

## **Section 2**

# **The McLean's Mountain Wind Farm ESR/EIS July 2009 Comment/Response Table**



TABLE A

PROPONENT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE 30-DAY CELANDAR REVIEW PERIOD (July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009 – August 24, 2009)  
ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING REPORT (EIS/ESR)  
FOR THE MCLEAN'S MOUNTAIN WIND FARM

<b>PROPONENT:</b>	Northland Power Inc (NPI)
<b>PROJECT TITLE:</b>	McLean's Mountain Wind Farm
<b>PROJECT LOCATION:</b>	Municipality of North Eastern Manitoulin and The Islands (NEMI), Manitoulin Island, Ontario
<b>PREPARED BY:</b>	Don McKinnon, Dillon Consulting Limited
<b>PHONE # and E-MAIL:</b>	416-229-4647 Ext: 2355 dpmckinnon@dillon.ca

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.  
At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<b>HUMAN HELATH</b>		
<b>Ares, Paul</b> Member of General Public  August 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>B. Louis</b>	Request that the proposed project be elevated to an individual environmental assessment based on the following:  The McLean's Wind Farm project Environmental Review Report does not properly address the effects on humans who will be living near the turbine complex. Evidence form around the world	There is no scientific evidence of direct health effects resulting from noise at the level of noise generated by wind turbines. It has been repeatedly shown by measurements of wind turbine noise undertaken in the UK, Denmark, Germany and the USA over the past decade, and accepted by experienced noise professionals, that the levels of infrasonic noise and vibration radiated from modern, upwind configuration wind turbines are at a very low level; so low that they lie below the typical human threshold of perception. Potential health concerns/impacts

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p>Member of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Bickell, Gord</b> Member of General Public August 13<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Biugamak, Veronika</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Bond-Beaudry, Patti A</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Bond, Brad</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Champoux – Ares, Linda</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Cormier, Chris</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>	<p>strongly suggests that industrial wind developments can have a very negative effect on human health and quality of life. A proper health study is required to prove that the project can be constructed and operated without harming the local residents.</p> <p>A recent (released July 23, 2009) community-based self-reporting health survey conducted in areas with operational industrial wind turbines has found that 70% of the respondent reported a significant increase in the frequency of at least one health problem (the average was five health problems), or the onset of new health issues since the turbines began functioning near them. The health issues reported are serious and include: sleep deprivation - which leads to serious health problems (this is the number one problem); headaches; tinnitus (ringing in ears); cognitive dysfunction; and some serious cardiac effects such as irregular heart rhythm, palpitations and high blood pressure. Reports of adverse effects continue to come into light. Some victims have been forced to move from their homes.</p> <p>Dr. Robert McMurty, M.D.,F.R.C.S (C), F.A.C.S stated that enough evidence of adverse health effects exists in wind turbine complexes to demand an epidemiological study before any more turbines are installed. Dr. McMurty has made a deputation to a standing committee on General Government. Dr. McMurty's deputation discusses the inadequacy of the dBA scale for measuring noise form wind turbines because it does not take into account low frequencies. Todd et. al. have published research that proves the human inner ear is extremely sensitive to low frequency noise. It also point points out a similarity between the health effects being reported in Ontario and those reported by Dr. Nina Pierpoint (New York) and Dr. Amanda Harry (U.K.).</p>	<p>as a result of the wind turbines was considered as part of the environmental screening. There are very few residences in the vicinity of the turbines. All wind turbines have been sited a minimum of 550 meters for receptors.</p> <p>Furthermore, at present there are well over 10,000 wind turbines installed and operating in North America, and tens of thousands of people who live and work in proximity to these wind turbines. Of these individuals, a very small number have claimed that their health has been negatively impacted by wind turbines. However, surveys of peer-reviewed scientific literature have consistently found no evidence linking wind turbines to human health concerns. Although some studies have claimed that more research is needed.</p> <p>Certain individuals contend that wind turbines can adversely impact the health of individuals living in proximity to wind turbines. A prominent advocate of this view is Dr. Nina Pierpont of Malone, New York who claims that people living in proximity to wind farms may suffer from "Wind Turbine Syndrome". This view, however, has not been supported by scientists who specialize in acoustics, low frequency sound and related human health impacts. It is important to point out that none of the work by Dr. Pierpont - or others claiming similar impacts – has been published in peer-reviewed journals. The following is a concise summary of articles and publications on the subject from reputable sources in Europe and North America:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Infrasound from Wind Turbines – Fact, Fiction or Deception?" by Geoff Leventhall in Vol. 34 No.2 (2006) of the peer-reviewed journal Canadian Acoustics. This paper looks at the question of whether or not wind turbines produce infrasound at levels that can impact humans. It directly addresses assertions frequently made by Dr. Nina Pierpont, author of a book entitled "Wind Turbine Syndrome". "In the USA, a high profile objector (Nina Pierpont of Malone NY) placed an advertisement in a local paper, consisting entirely of selected quotations from a previously published technical paper by Van den Berg (Van den Berg 2004). However the comment "[i.e. infrasonic]" was added in the first line of the first quotation in a manner which might mislead naive readers into believing that it</li> </ul>

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p><b>Cormier, Kathy</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Dervis, Shiela</b> August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Gannon, Lynda and Logan</b> Member of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>G, Ron</b> Member of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Hall, Jeffery</b> Member of General Public August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Haney, Ron</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Haney, Monica</b></p>	<p>Dr. Michael Nissenbaum (Maine) has recently conducted medical interviews with residents of a wind complex in Maine. Dr. Nissenbaum presented his preliminary findings before the Maine Medical Association. He described the results as alarming. The residents are experiencing serious health problems related to shadow flicker and noise emissions from the turbines near their homes. The onset of symptoms including sleep disturbance, headaches, dizziness, weight changes, possible increases in blood pressure as well as increased prescription medication use, all coincide with the time of turbine commissioning.</p> <p>Shadow flicker and noise pollution are not the only sources of problems for residences near turbine complexes. Improper electrical integration of the turbines into the grid and lack of proper filters can expose residents to high frequency electrical pollution that can cause electromagnetic sensitivity. The symptoms associated with electrical pollution include: ringing in ears, headaches, sleeplessness, dangerously elevated blood pressure, heart palpitations, itching in the ears, eye watering, earaches, bleeding noses and pressure on chest causing difficulty breathing.</p> <p>There are many unanswered questions about the long term impacts regarding the elderly, infants, children and the unborn that are exposed during mother's pregnancy, and workers such as farmers and technicians who work near wind turbines. Some wind complex residents are being approached to participate in long-term health studies. Rural residents should not be taking the place of laboratory specimen.</p>	<p>was part of the original. The van den Berg paper was based on A-weighted measurements and had no connection with infrasound. So, not only is the advertisement displaying the advertiser's self deception, but this has also been propagated to others who have read it. [...] Claims of infrasound are irrelevant and possibly harmful, should they lead to unnecessary fears." <a href="http://www.wind.appstate.edu/reports/06-06Leventhall-Infras-WT-CanAcoustics2.pdf">www.wind.appstate.edu/reports/06-06Leventhall-Infras-WT-CanAcoustics2.pdf</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "<i>Context and Opinion Related to the Health Effects of Noise Generated by Wind Turbines</i>", Agence Française de Sécurité Sanitaire de l'Environnement et du Travail (Afsset), 2006. Afsset was mandated by the Ministries responsible for health and the environment to conduct a critical analysis of a report issued by the <i>Académie nationale de médecine</i> that advocated the use of a minimum 1,500 meter setback distance for 2.5 MW wind turbines or more. The Afsset report concluded that "It appears that the noise emitted by wind turbines is not sufficient to result in direct health consequences as far as auditory effects are concerned. [...] A review of the data on noise measured in proximity to wind turbines, sound propagation simulations and field surveys demonstrates that a permanent definition of a minimum 1,500 m setback distance from homes, even when limited to windmills of more than 2.5 MW, does not reflect the reality of exposure to noise and does not seem relevant." <a href="http://www.afsse.fr/index.php?pageid=1862&amp;parentid=523">http://www.afsse.fr/index.php?pageid=1862&amp;parentid=523</a> (in French only – please contact CanWEA for an English translation of this text).</li> <li>• Summary of research on wind turbines, noise and possible health effects, commissioned by the UK Government's Department for Business, Enterprise &amp; Regulatory Reform: (a) In 2006 the UK Government published a study by Hayes McKenzie which investigated claims that infrasound or low frequency noise emitted by wind turbine generators was causing health effects. The report concluded that there is no evidence of health effects arising from infrasound or low frequency noise generated by wind turbines. The report went on to note that a phenomenon known as Aerodynamic Modulation (AM) may be the cause of these complaints. (<a href="http://www.dti.gov.uk/energy/sources/renewables/publications/page31267.html">www.dti.gov.uk/energy/sources/renewables/publications/page31267.html</a>) (b) The</li> </ul>

