

# Proponent's Robo-Call "survey", July 2014

Their economic impact study **did not consider the many negative impacts to tourism and the area's economy.** Without looking at the negative, any claimed positive is meaningless.

As higher water levels mean more profit to the proponent, their proposed operating plan is that in August, Lake Muskoka water levels would be up to 5 cm higher than currently, and in September, they would be up to 6 cm higher. But this means **more chance of flooding** when an unexpected storm occurs – just **so they**

In the nine years of pursuing this, their only two "newsletters" have been in May and June this year, just for the purpose of **trying to pressure the Township of Muskoka Lakes Council into providing approvals the proponent desperately needs.** That isn't news, it is attempted coercion.

As you may know, Swift River was the successful bidder on the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources 2004 proposal to build a hydro-electric plant at the site of the original Bala number 2 generating station at north Bala falls. The project is a 4.5 Megawatt run-of-the-river waterpower facility on the south side of Bala's north dam.

...

Swift River's economic impact projection show an infusion 10.8 million dollars in local spending and 3.6 million dollars on local employment over the 18-month construction period. Do you support this infusion in the Muskoka Lakes economy? If you support this infusion press 1. If you do not support this infusion press 2.

Swift River intends to manage construction in order to help normal traffic movement. Would you support Swift River widening a small portion of the shoulder on highway 169 at Swift River's expense to minimize impacts during the construction period? If you support the widening at Swift River's expense press 1. If you do not support the widening press 2.

Swift River's engineers forecast that the hydro-electric plant will stabilize water levels in both upstream Lake Muskoka and downstream Moon River due to the sophisticated control system in the new station. Do you favour having the water level stabilized by the hydro plant? If you favour the water level stabilizing press 1. If you do not favour the water level stabilizing press 2.

Last February many of your neighbours participated in a Swift River survey asking how the new hydro-electric plant should look. The most popular designs were traditional and historic context in keeping with the classic Muskoka architecture and with the hydro plant built at the same site a hundred years ago. Do you agree with this approach? If you agree with this approach press 1. If you do not agree with this approach press 2.

Have you been receiving Swift River's project updates sent in both May and June? If you have been receiving project updates press 1. If you have not received project updates press 2.

...

Thank you for taking the time to respond to these questions so we can build a better plant.

In what way would answers to these so-called questions help them "*build a better plant*". This isn't a survey, it is a **lame attempt to circumvent Canada's telemarketing laws** so they can try to deceive the public into pressuring Township Council.

No, not "*run-of-river*", it would use the **dangerous cycled operation**, starting at about noon on more than  $\frac{1}{3}$  of summer days, just when people would be in the water, too close to the treacherously-turbulent water exiting. **This would be deadly.**

The proponent refuses to provide a traffic study to show what the delays would be – even with road widening. They have not disclosed to the public that traffic would be **stopped for up to 1.5 hours for each blast**, and that blasting would continue for a month.

The proponent's original proposal (due to which they were **selected through a competitive process**) promised the generating station would be only 5' above ground level and would not rise above the roadway. Now we find it would be **30' above the water and 21' above the road**. And the footprint would be **25 times** the size of the old station. This would be too big and too ugly.