

January 24, 2013

ZEP Ganaraska Wind Farm

Follow-up on Questions asked at December 20, 2012 Interim Public Meeting for ZEP Wind Farm Ganaraska

An interim public meeting was held for the proposed project at the Ganaraska Forest Centre on December 20, 2012. Sprott Power Corp. committed to follow-up with more information in response to the following questions. The questions are paraphrased from the transcript of the December 20th meeting. If anyone believes that the questions were not interpreted correctly, please inform the proponent at the following email address:

Ganaraska@zeroemissionpeople.com

We thank everyone who participated in the December 20th meeting.

1. Why was the December 20, 2012 meeting not held at the Clarke High School as was indicated on the original meeting notice?

The school was not available on Thursday, December 20. The mandatory on-line booking system at <http://www.kprschoools.ca/Schools/CommunityUseofSchools.html> has a calendar feature that shows all dates and times that particular schools are available for. Interested local residents can see for themselves how the system is set up and what dates are available for different school facilities. A tentative booking at the school was made for the preceding Saturday, in order to ensure that a facility would be available on a day in December. However, on further discussion, it was determined that not all relevant project experts would be available on the Saturday, and the Thursday date was required. At that point, the booking was cancelled and the proponent began making arrangements for other facilities. The only facility available on the Thursday that met minimum size and accessibility criteria was the Ganaraska Forest Centre. The original notice for the December 20th meeting was issued with an error in the meeting location. A correction to the notice was published on December 14th with the correct location for that meeting. Both Sprott Power Corp. and M.K. Ince and Associates apologize for any inconvenience associated with the error on the original notice.

2. Can the proponent direct community members to a project that has already been built that is similar in size so community members could go visit an operating facility to get a better understanding of what is being proposed for this project?

The proposed turbine to be installed at the Ganaraska Wind Farm is the REPower MM92. It has a hub height of 100m and blade diameter of 92m. Sprott Power Corp. has many operating wind farms; however none of them currently use this turbine model. As of March 2012, there were 1209 of this turbine model installed and operating worldwide. The closest location to observe the operation of REPower MM92 wind turbines is the Saint Robert Bellarim project located in Saint Robert Bellarim,

Quebec. This is south of Quebec City near the border of Quebec and Maine. The project is owned is owned by EDF EN.

The closest location to observe the operation of a wind project owned by Sprott Power Corp. would be the Ravenswood and Proofline projects located in Lambton County, located approximately 45km north of Sarnia (directions to the wind farms can be found at the end of this section). It should be noted that the turbines at this project are a different make and model than the turbines proposed for the ZEP Ganaraska Wind Farm. As such, the dimensions of the turbines and specifications are different. Lambton County is a lengthy drive from the Orono area. There are some other projects of comparable size located somewhat closer to Orono. Please note that none of these projects use the same turbine model as the proposed ZEP Ganaraska Wind Farm. We have provided a table below to provide the location of these projects and a description of the main differences in specifications.

Project	Owner	Location	Turbine Model	Number of Turbines	Turbine Hub Height	Turbine Rotor Diameter	Turbine Rated Noise Level (dBA)
Proposed ZEP Wind Farm Ganaraska	Sprott Power Corp. and Wind Works Power Corp.	Orono, ON	Repower MM92 2.0MW	10	100m	92m	103.2
Ravenswood	Sprott Power Corp.	Forrest, ON	Vestas V82 1.65MW	6	80m	82m	109.8
Proof Line	Sprott Power Corp.	Forrest, ON	Vestas V82 1.65MW	4	80m	82m	109.8
Arthur	Natenco	Arthur, ON	Enercon E70 2.0MW	5	85m	70m	104.5
Pickering Wind Generating Station	Ontario Power Generation	Pickering, ON	Vestas V80 1.8MW	1	78m	80m	unavailable

CANWEA maintains a list of operating wind projects at the following link:
http://www.canwea.ca/farms/wind-farms_e.php

It should be noted that wind farms and individual turbine models vary in size and noise level. Many of the wind farms that CANWEA lists in Ontario are much larger projects (many more turbines) than what is proposed for ZEP Wind Farm Ganaraska. We have listed Ravenswood and Proof Line above because these projects are owned and operated by Sprott Power Corp. We have listed the Arthur Wind Farm because it is a closer drive from Orono than Sprott Power’s projects but it is comparable in size to Ganaraska. We have listed the Pickering wind turbine because it is the closest and most readily

accessible wind turbine for people in the Clarington area that do not want to take a long drive to visit a turbine.