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p>Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Hare, Marilou</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Hare, D.</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Hart, Suzan</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Jansen, Barbara</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Jewell, Sandra</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>	<p>Ontario has approximately 585 operating wind turbines, currently 86 victims have reported problems. Such a high incidence of injury is criminal. The Ministry of the Environment has overseen the development of these existing turbine complexes and issued their certificates of complaints yet people through the province are suffering sever health effects. The current guidelines indicate are clearly inadequate. Ontario citizens must be properly protected. A proper epidemiological study must be performed before the McLean's Mountain Wind Farm is developed. Many are asking for a public inquiry.</p> <p><i>(50)- This comment submitted as a template.</i></p>	<p>Government then commissioned experts at Salford University to investigate Aerodynamic Modulation and the broader issue of noise from wind turbines. The Salford research looked at 133 wind farms and concluded that "... in terms of the number of people affected, wind farm noise is a small-scale problem compared with other types of noise; for example the number of complaints about industrial noise exceeds those about windfarms by around three orders of magnitude" and that "The low incidence of AM and the low numbers of people adversely affected make it difficult to justify further research funding in preference to other more widespread noise issues." <a href="http://usir.salford.ac.uk/1554/1/Salford_Uni_Report_Turbine_Sound.pdf">http://usir.salford.ac.uk/1554/1/Salford_Uni_Report_Turbine_Sound.pdf</a> . (c) Based on these findings, the U.K. Government published a statement indicating that "Government does not consider there to be a compelling case for further work into AM and will not carry out any further research at this time." <a href="http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file40571.pdf">http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file40571.pdf</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Health impact of wind turbines", prepared by the Municipality of Chatham-Kent Health &amp; Family Services Public Health Unit. This is a comprehensive review of available literature on the subject. This paper concludes and concurs with the original quote from Chatham-Kent's Acting Medical Officer of Health, Dr. David Colby: "In summary, as long as the Ministry of Environment Guidelines for location criteria of wind farms is followed, it is my opinion that there will be negligible adverse health impacts on Chatham-Kent citizens. Although opposition to wind farms on aesthetic grounds is a legitimate point of view, opposition to wind farms on the basis of potential adverse health consequences is not justified by the evidence." <a href="http://www.chathamkent.ca/NR/rdonlyres/CA6E8804-D6FF-42A5-B93B-5229FA127875/7046/5a.pdf">http://www.chathamkent.ca/NR/rdonlyres/CA6E8804-D6FF-42A5-B93B-5229FA127875/7046/5a.pdf</a></li> <li>• "Wind Turbine Acoustic Noise", A White Paper by Dr. Anthony Rodgers at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. This paper looked into the issue of both sound and infrasound (low frequency sound) and concluded "There is no reliable evidence that infrasound below the perception threshold produces physiological or psychological effects."</li> </ul>

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**  
**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p><b>J.E.</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Kameoka, Terry.T (Dr.)</b> August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Kerr, Dawn L.</b> August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Kerr, Hugh</b> August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Kerr, Hugh A.</b> August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Kerr, Jennifer</b> August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Labelle, Carole</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Labelle, Maurice</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Laberge, Cory</b></p>		<p><a href="http://www.ceere.org/repl/publications/whitepapers/Wind_Turbine_Acoustic_Noise_Rev_2006.pdf">http://www.ceere.org/repl/publications/whitepapers/Wind_Turbine_Acoustic_Noise_Rev_2006.pdf</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"Recent Studies of Infrasonnd from Industrial Sources"</i> by William Gastmeier and Brian Howe, presented at the Canadian Acoustical Association, October 2008. The authors "conducted several infrasonnd studies using refined measurement methods to isolate the infrasonnd energy produced by industrial sources from naturally occurring infrasonnd in the environment." The results conclude "that infrasonnd from wind turbine generators is well below any realistic human perception limits." Available from the Canadian Acoustical Association, <a href="http://www.caa-aca.ca">www.caa-aca.ca</a></li> <li>• <i>"Electricity generation and health"</i> in the peer-reviewed journal The Lancet. The paper concludes that "Forms of renewable energy generation are still in the early phases of their technological development, but most seem to be associated with few adverse effects on health" <a href="http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17876910">http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17876910</a></li> <li>• <i>"Energy, sustainable development and health"</i>, World Health Organization, June 2004. The study finds that "Renewable sources, such as photovoltaic and wind energy, are associated with fewer health effects. [...] The increased use of renewable energy, especially wind, solar and photovoltaic energy, will have positive health benefits, some of which have been estimated." There is also a table on page 79 showing the relative health effects of nearly all sources of energy, which clearly shows wind as negligible. <a href="http://www.euro.who.int/document/ehec/ebakdoc08.pdf">http://www.euro.who.int/document/ehec/ebakdoc08.pdf</a>.</li> </ul> <p>The above findings clearly show that there is no peer-reviewed scientific evidence indicating that wind turbines have an adverse impact on human health (Canwea 2009).</p>



<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p>Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Laberge Family</b> Members of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Martin, Marisa</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>McAllister , Tom and Michelle</b> Members of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>McCauley Jennifer</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>McCauley Jessie</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Medwig, Jonathan</b> Member of General Public</p>		



<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p><b>Medwig, Lucia</b> Member of General Public August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Murray, Marian</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Opoiko, Rachel</b> Directing Manager August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Pascos, Harry and Betty</b> Members of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Perreault, Orlando and Anne</b> Members of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Rapski, Al</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>		





<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p><b>Shortt, Julia</b> Member of General Public August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Stewart, Jane</b> Member of General Public August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Sunday, Lori</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Taliotis, Gloria</b> Member of General Public August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Tilson, Kerrene</b> Member of General Public August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Watson, Boo</b> Member of General Public August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Weber, Elaine</b></p>		

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.  
At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
Member of General Public August 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2009  <b>William, Martin</b> Member of General Public August 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009		
<b>Dedman, Randy</b> Member of General Public August 12 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Concerned about harmful effects of noise.	A Noise and Acoustics Assessment was conducted in accordance with the Ontario Ministry of the Environment guidelines. This document can be found in Appendix G of the Environmental Screening Report. Wind turbines generate some sound. The noise from a wind turbine is caused by the passing of the blade through the air, and is similar to white noise from wind, or waves. But even when the turbine is turning you can carry on a conversation at its base. The sound is a "swish" like the waves on a beach. Wind turbines produce noise only when the wind is blowing, although background ambient noise from the blowing wind also increases. Other sources of background noise for the area includes traffic on the nearby Highway 6 and/or Highway 540. There is no scientific evidence of direct health effects resulting from noise at the level of noise generated by wind turbines. It has been repeatedly shown by measurements of wind turbine noise undertaken in the UK, Denmark, Germany and the USA over the past decade, and accepted by experienced noise professionals, that the levels of infrasonic noise and vibration radiated from modern, upwind configuration wind turbines are at a very low level; so low that they lie below the threshold of typical human perception, Potential health concerns/impacts as a result of the wind turbines was considered as part of the environmental screening. There are very few residences in the vicinity of the turbines. All wind turbines have been sited a minimum of 550 meters from receptors.
<b>Ferrie, Helke</b> Member of General Public August 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Concerned with adverse human health effects of wind farms.	Please refer to responses provided above.

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<b>Wellman, W.J &amp; A</b> Members of General Public  July 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Concerned with adverse human health effects of wind farms.	Please refer to responses provided above.
<b>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</b>		
<b>Arp, Melissa</b> Member of General Public  Little Current, Ontario  August 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2009	Requests that the proposed project be elevated to an individual environmental assessment based on the following: 1. Moved from Toronto to Little Current in May to study organic and biodynamic farming and the development of bees in the area. Has learnt that there are at least ten windmills to be built within few kilometers of her residence.  2. Lack of notice and public consultation and new studies coming from Europe regarding the effects of wind turbines on the weather, health and natural habitat.	1. The proposed McLean's Mountain Wind Farm will consist of 43 wind turbines. All of the proposed wind turbines will be sited at least 550 meters away from any residence in the study area.  2. The proposed project has been in the formal planning stages since the spring of 2004. Since that time, various forms of consultation have taken place. For more information on consultation activities undertaken to date please refer to <i>Section 4</i> of the Environmental Screening Report. NPI continues an open public consultation process regarding the proposed project. NPI will also continue its stakeholder consultation and communications through project construction and implementation phases. An environmental screening process to assess the potential impacts of wind turbines on ecosystems and human health was undertaken for the proposed project. The completed studies have been documented in the McLean's Mountain Wind Farm Environmental Screening Report (ESR).
<b>Beaudry, Raymond</b> Member of General Public  August 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2009	Expresses concerns regarding: impacts to vegetation, wildlife and bird impacts and soils.	The project components have been sited to avoid the most sensitive habitat in the study area. Some vegetation disturbance and removal will occur during the construction phase of the wind farm. NPI will ensure to minimize the removal of vegetation and where required, replant areas with native vegetation to maintain biodiversity. An Assessment of Avifauna and wildlife in the project area was conducted in accordance with Ministry of Natural Resources and

