

From: [REDACTED]
To: [ResourceStewardship Committee](#)
Subject: lobbying for legislation changes Oct.16, 2016 as per newspaper ad
Date: Sunday, October 16, 2016 11:44:19 AM

Hello there,

The link on your website <http://www.assembly.ab.ca/committees/resourcestewardship/LAR/LAR.html> SUBMIT HERE is not functioning. As such, I would like to ensure that my suggestion for changes in legislation be put forth on my behalf. Please find the information that I was trying to submit below:

Tim Mattson, [REDACTED], Rockyview County, AB
I have never been a lobbyist in Alberta or anywhere else in Canada.
Here is my submission for the Lobbyist Act:

My direct involvement with AltaLink putting a power line directly next to my house within a few months after I had built my shop which was to provide retirement income on my small acreage - the Langdon to Janet Transmission power line. This line was the shortest line in all of Alberta to be installed and I was the most affected property owner. We fought this thing as the Mattson Group (with six other homeowners affected along this line) and lost due to the AUC decision to use this path as a primary route as the secondary route didn't affect nearby homes. My land was rare and unique and allowed me to put up my 5500 sqft shop with 28 ft height on 3.5 acres which was easy to care for 4 miles east of the Calgary truckers hub industrial area.

The Mattson Group lost at the AUC hearing and I decided to take a buyout because I didn't want to live next to these lines. However, my appraisal was \$728,000 higher than AltaLink's appraisal. With this now in the direction of arbitration for final pricing on my former property, I have looked for five years for other suitable property which matched the same zoning requirements for my lifestyle requirements. Therefore, finding it was impossible to find a suitable property. With the money that I received so far from the sale of my former property, my new property was most similar to the zoning to allow me to do as I did on my former property but in order to make this happen, I have had to suffer great financial damages (additional \$400,000 mortgage as compared to no mortgage at former property to lead me into retirement with an income) and emotional stress to maintain my desired lifestyle. My new property won't lead me into retirement like planned with my old one.

As I understand, it is legislated now that they only have to give you fair market value for your property. I feel that this legislation doesn't fit property owners that have an extremely rare property and therefore would like to see it written that if the property is rare and not a suitable/comparable (2300 sqft house, 1600 sqft & 5500 sqft shops with three-phase power and land zoning) as mine was one of a kind, that the energy company shouldn't force property owners to be in financial strain for wishing to continue their lifestyle. Therefore, if it is an energy company wishing for a change by disturbing property owners then I would like to see it legislated that the companies must provide rare property owners what they have for house/shop/land zoning somewhere else in their area without additional financial burden to the property owner as I believe that this was once legislated this way which I feel should be returned to legislation as this current legislation has been very disturbing to me and my family. The energy company should be made financially responsible to the property owners.

I would also like to have something else legislated as I have spent literally thousands of hours over the last seven years dealing with AltaLink and viewing properties with several realtors only to find that the AltaLink feels that the value of my time to deal with this matter in search of a new home means nothing. I feel that the homeowner should be reimbursed a % of their yearly income/year of dealing with the matter for the disruption of life (ie. 25% of yearly income).

Another piece of legislation to consider is regarding country property owners that new power lines aren't built closer than 300m to any human-occupied dwellings. In the current AUC decision, they favoured the primary route over the secondary route because it had less impact on farmland. (Primary route 14 kms directly impacted 22 homeowners, secondary indirectly impacted 8 homes.)

Please contact me as it is probably easier to further explain myself in person as my counsel has indicated that there are loopholes in legislation which didn't fit my particular situation.

I found the information about the committee in a printed copy of a newspaper.

Thank you,
Tim Mattson