Directions to Pickering Wind Generating Station:

To visit the Pickering wind turbine, take Liverpool Rd. south to Lake Ontario and park by the marina. Visitors can then walk right to the base of the turbine.

Directions to Sprott Power's Ravenswood Wind Farm:

To visit the Ravenswood Wind Farm, take Hwy. 401 west to Hwy. 402 west. Continue to Forest Rd. and head north through the town of Forest and then on to Rawlings Rd. Head eastbound on Lakeshore Road 1km to the project site.

Directions to Sprott Power's Proof Line Wind Farm:

To visit the Proof Line Wind Farm, take Hwy. 401 west to Hwy. 402 west. Continue to Forest Rd. and head north through the town of Forest and then on to Rawlings Rd. Head westbound on Lakeshore Road 4km to the project site.

3. Please explain the containment features of the wind turbine in the event of leakage of oil or fluids.

An overview of the containment features is provided below. More information is available upon request.

Gearbox

The main gearbox (between the rotor and the generator) contains <500L of oil. Both the drive shaft and output shaft of the gearbox are equipped with wear-free sealing systems. If leakages occur from the gearbox, the discharged oil will be immediately collected in an oil pan that is integrated in the nacelle. The top platform in the tower is also designed to function as an oil pan. The platform is welded oil-tight with an 80mm high, circular edge. The threaded joint holes are sealed. This effectively prevents the oil from continuing to enter the tower interior.

Blade pitch gearbox

The blade pitch gearboxes are arranged along the cast element of the rotor hub and rotate with the rotor. There is one for each blade. Each gearbox contains 5.5 L of oil. A double sealing system effectively prevents the discharge of the gear oil. If there is leakage, the oil will remain in the rotor hub enclosure or rotor blades. The corresponding sump capacity is adequate for the relatively low oil quantity.

Yaw gearbox

The oil-filled gearboxes for the yaw system (i.e. the system that turns the rotor in the direction of the wind) contain 20L of oil and feature a complex sealing system on the input and output shafts. The drives are located within the nacelle enclosure. If oil escapes as the result of damage, this oil will be collected by a circular coaming mounted on the nacelle enclosure.

Hydraulic system

The hydraulic unit is located in the nacelle. It contains 15L of hydraulic oil. An oil pan is positioned directly below the unit for any lingering leaks or discharged hydraulic oil.

In addition to the features mentioned above, bearings are lubricated with grease. Each has its own containment provisions for any discharged grease. Details of the grease containment are available upon request.

4. Please explain the guidelines for bat surveys.

Bats and bat habitats are covered under several guidelines, some relating to pre-construction, and others post-construction.

Pre-construction surveys focus on determining the location and significance of bat habitats. This begins with the Natural Heritage Assessment, under the Natural Heritage Assessment Guide <http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/stdprodconsume/groups/lr/@mnr/@renewable/documents/document/stdprod_078471.pdf>. The Bats and Bat Habitats: Guidelines for Wind Power Projects <http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/stdprodconsume/groups/lr/@mnr/@renewable/documents/document/stdprod_088155.pdf> contains further information about how these habitats should be identified and evaluated. The Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide <http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/en/Business/FW/Publication/MNR_E001285P.html> is the main manual for evaluation of all wildlife habitat types, and contains definitions and criteria for several types of bat habitats as well as habitats for other fauna.

As you can see on page 91 in Appendix D of the Natural Heritage Assessment Guide, there is a process for completing a Natural Heritage Assessment and obtaining MNR approval while committing to additional pre-construction evaluation surveys for candidate significant wildlife features: "...the applicant must either: a) Conduct an evaluation of significance to determine the significance of the habitat; OR b) Treat the habitat as significant and commit to undertake a study of habitat use prior to construction within 120 metres of the habitat. This commitment must be included in the Environmental Impact Study Report (see below)."

For the ZEP Wind Farm Ganaraska, the proponent chose to use option b) for the Candidate Bat Maternity Roost. Therefore, the environmental study was completed with a commitment to undertake pre-construction evaluation surveys of the habitat use, and in the interim, the habitat is being treated as significant and all appropriate mitigation measures have been applied in the Environmental Impact Study Report. If the habitat is determined to be significant as a result of these surveys, Turbine #8 will not be built.

5. How many acres of land would be required to produce the same electricity as the proposed wind farm from a solar project?