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**  
**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
		Environment Canada guidelines. The assessment concludes that the potential effects of the proposed project in the avian and other wildlife populations are minimal. NPI will provide source controls and adverse impacts on soils mitigation will be incorporated into an environmental management plan. The results of all the biological assessments and future related commitments are documented in the Environmental Screening Report (ESR).
<b>Bell, Chris and Joan</b> Members of General Public  August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The 43 wind turbines will be aesthetically unpleasant. Their position on top of height ground makes them very visible.</li> <li>2. More of the Niagara Escarpment, which is not protected on Manitoulin will be quarried.</li> <li>3. More studies on birds are required</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Perceptions regarding the visibility of wind turbines are subjective . NPI in the siting of the tubines has attempted to balance the visibility of the turbines with maximizing the output of the tubines. Visual simulations have been prepared as part of the Environmental Screening process. The machines used for this project will blend in well with the surrounding area.</li> <li>2. No response required.</li> <li>3. The avian assessment for the proposed project was conducted in accordance with guidelines provided by Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment Canada. Additional post construction avian monitoring work is to be conducted. The program for this additional work is being determined in consultation with the Ontario MNR and EC.</li> </ol>
<b>Bickell, Gord</b> Member of General Public  August 13 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Expresses concerns regarding immense land clearing required	For some turbine sites, natural vegetation will need to be cleared for the turbines, collector lines and access roads. Further, some vegetation may need to be cleared for the transmission line right-of-way. All project components have been located to minimize if not avoid effects on the most sensitive features in the area (e.g. wetlands). An area of approximately 1ha will be required for each turbine location for assembly of the turbine rotor before being erected onto the turbine tower. Of the total number of tubines, only about 8 are located in interior forest habitat. The rest are located either in open pasture land or on the edge of forested areas.
<b>Carson, Ann Elizabeth</b> Member of General Public	Inadequate bat population study research	The bat monitoring for the proposed project was conducted in accordance with guidelines provided by the Ministry of Natural Resources. As requested by the MNR additional bat monitoring is being undertaken as a post ESR submission activity (August-Sept 2009). The

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
August 27 <sup>th</sup> , 2009		findings of this additional survey work will be made available for the MNR to review. Adjustments will be made to the project as a result of these studies if warranted.
<b>Dedman, Randy</b> Member of General Public August 12 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Indicated that: "Manitoulin Island is very pristine and holds thousands of acres of unspoiled beauty and wildlife (...) and countless species of birds and plant life. Concerned that "on the neighbouring lot where turbine #3 is proposed there is a large swamp and duck pond (...)	As part of the environmental screening that was conducted, a Natural Environment Review was conducted for this project in accordance with MNR and EC guidelines. The turbines have been appropriately setback from critical wildlife areas.
<b>Ares, Paul</b> Member of General Public August 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>B. Louis</b> Member of General Public August 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2009  <b>Beaudry, Raymond</b> Member of General Public Manitoulin Island, Ontario  August 19 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Champoux – Ares, Linda</b> Member of General Public August 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Requests that the proposed project be elevated to an individual environmental assessment based on the following:  Impacts of the proposed wind farm on the bat populations have not been adequately studied.  It is impossible to study the impact of the wind turbines on bats without knowing the number and location of the wind turbines. NPI should be required by the MNR to do a bat study in May since the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) suggested that it is likely that it is a migratory route for bats". MNR recommended that bat studies be conducted in August and the NPI's sub-contracted Natural Resources Solutions Inc (NRSI) reported on their studies in July.  NPI has acquired the University of Waterloo to monitor bat activity which they did on August 17, 2009, without the final locations of wind turbines approved. The public cannot comment on the study as the deadline for the ESR would be past.	The bat monitoring for the proposed project was conducted in accordance with guidelines provided by the Ministry of Natural Resources. As requested by the MNR, additional monitoring is being undertaken as a post EA submission activity (August-Sept 2009). The findings of this additional survey work will be made available for the MNR to review. Adjustments will be made to the project as a result of these studies if warranted.  Bat monitoring in May is not warranted on the McLean's Mountain particularly since the project site sensitivity is rated as 'High' and not "Very High" (a rating of Very High" would require May monitoring) . The July and September results of bat monitoring do not indicate that the proposed project is located in a migratory path. The species data also does not reflect high numbers of migrating bats. Only one migratory bat species was recorded.  The bat monitoring has been conducted with the general layout knowledge of the wind farm project. It is typical for wind farm layouts to change after the environmental studies have been completed (to reflect the results of the studies).  Bat survey work has been conducted by the consulting firm NRSI – not the University of Waterloo.



<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p><b>Cormier, Chris</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Dervis, Shiela</b> August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Gannon, Lynda and Logan</b> Member of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>G, Ron</b> Member of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Haney, Ron</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Haney, Monica</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>	<p>Fifty percent of wind turbines are in wooded areas known to support bats as well as other wildlife. This does not address tree removal of the 10 kilometers for a 115,00 volt transmission line.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(39) –This comment submitted as a template.</i></p>	



<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p><b>Hare, Marilou</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Hare, D.</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Hart, Suzan</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Jansen, Barbara</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Jewell, Sandra</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>J.E.</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Labelle, Carole</b> Member of General Public</p>		

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.  
At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received  
is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p>75 Honora Lakeshore, Little Current, P0P 1K0 Ontario August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Labelle, Maurice</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Laberge, C.</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Laberge Family</b> Members of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Martin, Marisa</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>McAllister , Tom and Michelle</b> Members of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>		





The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.		
At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p><b>McCauley Jennifer</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>McCauley Jessie</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Medwig, Jonathan</b> Member of General Public 2009</p> <p><b>Medwig, Lucia</b> Member of General Public August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Murray, Marian</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Opoiko, Rachel</b> Directing Manager August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Pascos, Harry and Betty</b> Members of General Public</p>		



<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories. At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
August 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2009  <b>Perreault, Orlando and Anne</b> Members of General Public  August 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2009  <b>Rapski, Al</b> Member of General Public  August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Shortt, Julia</b> Member of General Public  August 19 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Stewart, Jane</b> Member of General Public  August 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2009  <b>Sunday, Lori</b> Member of General Public  August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Taliotis, Gloria</b> August 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2009  <b>Tilson, Kerrene</b>		

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.  
At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p>Member of General Public August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Weber, Elaine</b> Member of General Public August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>William, Martin</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>		
<b>PROPERTY VALUES</b>		
<p><b>Bell, Chris and Joan</b> Members of General Public  August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>	<p>Those adjacent to proposed wind turbines and those in sight of turbines will have property values reduced and homes will be very hard to sell.</p>	<p>Based on the consultations undertaken with the local residents, NPI is aware of the public concerns over the loss of property values due to the proposed development of the McLean's Mountain Wind Farm. The vast majority of evidence on the impact of wind farms on land values comes from Europe, Australia and United States of America (USA). The studies conducted in these countries indicate wind farms have no material effect on property values. Data from Ontario is beginning to emerge as more wind farms are constructed, and the experience from those projects also suggests that wind farms do not decrease property values.</p> <p>A 2006 study conducted by Blake, Matlock and Marshal Ltd. for Windrush Energy suggests that wind farms have not negatively affected property values. "<i>Property Value Study: the Relationship of Windmill Development and Market Prices</i>" aimed to determine if the development of wind farms in the Melancthon area has had any impact on the growth of property values in the Township. Property values before and after wind farm development in the Township of</p>

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
		<p>Melancthon where compared to values in East Luther Grand Valley Township, a neighbouring and similar township except for its lack of wind farms. Property values in Melancthon were also compared to those in Dufferin County. The analysis showed that property values in the Township of Melancthon grew similarly to the rest of the County, and increased more than East Luther Grand Valley Township. Wind farm development was not found to have diminished property values.</p> <p>The Canadian Hydro Developers Inc. also compared housing price ranges on Wolfe Island and Simcoe Island in Ontario, before and after the development of the wind farm (<a href="http://www.shearwind.com/glen_dhu_community/fact_sheet.html">http://www.shearwind.com/glen_dhu_community/fact_sheet.html</a>). Findings indicate that Township of Melancthon experienced a stronger growth rate in sales price per property, than the adjoining East Luther Grand Valley Township. The findings of this particular research indicate that the presence of the Wind Farm in Melancthon Township has not had an adverse impact on values within that municipality.</p> <p>A study conducted by the Renewable Energy Policy Project (REPP) "<i>The Effect of Wind Development on Local Property Values</i>" (May 2003) presents data to counter the threat of decreased property values. The REPP study is the first study to systematically analyze property values data in order to examine the charge often voiced by wind farm opponents that wind development will lower the value of property within view of the turbines. The REPP study looked at wind development projects with a generating capacity of 10 MW or more that were installed in the U.S. from 1998 to 2001. The REPP study also used much larger wind farms (up to 80 wind turbines per site) than the proposed McLean's Mountain Farm (43 wind turbines). The REPP study found no evidence that property values decreased as a result of wind farms. Quite the contrary, for the great majority of projects the property values in the view shed of the wind farm increased at a higher rate than they did in the comparable community.</p> <p>Experience in other countries indicates no evidence supporting the claim that views of wind farms decrease property values:</p>

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>USA</u> - Research in 2002 by ECONorthWest backed-up by a May 2003 Analytic Report for the REPP involving the review of over 25,000 records of property sales within a distance of 8km of wind farms and interviews with property tax assessors. The report found that property values increased at a higher rate within the view-shed of the wind farm than in comparable locations away from wind farms.</li> <li>• <u>Denmark</u> - A report by the Institute of Local Government Studies (AKF) found that "the economic expenses in connection with noise and visual effects from wind mills are minimal".</li> <li>• <u>United Kingdom</u> – The Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) released a study in 2005 that found that of 405 surveyors surveyed, 63% felt wind farm developments had no impact on the value of agricultural lands. The surveyors involved in the study all had experience with transactions affected by wind farms.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ares, Paul</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>B. Louis</b> Member of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Bickell, Gord</b> Member of General Public August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Biugamak, Veronika</b></p>	<p>Request that the proposed project be elevated to an individual environmental assessment based on the following:</p> <p>Setbacks, distances from a wind turbine to a house, that NPI proposes are not adequate to protect property value in the area.</p> <p>The large lots on McLean's Mountain are privately owned, many have no "Dwellings": homes, cottages or hunt cabins. A few lots have dwellings that are not identified in the ESR noise study. The company has arranged its setbacks as per MOE guidelines so that no current dwellings will receive more than 40 decibels of noise. This does not address the vacant land issue for future use as MOE does not have an interpretation for seasonal residences who determine such.</p>	<p>Please refer to response provided above.</p>

