simply states that according to the Ontario Power Authority ("OPA"), a facility of up to 850 MW is needed, without any further explanation. There is no explanation as to how the facility has become a 975 MW plant. **We have yet to even see an explanation as to how TransCanada Energy Ltd. was able to participate in the OPA's process**, given that it was not qualified or registered to do so, and we have seen no indication that a change of name was requested or granted.

Although we have requested information from TransCanada, the Ontario Power Authority and other government agencies with respect to the proposal, including to obtain information that may assist us in assessing the proposal, **information has not been forthcoming**. This by itself raises serious questions and concerns, which in turn results in very significant uncertainties. The OPA and TransCanada have suggested that the process is open and fair, but the lack of information being provided confirms that is not the case. This is particularly troublesome for us, as we are the key stakeholders who would be most impacted for many decades by the proposal.

We hope that TransCanada will work with us, the Town of Oakville and the Ontario government to turn such a negative situation into a legacy that we can all be proud of. That means not continuing with an environmental review process that simply compounds the problem. **In our view, the proposal should not proceed at all, in light of the obvious safety, health and environmental issues.**

At a minimum, given the unique aspects of the proposed site, there must be a proper process that includes fundamental principles of fairness and protections that are currently lacking. For a project of this size, at a location so close to schools and houses, there must, at a minimum, be a transparent, objective assessment process that includes studies and analyses by independent experts. Instead, we have been presented with almost 2000 pages of reports prepared by a consultant retained by TransCanada. This one-sided approach is simply a self-assessment of the proposal by TransCanada, which is unacceptable. The stakes are too high, and there are too many issues and uncertainties to proceed without, at a minimum, a proper independent and objective assessment. **We trust that TransCanada and the Ontario government will take**

immediate steps to prevent these flawed processes from creating a negative legacy that we, and most importantly our children, will have to live with for many decades.

As part of any process to assess such a large plant at such a small site that is so close to schools and houses, there **must, at a minimum, be meaningful public consultation. This has not occurred, and it clear to us that there is no plan or intention to do so.** Instead, TransCanada held two information sessions before any site was selected. Since the date the site was selected by a process that remains for the most part secretive to us, there has been no meaningful public consultation. TransCanada held one closed-door, by invitation-only session, which we were not invited to, but were able to attend only by happenstance. This session, which was very tightly controlled by TransCanada, was clearly intended to try to project an image of consultation, but in fact did nothing other than to provide superficial information without any opportunity for real dialogue or consultation. The lack of any meaningful public consultation has continued.

TransCanada then released the draft environmental review report, which we expect was prepared by many consultants working full time over the course of many months, if not more than a year. **The lack of meaningful public consultation is highlighted by the fact that we are being asked to provide comments on this report, which TransCanada surely knows is clearly not possible given the complexity and significant implications arising from the many issues that are raised by the report, and many that are not even included.**

For example, although representatives of C4CA had raised issues and requested information about appropriate safety buffer zones for this proposal, given its close proximity to schools and houses, TransCanada merely stated that it has years of experience in the transportation of natural gas, facilities such as this are inherently safe and there is a 15 metre setback from the railway and road. TransCanada may want to suggest that the tragedy that occurred at Middletown is not relevant, but the fact is that an explosion occurred during the construction of an even smaller natural gas-powered electricity generating facility. Given the lack of setbacks for the proposal, a similar incident here would result in very significant tragedy and loss.

TransCanada held one "open house" in February 2010, on short notice, which again it tightly controlled. Although it may seem like a small matter, the following clearly shows that TransCanada has not engaged in meaningful consultation. When C4CA simply requested that it be allowed to have a table at the open house, TransCanada's representative replied, "Upon reflection and discussion, I confirm that we are not in a position to provide space for a table for C4CA in the main lobby at the Oakville Conference Centre". This is only one of many examples that show how it appears the process is being treated as an irritant to TransCanada, which has made clear, unequivocal public statements that the proposal is proceeding. None of this would be allowed to occur in an individual EA, which would include important oversight, control and decision-making by the Minister of the Environment.

In summary, TransCanada has requested comments in response to the almost 2000 page draft report that it released only a month ago. Of course, as you know, that is not possible. In the circumstances, we request that TransCanada not proceed with the proposal. At a minimum, we

request that TransCanada stop the current process, and instead work with the Minister of the Environment, the Town of Oakville and us to ensure that there is a proper process in place for the objective, independent and transparent assessment of the proposal, including need and alternatives. Nothing less is acceptable under TransCanada's values, principles and vision, or to meet proper planning principles. Anything less will result in a very negative legacy, including most importantly our children, who would have to somehow manage the significant issues and uncertainties that would inevitably arise from this proposal at such a unique location.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in red ink, appearing to be 'D. M.', written in a cursive style.

President C4CA

Cc: Premier Dalton McGuinty
Hon. John Gerretsen, Minister of the Environment
Hon. Brad Duguid, Minister of Energy and Infrastructure
Hon. Deb Matthews, Minister of Health and Long Term Care