Sprott Power Corp compared the specifications for the proposed ZEP Wind Farm Ganaraska to publicly available information on the 97 MW Sarnia Solar Farm which was commissioned in 2010. For an "apples-to-apples" comparison, the values for the Sarnia PV Plant were pro-rated down to 20 MW (from 97

MW). The area stated for the Sarnia PV Plant includes the solar modules and the row spacing between panels (which cannot be used for farming). The area stated for the wind farm includes foundations, roads, crane pads and the substation.

Comparison of Land Use Impacts from Wind Power and Solar PV			
	Proposed ZEP Wind Farm Ganaraska	Sarnia PV Plant	Ratio of Solar / Wind
MW	20	20	
Net Output (GWh/yr)	52,000	24,742	
Net Capacity Factor	30%	14%	
MWh/MW	2,600	1,237	
Acres Utilized (total)	9.2	226.8	
Acres Utilized (acres/MW)	0.5	11.3	25x
Acres Utilized (acres/GWh)	0.2	9.2	52x

6. Can the proponent guarantee that turbines are completely failsafe (i.e. What happens when one safety system ceases to function properly)?

Sprott Power Corp. has submitted this question to the turbine manufacturer (REpower). When Sprott Power Corp. receives this information from Repower it will be posted to the project website.

7. Concern was expressed by a local resident who owns an equestrian centre in the vicinity of the proposed project. The centre offers riding lessons including lessons for children with special needs. The concern was that horses may be startled by turbines operating in the area when they are not used to seeing them and this would be a safety concern for riders. The question asked was what can the proponent do to mitigate potential impacts on the business of the equestrian centre while the horses are becoming acclimatized to this change in their surroundings?

Sprott Power Corp. understands the importance of maintaining the safety of customers at the equestrian centre. Since the December 20th meeting, Sprott Power has done some research into the issue of horseback riding near wind turbines.

We discovered that the Whitelee Windfarm in Scotland has hosted a familiarization event for the British Horse Society. Details of this event can be found here:

http://www.whiteleewindfarm.com/news/whitelee_windfarm_hosts_first_ever_british_horse_society_familiarisation_event

Note that the website referenced above also includes a link to a video from the event.

The British Horse Society has published information regarding horseback riding in the vicinity of wind turbines.

Here is a link to the document produced for England and Wales:

<http://www.bhs.org.uk/~media/BHS/Files/PDF%20Documents/Access%20leaflets/Wind%20Farms%20Leaflet.ashx>

Here is a link to the document produced for Scotland:

http://www.bhsscotland.org.uk/uploads/5/4/5/3/5453271/scottish_windfarm_advice_note_2012.pdf

Spratt Power would like to meet with the owner of the equestrian centre and anyone who has concerns related to horseback riding near the proposed wind farm. The recommendations of the British Horse Society (or other relevant mitigation measures) can be discussed in the context of the proposed project and the specific locations where horseback riding is currently taking place in the vicinity of the proposed project. Spratt Power is also seeking out individuals with experience riding horses near wind farms in Canada so more local experience can be passed along to residents near the proposed project.

8. There was a question asking that Spratt elaborate on what type insurance the company will have for the project.

During construction the Company and/or the construction contractor will maintain builder's all-risk insurance. This will cover damage to project equipment and infrastructure as well as 3rd party liabilities.

During operations, Spratt Power Corp. will have three types of insurance:

- Insurance on equipment and infrastructure: this will cover replacement of equipment and infrastructure from events such as severe storms, earthquakes, floods and other "Acts of God". This coverage also includes clean-up of the site following any event that may have caused damage.
- Business interruption insurance: this will cover lost revenues from the project while the project is being repaired from an event that damages the facility.
- General Liability insurance: this covers bodily injury, property damage, personal injury to employees and third parties.

9. There was a comment from a resident that during bird studies for the project, consultants for the project drove through a field owned by a non-participating landowner and in doing so damaged hay in that field. The question was how will that landowner be compensated for such crop damage?

The bird studies in question took place prior to Spratt Power's involvement in the project and Spratt Power was not aware of this incident. Nevertheless, if this did occur, Spratt apologizes on behalf of the project to anyone who was impacted. Spratt Power has spoken to the owner of the property in question and offered to meet to discuss this matter. Spratt Power does not instruct consultants or contractors to enter into any non-participating land and will make it clear to anyone involved in the project that they are not to do so.