<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p>Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Bond-Beaudry, Patti A</b> Member of General Public Manitoulin Island, Ontario August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Bond, Brad</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Champoux – Ares, Linda</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Cormier, Chris</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Cormier, Kathy</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>	<p>There are many farms on Manitoulin with large acreage and one or no dwellings but have the potential to build. If a farmer wants to finance retirement by severing or selling a lot he will be out of luck once this project goes away through. If a farmer or resident wants to move because of the industrial farm, his land will be so reduced in value that he might not be able to afford to move.</p> <p>The land on McLeans' Mountain is privately owned and the needs and rights of the landowners must be respected. Many of the existing farms have been passed on for generations. This company from Toronto should not be allowed to ignore and devalue the years of hard work that have gone into owning, maintaining and paying taxes on these lands.</p> <p><i>(42)- Comment submitted as a template.</i></p>	



<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p><b>Dervis, Shiela</b> August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Gannon, Lynda and Logan</b> Member of General Public</p> <p><b>G, Ron</b> Member of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Haney, Ron</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Haney, Monica</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Hare, Marilou</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Hare, D.</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Hart, Suzan</b></p>		



<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p>Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>J.E.</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Jansen, Barbara</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Jewell, Sandra</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Labelle, Carole</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Labelle, Maurice</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Laberge, Cory</b></p>		





<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
Member of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Laberge Family</b> Members of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Martin, Marisa</b> Member of General Public August 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>McAllister , Tom and Michelle</b> Members of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>McCauley Jennifer</b> Member of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>McCauley Jessie</b> Member of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Medwig, Jonathan</b> Member of General Public		



The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.  
At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p>2009</p> <p><b>Medwig, Lucia</b> Member of General Public August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Murray, Marian</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Opoiko, Rachel</b> Directing Manager August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Pascos, Harry and Betty</b> Members of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Perreault, Orlando and Anne</b> Members of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Rapski, Al</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>		



<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p><b>Shortt, Julia</b> Member of General Public August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Stewart, Jane</b> Member of General Public August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Sunday, Lori</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Taliotis, Gloria</b> Member of General Public August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Tilson, Kerrene</b> Member of General Public August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Weber, Elaine</b> Member of General Public August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>William, Martin</b></p>		



<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
Member of General Public August 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009		
<b>SETBACKS FROM RESIDENCES</b>		
<b>Courtin, Gerard</b> Member of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Distance to their home Setback from private property	All wind turbines have been sited a minimum of 550 meters from sensitive noise receptors in the area. Noise levels cannot exceed 40 dBA as per MOE requirements. Non participating residences will not be significantly affected by the proposed project.
<b>Dedman, Randy</b> Member of General Public August 12 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Inadequate setbacks	Please see response provided above.
<b>Roy, Jeffery</b> Member of General Public August 12, 2009	Turbine setbacks	Please see response provided above.
<b>Mayhew, Randy</b> Member of General Public August 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2009	Setbacks concerns	Please see response provided above.
<b>McCallister, Tom</b> Member of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Setback limits	Please see response provided above.
<b>Morphet, Blair</b> Member of General Public August 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2009	Concerned about setback from their property	Please see response provided above.
<b>Wellman, W J</b> Member of General Public July 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Concerned about setbacks	Please see response provided above.

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS</b>		
<b>Beaudry, Raymond</b> Member of General Public Manitoulin Island, Ontario  August 21, 2009	Wrong date on flyer for open house  Delivery of notice to only a few homes	The proposed project has been in the formal planning stages since the spring of 2004. Since that time, various forms of consultation have taken place. For more information on consultation activities undertaken to date please refer to <i>Section 4</i> of the Environmental Screening Report. The Notice of Project Restart and PIC appeared in the Manitoulin Expositor for two consecutive weeks prior to the scheduled meeting on June 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2009. While the numerical date for the PIC on the notice was off by a day – the day of the week was correct. Several calls were made to NPI and people were advised of the correct date. NPI received no information indicating that someone had missed the PIC because of the incorrect date on the notice. Flyers were distributed throughout the study area by Canada Post Ad Mail. NPI continues an open public consultation process regarding the proposed project. NPI will also continue its stakeholder consultation and communications through project construction and implementation phases.
<b>Corbiere, Lynn (Patrick Wedaseh Madahbee)</b>  Anishnabek  August 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Lack of consultation – informal discussion occurred at the least  Requests that full consultation be pursued with the Nation  False allegation that offers were made to seek support – informal discussion at the least	Please see response provided above. Consultation with First Nation communities has been ongoing for several years. NPI has received letters from the UCCM regarding their concerns. NPI intends to continue consultations with First Nation communities as the project continues.
<b>Wellman, W.J &amp; A</b> Members of General Public  July 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Indicated that all landowners in the project area should have been contacted about the possible siting of wind turbines.	Please see response provided above.
<b>OTHER</b>		
<b>Ares, A Georges</b>	Request that the proposed project be elevated to an individual	Since 2004, NPI has had discussions with members of the local community regarding the

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p>Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Ares, Paul</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>B. Louis</b> Member of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Beaudry, Raymond</b> Member of General Public Manitoulin Island, Ontario  August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Bickel, Gord</b> Member of General Public August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Biugamak, Veronika</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Bond-Beaudry, Patti A</b></p>	<p>environmental assessment based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to inform or consult with local residents.</li> <li>• Changes in scale of the proposed project from a 54MW. (30 wind turbines) wind farm as presented by Northland Power Inc (NPI) in 2004 to a 100 MW (60 wind turbines) wind farm as proposed by NPI in 2005 to a 77MW (43 wind turbines) wind farm as proposed by NPI in 2009.</li> <li>• The increase of project land base since the initial start of the project with an additional land use of 1400 to 1600 acres in the past two years.</li> <li>• The wind turbine sites are proposed and sites have not been secured and the existing dwellings in the project area have not been identified.</li> <li>• Future dwelling in the project area are planned as building permits are being acquired with the township.</li> <li>• The company has been negotiating leases with landowners for at least 6 years. June 25, 2009 was the first time the community heard about the 43 wind turbines and a submarine cable under the North Channel as well as transformer station, switching station and a transmission line which all have their impacts.</li> <li>• This is not a fair process and does not meet the public consultation requirements of a Class Environmental Assessment.</li> <li>• Urge to require NPI to properly consult with the local community.</li> </ul> <p><i>(42)- Comment submitted as a template.</i></p>	<p>project. Notices of Project Commencement, subsequent Public Information Centres and Notice of Completion were published in the <i>Manitoulin Expositor</i> over the course of the last five years. Notification of these project milestones was also provided the residents in the study area through Canada Post Ad Mail.</p> <p>The changes to the number of turbines for the project have been based on available property, turbine size/type availability and the opportunities to secure a contract to sell power to the Province. These changes have been considered in the preparation of the environmental screening. It is very typical for wind projects to adjust the layout/number of turbines as a project is developed. It is noted that the number of turbines in the final layout are fewer than what was proposed in 2005, where a 60 turbine, 100 MW project was being considered. The vast majority of the required properties for the project have been secured by NPI through a lease arrangement.</p> <p>There was only a couple of property leases still required at the time the ESR was issued. NPI made efforts to identify all potential receptors in the study area. In the event that any receptors were missed, required changes to the layout will be made to maintain a minimum 550 m setback and meet applicable MOE noise guidelines.</p>



<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
Member of General Public Manitoulin Island, Ontario  August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Bond, Brad</b> Member of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Champoux – Ares, Linda</b> Member of General Public August 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Cormier, Chris</b> Member of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Cormier, Kathy</b> Member of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Dervis, Shiela</b> August 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2009  <b>Ferrie, Helke</b>		



The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.  
At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
Member of General Public August 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2009		
<b>Gannon, Lynda and Logan</b> Member of General Public August 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2009		
<b>G, Ron</b> Member of General Public August 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2009		
<b>Haney, Ron</b> Member of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009		
<b>Haney, Monica</b> Member of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009		
<b>Hare, Marilou</b> Member of General Public August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009		
<b>Hare, D.</b> Member of General Public		





<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Hart, Suzan</b> Member of General Public  August 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Jewell, Sandra</b> Member of General Public  August 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>J.E.</b> Member of General Public  August 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Jansen, Barbara</b> Member of General Public  August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009  <b>Labelle, Carole</b> Member of General Public  August 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009		



The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.  
At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p><b>Labelle, Maurice</b> Member of General Public</p> <p>August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Laberge, Cory</b> Member of General Public</p> <p>August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Laberge Family</b> Members of General Public</p> <p>August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Martin, Marisa</b> Member of General Public</p> <p>August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>McAllister , Tom and Michelle</b> Members of General Public</p> <p>August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>McCauley Jennifer</b> Member of General Public</p> <p>August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>		



<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p><b>McCauley Jessie</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Medwig, Jonathan</b> Member of General Public 2009</p> <p><b>Medwig, Lucia</b> Member of General Public August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Murray, Marian</b> Member of General Public August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Opoiko, Rachel</b> Directing Manager August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Pascos, Harry and Betty</b> Members of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Perreault, Orlando and</b></p>		



<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p><b>Anne</b> Members of General Public August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Rapski, Al</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Shortt, Julia</b> Member of General Public August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Stewart, Jane</b> Member of General Public August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Sunday, Lori</b> Member of General Public August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Taliotis, Gloria</b> Member of General Public August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Tilson, Kerrene</b> Member of General Public</p>		

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**  
**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<p>August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Weber, Elaine</b> Member of General Public</p> <p>August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2009</p> <p><b>Wellman, Angela (and John)</b> Professor Emeritus</p> <p>August 18, 2009</p> <p><b>William, Martin</b> Member of General Public</p> <p>August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>		
<p><b>Beaudry, Raymond</b> Member of General Public Manitoulin Island, Ontario</p> <p>July 28<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>	<p>1. One megawatt supplies about 350 homes. Over the last two months Manitoulin peak usage was 16 MW. Average was 12 MW. Northland Power McLean's Mountain project is proposed 77MW. Wind farms are on average 25% efficient due to Hydro having to keep the power produced from other sources available for supply when the wind stops in that area. Approximately 30 MW from Sudbury including line loss. If the provincial grid goes down Manitoulin will still not have power due to being non utility generator. Hydro One still maintains control authority for safety.</p>	<p>1. A modern wind turbine produces electricity 70-85% of the time, but it generates different outputs dependent on wind speed. Over the course of a year, it will generate about 30% of the theoretical maximum output. This is known as its load factor. The load factor of conventional power stations is on average 50%. A modern wind turbine will generate enough to meet the electricity demands of more than a thousand homes over the course of a year. Furthermore a wind turbine produces enough clean electricity in 3 to 5 months to offset all of the greenhouse gas emissions emitted in its manufacture – and it will produce clean electricity for another 20-25 years. A modern wind turbine is designed to operate for more than 20 years and at the end of its working life, the area can be restored at low financial and environmental costs.</p>

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
July 29, 2009	<p>2. Concerned with the following construction impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximately 50% of turbines will be in wooded areas.</li> <li>• Tree removal includes road allowances.</li> <li>• Overhead lines form turbines require more road width including potential dangers trees adjacent to lines.</li> <li>• The 115,000 volt transmission line construction will be looking into authority to expropriate private and NEMI property if required.</li> </ul>	<p>2. Efforts will be made to minimize tree or vegetation removal to accommodate the turbines and transmission line. In the event that tree or vegetation removal is required for the transmission line NPI will undertake the appropriate mitigation measures.</p>
August 21, 2009	<p>3. Expresses concerns regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact to First Nation communities (Sacred Giant Site)</li> <li>• Social and economic impacts</li> <li>• Natural and cultural impacts</li> <li>• Visual impacts</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>3. NPI has consulted with several First Nations regarding the project and the potential for impacts to First Nation communities. These consultations are expected to continue as the project development process continues. Impacts to the natural, social and cultural environment have been addressed through the environmental screening process and are documented in the Environmental Screening Report (ESR).</p>
<p><b>Bell, Chris and Joan</b> Members of General Public</p> <p>August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>	<p>1. The 43 wind turbines will be aesthetically unpleasant. Their position on top of height ground makes them very visible. Their height of 410 feet is excessive and not in keeping with the landform.</p> <p>2. The red flashing lights pollute the dark sky. No information has been given as to which of the turbines will have the lights – this will be required for the elevated assessment.</p>	<p>1. Perceptions regarding the visibility of wind turbines are subjective . NPI in the siting of the tubines has attempted to balance the visibility of the turbines with maximizing the output of the tubines. Visual simulations have been prepared as part of the Environmental Screening process. The machines used for this project will blend in well with the surrounding area. In the current layout the turbines are spaced at least 600 M apart.</p>

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p>Many people have moved to Manitoulin for the rural landscape which could now be ruined.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The construction period will be very disruptive. Highway 6 and Highway 540 are two lane roads and too narrow and congested for construction traffic. McLean's Mountain Road and Burnett Side Road are 1.5 lane roads, up very steep hills and will have to be rebuilt at NEMI taxpayer's expense.</li> <li>4. Gravel pits will have to be expanded or new ones opened to handle the aggregate requirements.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Wind turbines will be lit according to Transport Canada (TC) standards. Select WT's on the perimeter will be lit with a single red flashing light (horizontal distance between lit WT's not to exceed 900 meters for any approaching aircraft). The highest WT in the wind farm will be lit. All lit WT's will flash simultaneously. The amount of lighting required should not unduly impact residents and cottagers in the area. Current lighting systems ensure pilot safety, minimal impact on birds and minimal impacts on the night sky viewing while remaining unobtrusive for communities.</li> <li>3. During the project construction phase truck traffic will increase along Highway 540, Hwy 6 as well as the local roads within the project area in order to deliver turbine parts and accessories to the project. There will also be an increase in regular vehicular traffic as construction workers drive to the construction site. Project related traffic volumes will be substantially reduced after all turbine components are on site. Any damaged roads will be repaired to their pre-construction condition or better at the expense of NPI. Once in operation project related traffic will be limited to maintenance staff.</li> <li>4. NPI expects to obtain the required amount of aggregate material from existing licensed pits in the area.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Bickel, Gord</b> Member of General Public August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>	<p>NPI is trying to get the project approved prior to the new regulations in accordance with the Green Energy Act without making the public aware of all that is involved with the turbines.</p>	<p>NPI expects that it will need to be in compliant with the set back requirements of the pending Green Energy Act regulations.</p>
<p><b>Dedman, Randy</b> Member of General Public August 12<sup>th</sup>, 2009</p>	<p>Concerned about harmful effects of shadow flickering, ice throw and lighting on humans and wildlife.</p>	<p><u>Shadow flicker</u> - Shadow flicker is caused as rotating turbine blades disrupt the sun's rays as they are cast on incident surfaces. When the incident surfaces affected are windows at nearby houses, shadow flicker may become a concern that must be minimized through effective planning and design. Shadow Flicker was modeled for the project and the results are presented in Appendix J of the Environmental Screening Report. The proposed wind farm has been designed to ensure a minimal amount of shadow flicker to nearby receptors. Shadow</p>

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
		<p>flicker can also be minimized by planting trees with landowner consent. The analysis indicates there are no houses which receive greater than 30 hours of shadow flicker per year when accounting for cloud cover, while seven homes may experience a maximum daily shadow flicker greater than 30 minutes. As this simulation is based on a worst case scenario, it is unlikely that many of the houses will noticeably experience the number of hours of shadow flicker that has been modeled. The need for any specific mitigation to address actual flicker effects will be discussed with affected residents. NPI commits to adding screening as is appropriate to address any excess flicker effects as reported by residents.</p> <p><u>Ice Throw</u> - All of the turbines are located on private lands that are not publicly accessible. During icing events it is possible for ice to fall or be thrown from turbine blades. Any ice that is accumulated may be shed from the turbine both due to gravity and the mechanical force of the blades. An increase in temperature or solar radiation may cause sheets or fragments of ice to loosen and fall, making the area directly under the turbine subject to the greatest risk. Modern wind turbines have sensors that detect an imbalance in the rotor system and cause the turbine to stop rotating its blades and powers off until the imbalance is corrected. Since each wind turbine will be constructed on privately owned land that is generally publicly inaccessible the threat posed from ice throw and fall is greatly diminished. Turbines have all been sited with appropriate setbacks from residences to alleviate this risk. Furthermore, icefall and throw occur in the winter when agricultural fields are not in use. Therefore there should not be very much activity on or in the vicinity of turbines during the winter months.</p> <p><u>Lighting</u> - Wind turbines will be lit according to Transport Canada (TC) standards. Select WTs on the perimeter will be lit with a single red flashing light (horizontal distance between lit WTs not to exceed 900 meters for any approaching aircraft). The highest WT in the wind farm will be lit. All lit WTs will flash simultaneously. Wind turbines will be lit according to Transport Canada (TC) standards. <i>(Please see above response)</i>. The amount of lighting required should not unduly impact residents and cottagers in the area. Current lighting systems ensure pilot safety, minimal impact on birds and minimal impacts on the night sky viewing while remaining unobtrusive for communities.</p>



**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
<b>Ferrie, Helke</b> Member of General Public  August 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Concerned with impacts on archaeological significance of the proposed project area.	As part of the environmental assessment process for the proposed project a Stage 1 Archaeological Resource Assessment, as required by the Ontario Ministry of Culture, was undertaken. The assessment concluded that majority of the project area has low archaeological potential. Although the proposed study has found low archaeological potential for much of this property, there is always the possibility of buried deposits. If artifacts or human remains are found in the course of excavation of the property the appropriate authorities should be contacted. Stage 2 survey work is to be conducted if the higher potential areas are to be impacted.
<b>Harfiled, Nicolas</b> Hon.B.Sc. (biology)  August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Indicated that: Part A.6.2.4 of the Guide to EA Requirements for Electricity Projects describes the process of mandatory notification. It states that, "The notice must be mailed or delivered to households in the immediate vicinity of the project and to affected government agencies." My home is clearly identified as residence #3 on a map titled "McLeans Mountain Windfarm Figure 6-4 Noise Receptor Locations and Noise Contours." Neither myself nor my father (owner of Lot 9 Con 1 and Lot 9 Con 2) received correspondence of any sort from Dillon Consulting or NPI. The property I live and farm on, which is owned by my father and which I am currently in the process of buying, is adjacent to turbines 24 and 28. My family should have been notified of all public meetings held by NPI.	The Notice of Project Restart and PIC appeared in the Manitoulin Expositor for two consecutive weeks prior to the scheduled meeting on June 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2009. Notices of Project Commencement, subsequent Public Information Centers and Notice of Completion were published in the <i>Manitoulin Expositor</i> over the course of the last five years. The Notice of Completion was also provided to the residents in the study area through Canada Post Ad Mail. The turbines are set back at least 550 meters from all residences including the few residences within the study area for the proposed project. NPI has sited the proposed wind turbines away from local businesses and dense residential areas. NPI will continue an open public consultation process regarding the proposed project.
<b>Williamson, David</b> CAO  August 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Indicates that: "NEMI Council has passed previous Resolutions in support of the project and these resolutions remain on the public records. Council's position has been modified though the passage of Resolution No. 218-08-09 rescinding proposed setbacks under the NEMI Zoning By-Law agreed to by Resolution No. 36-02-07 (...). It should be noted that the setbacks identified in Resolution No. 36-02-07 were never	Your comments regarding the recent Council resolutions have been noted. It is NPI's understanding that the project is still in conformance with the existing zoning by-law.

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	implemented into the NEMI Zoning By-law under the provision of the Planning Act (...). Asks "(...) to revise page 11 of the (ESR/IES) document and delete any reference to any setbacks governing the project under the NEMI Zoning By-Law (...)"	
<b>Wellman, W.J &amp; A</b> Members of General Public  July 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	Concerned with negative impacts on tourism.	<p>The project area is not an area that is frequented by tourists. The project is well set back from the Island shoreline areas and as such is not expected to impact tourism activities. While some of the turbines may be visible in the distance horizon from the waters that surround the Island, it is not expected that this would influence people's decision to visit this area.</p> <p>We note that the proposed project may have the potential to attract visitors. At NPI's Miller Mountain project in a remote part of Quebec, in excess of 3500 tourists visited the project in 2008. The Providence Bay Wind Farm located to the south east of the proposed project, approximately 45 km away, established an interpretation centre for the project, which attracts numerous visitors over the summer visitor months.</p>
<b>COMMENTS RELATING TO THE SPECIFIC SECTIONS IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING REPORT</b>		
<b>Harfiled, Nicolas</b> Hon.B.Sc. (biology)  August 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2009	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 1.1 in part states that, "No surface water will be required for the project," yet on page 8 of the ESR under section 1.9 it indicates that the following permit may be required: "<i>Ontario MOE Permit to Take Water under the Environmental Protection Act, should water be extracted for use in the temporary cement plant/concrete batch plant (if necessary) or for other purposes from a surface and or groundwater source in excess of 50,000 liters per day;</i>" Will surface water be required for this project or not?</li> <li>Section 1.2 In part states that "Some de-watering of the turbine foundation area may be required. Affects on groundwater levels are not expected because of this." What will happen to the flow of groundwater as a result of the</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If an on-site cement batch plant is required, the likely water source would be groundwater – not surface water. The need for such a facility within the project area has not been confirmed. All necessary permits would be obtained should there be a need for groundwater.</li> <li>The amount of dewatering required for turbine foundation construction is expected to be minimal and temporary. The extracted water from the foundation area would not be consumed but would be returned to the area. Blasting may be required to construct the turbine foundations. It is highly unlikely that the project would have any material effect on the ground water resource in the area.</li> <li>The wind turbines, once constructed, will not prevent landowners from constructing buildings in their vicinity. There are currently no by-laws preventing a landowner from</li> </ol>

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p>blasting required to pour foundations for the turbines? It is my understanding that there have not been any windfarms developed in Ontario on this type of bedrock. It is also my understanding that the spring water (groundwater) flowing down through the escarpment to my farm originates from proposed turbine sites. I am concerned that the construction of the turbines (particularly turbines 24, 28, 29, 30, and 34) may alter the flow of groundwater to my farm. I rely on this water to operate my farm. What is an appropriate compensation for the loss of access to clean water?</p> <p>3. Section 2.1 In part states that "There are few residences in the vicinity of the turbines. The turbines are set back at least 550m from each residence and future building envelopes." Because many of the turbines are located on single 100 acre lots, many adjacent landowners will be prevented from building on their own land in the future. With the 550m setback requirements of the Green Energy Act, property owner rights will be restricted with respect to building a dwelling. Dillon Consulting and NPI cannot possibly know about adjacent landowners future building plans because they did not adequately consult with us. What is equally problematic is the restriction future landowners will face if they choose to build. I have recently purchased a building permit for a dwelling on Lot 9 Con 2. My building permit is dated August 20, 2009, as is my receipt of payment. I expect NPI to change the proposed location for turbine 28 as it is less than 550m from my building site. I also expect that NPI should report on any negative environmental impacts for the</p>	<p>doing this. NPI is siting its turbines a minimum of 550 m from sensitive noise receptors as required by provincial policy.</p> <p>4. Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>5. Discussions were held with several agencies as well input was received from local people with knowledge on conservation issues. If there are other individuals in the area with relevant knowledge then NPI would be quite willing to speak with them.</p> <p>6. Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>7. It was not necessary to evaluate each wetland in the study area to avoid them. Available mapping, information from the MNR and field work was all considered to identify the location of wetlands in the project area.</p> <p>8. A Natural Environment Assessment in consultation with the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment Canada was conducted for this project. The assessment concluded that risk to rare, threatened and endangered species in the area is low and minimal adverse significant effects are anticipated. NPI will implement mitigation measure where required.</p> <p>9. Please see responses provided above to #5 and #8 of this section. Further, there is a large amount of information available regarding the effects of wind farms of birds. This base of information continues to grow. From the experience of existing wind farms, wind farms generally result in minimal effects to birds during operations.</p> <p>10. The effects on natural habitat as a result of wind farm construction are documented in the ESR (both disturbance and removal effects). Further, NPI continues to work with the MNR and Environment Canada to ensure that effects of the project are minimized.</p>

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p>new site chosen for turbine 28.</p> <p>4. Section 4.1 In part states that, "Based on an extensive literature review, consultations with local experts, and a full year of fieldwork, rare, threatened or endangered species are unlikely to be affected by the project." I have partially commented on this statement in paragraph 3 of this elevation request, with particular attention to the Puma, which is endangered in eastern North America.</p> <p>5. Which local experts were contacted for consultation? Judith Jones, Dr. Gerard Courtin, and Chris Bell were not consulted. Local residents who know the land and its communities better than any, were not consulted. I have seen a list of "local" authorities in the ESR who were consulted with, and most if not all of these people hold offices that are not on Manitoulin Island. Was John Diebolt used as a consultant in this project? He is our local, senior Conservation Officer who likely knows the project area extremely well. I suggest that in the individual Environmental Assessment being requested, some of these truly local experts are used for consultation.</p> <p>6. Section 4.2 In part states that, "There are no known ESAs in the study area. The one ANSI (life science) in the area has been avoided." I contend that the effects to the ANSI (presumably Bass Lake Marsh/Swamp – AREA_ID 4853) will be mitigated simply because the project area boundary conveniently excludes this ANSI. I have discussed my concerns related to this in paragraph 4 of this elevation</p>	<p>11. The effects to any harvestable forests from the project would be on private land. No concerns have been expressed by landowners to NPI in this regard. No public forested lands are affected.</p> <p>12. Hunting activities will be only disturbed if project construction occurs during the fall hunting season. Once operational, the wind farm is highly unlikely to affect games species in the area. Anecdotal information from NPI's other projects supports this. NPI is consulting with First Nations regarding the impact of the project on traditional land use activities.</p> <p>13. The proposed project is located in The Municipality of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands (NEMI) which is a rural community. For the purposes of the noise assessment, the area is defined as a "Class 3 Area" which includes rural areas and/or small communities with a population of less than 1000 and an environment dominated by natural sounds and little or no road traffic. All potential receptors in the noise study area for the proposed project are defined as Class 3 areas for purposes of the noise assessment. This approach triggers the most stringent of noise criteria for use in the noise assessment.</p> <p>14. The statement regarding no businesses refers to the lands within the project area or immediate vicinity of the project. The only effect that is to occur beyond the immediate vicinity of each wind turbine is the visibility of the turbines. The potential for the visibility of the turbines to affect tourism activity on the Island has been addressed in the ESR. In considering the experience of other turbine projects around the world, it is more likely that the project will positively influence people's decision to visit the Island.</p>

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p>request.</p> <p>7. Section 4.3 In part states that, "Wetlands in the study area have been avoided as much as possible." Were qualified wetlands evaluators used to evaluate the wetlands that will not be avoided? If not, this should be completed in the requested EA.</p> <p>8. Section 4.4 In part states that, "The construction and installation of project components has the potential to result in effects to wildlife through the removal of some habitat." This proposed wind farm will result in more habitat loss in the project area than has ever before been experienced – it not only has the potential to result in effects to wildlife – it will have effects to wildlife.</p> <p>9. Section 4.6 In part states that, "The scale and significance of these effects has been assessed in this Environmental Screening". Ducks Unlimited acknowledges that the indirect impacts of windfarms on migratory birds are not well understood and that quality information on this particular issue is generally lacking (Pers. Comm.). How can Dillon Consulting and NPI assess and mitigate the effects of something the scientific community knows very little about?</p> <p>10. Section 4.7 In part states that: "From some turbine sites, natural vegetation will need to be cleared for the turbines, collector lines and access roads." Because every turbine will require the construction of at least some length of road, and</p>	<p>15. NPI will be obligated to maintain a minimum 550 m setback from all sensitive noise receptors and meet required noise levels at these locations. The need to consider hunt camps as noise sensitive receptors is being discussed with the MOE.</p> <p>16. We disagree with this point of view that the project will not result in economic benefits to the Island. The benefits that will result are clearly outlined in the ESR. Further, this project may have the potential to attract visitors. At NPI's Miller Mountain project in a remote part of Quebec, 3500 tourists visited the project in 2008. The Providence Bay Wind Farm located to the south east of the proposed project, approximately 45 km away, established an interpretation centre for the project, which attracts numerous visitors over the summer visitor months. Furthermore Wind farms generally have positive long term effects on the local tourist economy. There are 6,000 wind turbines in Denmark, which are used for marketing tourism. Hotels, guesthouses, and campsites may use wind turbines to promote "green tourism". This is particularly targeted towards the German market, where the public is known to have a high level of interest in both environmental issues and in new technology. In a Scottish study<sup>1</sup> 43% of respondents said a wind farm would have a positive effect on their inclination to visit the Argyll area, an area of high landscape value. About the same proportion of respondents said it would make no difference, while less than 8% felt that it would have a negative effect. Nine out of ten tourists visiting some of Scotland's top beauty spots say the presence of wind farms makes no difference to the enjoyment of their holiday. Twice as many people would return to an area because of the presence of a wind farm than would stay away, according to a poll carried out by MORI Scotland. Commercial tour companies provide guided tours of several wind farms in the Pincher Creek, Alberta region.</p> <p>17. There is no scientific evidence of direct health effects resulting from noise at the level of</p>

<sup>1</sup> *Tourist Attitudes Toward Wind Farms*, MORI Summary Report, September 2002 [www.bwea.com/pdf/MORI.pdf](http://www.bwea.com/pdf/MORI.pdf)

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p>a foundation, natural vegetation will be destroyed at every turbine site. Also, because many (nearly 50%) of the proposed turbine sites are located in wooded areas, much of the vegetation that is destroyed will be forest.</p> <p>11. Section 5.5 In part states that: "The affected lands do not support harvestable forest resources." This statement is simply not true. I invite you to visit the project area and have one of the adjacent landowners show you some of the harvestable forest resources that will be cleared for collector lines and access roads.</p> <p>12. Section 5.6 In part states that: "The project is located in an area that may be used for recreational hunting." And that "None of the affected lands can be considered inaccessible." The project area is unquestionably used by recreational and sustenance hunters. The people that hunt these lands include members of Sheguiandah First Nation, local land owners and their families, as well as off-Island residents who come to the area for hunting (bringing money into the local economy). A large percentage of the lands in the project area are used solely for hunting. Should the windfarm cause the emigration of game resources from the area it is possible that many of these landowners will sell, depreciating property values.</p> <p>13. Section 6.1 In part states that: "There are no built communities in the vicinity of the project, the area is rural in nature with a few scattered residences." This is a terribly misleading statement. The project area boundary conveniently excludes:</p>	<p>noise generated by wind turbines. Please refer to the response provided in the "Human Health" section of this Table.</p>

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aundeck Omni Kaning First Nation which is approximately 1 km from the nearest proposed turbine (turbine 8)</li> <li>• All of the homes north and west of HWY 540</li> <li>• All of the homes on Bidwell Road south of proposed turbines 42 and 43 (these homes are approximately 1 km from the proposed turbines)</li> <li>• All of the homes on Townline Road south of the project area</li> <li>• Sheguiandah and Sheguiandah First Nation</li> <li>• All of the homes along HWY 6</li> <li>• Little Current which is approximately 3 km from the nearest proposed turbines (turbines 1 and 4)</li> </ul> <p>The project area boundary should be extended 1 km in each cardinal direction, with special mention given to Little Current, to properly describe the level of human habitation in the vicinity of the project. Please refer to the McLeans Mountain Windfarm Figure 6-4 Noise Receptor Locations and Noise Contours map to help clarify my arguments on this topic. Note that the 40 dBa Noise Contour of proposed turbine 37 exceeds the project area boundary to the west. Also note the obvious exclusion of Aundeck Omni Kaning from the project area (the project area boundary clearly cuts to the southwest as it approaches AOK).</p> <p>14. Section 6.2 In part states that: "There are no businesses in the vicinity of the project that could be negatively affected." How can Dillon Consulting make such a bold statement</p>	

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p>based on the information in this ESR? Most Island businesses rely on tourist dollars, and tourists do not come to Manitoulin Island to see wind turbines. Tourists come to the Island to get away from large man made structures like turbines, and the light and noise pollution associated with such structures.</p> <p>15. Section 6.3 In part states that: "Disruption during operations is not expected," and that "No recreation cottages are within the project area. There are a couple of hunt camps in the project area." - One of the 40 dBa Noise Contours on the McLeans Mountain Windfarm Figure 6-4 Noise Receptor Locations and Noise Contours map includes a large portion (approximately 30%) of the land my family and I hunt on (Lot 9 Con 2). This will undoubtedly disrupt the game that I hunt and will disrupt the deep connection I feel with the land when I am hunting. I personally know of 12 dwellings in the project area, plus at least 2 building permits for dwellings that have been purchased within the last 6 months that are also within the project area. Of these 14 dwellings, at least 4 are within 550 metres of a proposed turbine. I am also unclear of the distinction Dillon Consulting makes between a recreation cottage and a hunt camp. Many consider hunting to be a recreational activity (though hunting for me is part of my Manitoulin lifestyle), therefore, making a hunt camp a recreational cottage. Also, many "hunt camps" are used year round for many forms of recreation including skiing, snowshoeing, wild crafting, maple syrup</p>	



The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p>making, and hiking. Regardless of their uses, these camps are all considered dwellings and will require the Green Energy Act setback of 550 m.</p> <p>16. Section 6.5 In part states that: "Negative effects on the area economy are not expected. The project will result in positive economic impacts through payments to land owners and taxes that will be paid to the municipality and job creation. Supplies and services will be obtained in the local area as much as possible." I have already addressed my concerns regarding negative effects on the area economy. Information in the ESR does not convince me that the tourism industry and land values of Manitoulin Island will not be negatively affected. NPI's commitment to support the local economy through job creation and the purchase locally of supplies and services is not convincing. Full-time, long term job creation has been estimated by NPI to be anywhere from 7-10 jobs, with no written commitment to hire locally. I have also not seen any written commitment in the form of a legally binding contract that holds NPI to using local businesses and labour during the construction phase of the project. It seems very likely that there will be no net economic benefit to the Island, it seems more likely that there will be a long term net negative impact to the local economy.</p> <p>17. Section 6.8 In part states that: "Potential effects to public health and safety during the operations period are minimal,"</p>	

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	and that "Project Health and Safety concerns have been responded to – local residents are generally supportive of the project. Potential health effects from wind turbines are still poorly understood. Dillon Consulting and NPI should not be able to make this claim, especially when organizations like the World Health Organization are approaching this issue with caution. I do not feel it is safe for us (residents within or near the project area) to be living in such close proximity to wind turbines until our provincial and national governments have a clearer understanding of the potential health effects from wind turbines. Local residents are not generally supportive of the project, at least not since being given the most recent information.	
<b>Roy, Jeffery</b> Member of General Public  August, 2, 2009	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR document: "<i>NPI intends to develop the project under the new Green Energy Act (GEA) Feed-In- Tariff (FIT) program</i>". This misleading because Northland Power Inc. (NPI) has publicly stated that they are not obligated to do not intend to follow the restrictions of the GEA.</li> <li>2. Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: "<i>Significant effects to the natural and social environment have been avoided through careful site selection, good planning, the implementation of mitigation measures, and adherence to regulatory requirements</i>". The (project) sites were selected according to availability of landowners willing to buy in; for example when one landowner recently reconsidered his decision to have Tower 3 on his land, it was moved from its previous</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed project conforms to the current legislation i.e., the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) and the Electricity Projects Regulation (O.Reg. 116/01). NPI conducted an environmental screening according to the Ministry of the Environment's (MOE) "Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Electricity Projects". The proposed regulatory changes pursuant to the Green Energy and Green Economy, 2009 Act ("MOE Regulatory Changes"), including a document describing the requirements of the new Renewable Energy Approval ("REA Approval Requirements") had not been passed as legislation when the ESR was completed. NPI intends to meet the 550 m setback from all applicable receptors and other set backs required by the Province.</li> <li>2. The siting of the turbines was based on a combination of factors including: land availability, wind resource potential, natural environmental features and their sensitivity, and social considerations (e.g. residences), and project economics.</li> <li>3. Effects to hunting activity would only occur if project construction occurs in the Fall during the hunting season. Once the project is operational, no effects to hunting are</li> </ol>

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p>location to its current one where it is close to a well known waterfowl pond and in the middle of a mature maple forest habitat.</p> <p>3. Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"The project is located in a rural area where the wind farm will not interfere with the existing land uses. No significant adverse environmental effects are anticipated. The overall conclusion of this ESR is that this project can be constructed, operated and decommissioned without any significant impacts to the environment, including the natural and social environment"</i>. This is the type of overstatement that is repeated frequently through the report as if its repetition alone will give the document some validity. There will be a significant interference with current land use; e.g. hunting is a major pastime in the green bush and will be significantly impacted by the construction and operation phase noise. Agricultural land (although limited) will be significantly reduced on the affected lots due to the combined land degradations of the development.</p> <p>Significant noise issues may affect the enjoyment of adjacent lands. Building restrictions on land within setback radius of turbines will restrict use. See further more specific comments below.</p> <p>4. Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"In addition to the wind turbines, the project will require a 10.3 km 115 kV power transmission line to be constructed to the west of the study area"</i>. No routing has been suggested that runs to the west. I assume this is the first of several errors in</p>	<p>anticipated. The land has very limited value for agricultural which is limited to cattle pasturing. The landowners whose property the turbines will be located on have not expressed any concerns regarding this. The turbines once operational will not restrict any development on adjacent lands. Landowners are free to build on their property as per current zoning regulations. We do note that the project lands have very little development within it. Most development activity has occurred along the edges of the project.</p> <p>4. Reference to the western direction of the transmission line is in error. The location of the proposed 115 kV power transmission line is to the north-east corner of the project. Mapping in the ESR shows the proposed route for the transmission line.</p> <p>5.</p> <p>5a) The proposed project has been in the formal planning stages since the spring of 2004. Since that time, various forms of consultation have taken place including sending notices to residents throughout the area. Since 2004, NPI has had discussions with several Aboriginal communities in proximity to the project area. This information is available in section 4.3 of the EIS/ESR for the McLeans Mountain Wind Farm document. Notices of Project Commencement, subsequent Public Information Centers and Notice of Completion were published in the <i>Manitoulin Expositor</i> over the course of the last five years. Notification of these project milestones was also provided the residents in the study area through Canada Post Ad Mail. NPI continues an open public consultation process regarding the proposed project. NPI held a Public Information Meeting on June 28, 2005 where NPI indicated that initially the proposed wind farm would consist of 60 wind turbines for a total capacity of 99 MW. The number of proposed wind turbines and total capacity of the proposed wind farm has therefore decreased over the past five years during the planning stages of the proposed project.</p> <p>5b) Please refer to the response provided above.</p>

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p>direction in the document. Or perhaps there is another route being considered – the project has a history of metamorphosing so frequently that local stakeholders have difficulty keeping up.</p> <p>5. Commented on the following statements as presented in the EIS/ESR:</p> <p>5a) <i>"As part of the EA requirements, a consultation process has been undertaken to provide the opportunity for the public, government agencies and aboriginal communities to identify any issues that they may have with the project and obtain information to mitigate their concerns."</i> I will let the First Nations speak for themselves as I understand they feel they have not been appropriately consulted. As for the local residents - the first we heard of this project was mid June 09 when NPI announced the "public information meeting" in the local paper. Residents who did not subscribe to a paper would not have heard about it. Previous meetings referred to in the ER involved a completely different proposal with different turbine locations, overall size and transmission line.</p> <p>5b) <i>"Public and agency consultation has been a cornerstone of this project with multiple information sharing and stakeholder feedback opportunities provided throughout the course of this study. Potential stakeholders were identified and contacted early in project planning to identify areas of concern. On June 8th and 15th, 2009 the Notice of study restart and PIC #3 was published in the Manitoulin Expositor. The notice was also sent on June 15th, 2009 to all residents in the project area and the larger area through Canada Post Ad</i></p>	<p>5c) The Notice of Project Restart and PIC appeared in the Manitoulin Expositor for two consecutive weeks prior to the scheduled meeting on June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009. Northland Power Inc. (NPI) held a Public Information Meeting on June 28, 2005 where NPI indicated that initially the proposed wind farm would consist of 60 wind turbines for a total capacity of 99 MW. NPI does not anticipate significant changes to the proposed number of wind turbines (i.e., 43) as recently presented at the Public Information Centre on July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009. The number of proposed wind turbines and total capacity of the proposed wind farm has therefore decreased over the past five years during the planning stages of the proposed project.</p> <p>6. Comment noted regarding the attempts of NPI to address the concerns of residents regarding the transmission line routing. NPI is willing to consider all reasonable options to route the transmission line through this area. At this time, the route as proposed in the ESR is still proposed.</p> <p>7. NPI expects that it will have to meet the set back requirements of the <i>Green Energy Act</i> which are likely to exceed the set back distances that the Town had formally established through resolution.</p>

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.  
At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p><i>Mail.</i> Our family lives on McLean's Mountain Road and we and our neighbours did not notice this mailing amongst the advertisement mail we received in June.</p> <p>5c) <i>"The final PIC was held on June 25, 2009 at the NEMI Recreation Centre/Arena in Little Current, Ontario from 7:30 pm to 9:30 pm. During the PIC, several information panels were displayed to provide the public with information about the project (see Appendix B). The purpose of the PIC was to present:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The results of environmental studies and evaluations of the siting of the wind turbine and transmission line route;</i></li> <li>• <i>The assessment of project impacts on the environment with potential mitigation measures and identification of residual effects;</i></li> <li>• <i>The specific information on the project; and,</i></li> <li>• <i>To provide a venue for questions and for providing feedback to NPI about the project.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The PIC was organized as a drop-in centre. In total, thirty-four (34) participants signed in. Overall the PIC was well received."</i> The date in the Expositor appeared incorrectly and many people may have missed it. The season is particularly busy in June for local people to attend a meeting with short notice. Many people had seen enough versions of this project over several years that they were skeptical that the development would proceed. To my knowledge there was no substantive changes made to the project in response to the public concerns. Steadily escalating public outcry as a result of educational efforts has also not resulted in any material change to the project.</p> <p>6. Commented on the following statement as presented in the</p>	

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p>EIS/ESR: <i>"Follow-up discussions were held with residents regarding the routing of the transmission line along Morphet's Side Road."</i> This refers to an effort to convince me to allow the 115KV line over my property (presumably over the edge of the escarpment and directly toward Little Current) as opposed to running down Morphet's Side Road. (MSR) This was the only alternative cheaper for the company than MSR. MSR is canopied in its upper section by 100 year old maple trees and features a fabulous vista to the East over the East Channel. Further east it is lined by trees and passes four lovely hillside farms. We didn't want a transmission line with ROW along it, nor did we want it overhead through our farm. (an underground routing was proposed but NPI's response was that it was too expensive.)</p> <p>7. Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"The wind turbine setback distance requirements as specified in the NEMI zoning by-law is observed or even surpassed in the siting the wind turbines for this project. These setbacks are:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <i>Separation distance from dwellings, the great of</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <i>250m, or</i></li> <li>b) <i>Ministry of the Environment, Certificate of Approval requirement, (NPC232)</i></li> </ol> </li> <li>2) <i>Participant property line setback – 10 m</i></li> <li>3) <i>Non-participant property line setback – rotor radius plus 10 m</i></li> <li>4) <i>Setback from road right-of-way line – rotor radius plus 10m</i></li> <li>5) <i>Separation distance from non-dwelling principal and accessory structures – rotor</i></li> </ol>	

<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>radius plus 10m."</i></p> <p>My understanding is that council had passed this concept in principle but subject to further consideration and research. Many municipalities are now realizing that the old setbacks are simply not adequate to protect residents. In addition they are recognizing that the setbacks may be better defined with reference to property lines rather than receptors to avoid infringement on property rights. The GEA has not yet established appropriate setbacks. The council intends to revisit this motion and propose a bylaw in the near future. This is well known to NPI and it is disingenuous to imply that the local government is onboard with the project as it stands.</p>	
	<p><b>8.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: "<i>A key aspect of all project phases is to minimize environmental effects. The wind turbines have been sited to target areas with the best wind energy potential, avoid sensitive natural areas/habitats, optimize use of existing roads, minimize the visual impacts of the turbines, and respect all municipal set back requirements</i>". See above.</p>	<p><b>8.</b> Thank you for your comment. Please refer to the response provided above.</p>
	<p><b>9.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: "<i>It is anticipated that the maximum width of the ROW would be approximately 8-10 meters depending on the distance of poles and conductor swing. The transmission line route as shown in Figure 2-1 is largely contained within municipal road rights-of-way</i>". Given the description of MSR (above) we are skeptical that an 8 to 10 meter ROW can be "largely contained within municipal road rights-of-</p>	<p><b>9.</b> The statement regarding the anticipated width of the ROW for the transmission line in the ESR is correct. Also, NPI has not applied to expropriate any land for the project.</p>

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	way." If NPI thought that was true they would not have applied for expropriation rights to route the transmission line.	
	<p><b>10.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"Turbine staging areas are located at each turbine site. The turbine staging area is comprised of three different zones. The crane pad is the area needed to support the crane used for construction and will be approximately 12 meters wide by 36.5 meters deep and will be accessible from the access road with a slope of less than 1% or less in all directions. Each turbine position will also require a staging and equipment storage area for the safe erection of the towers and the lift and securing of the nacelle and blades. Thus, a total leveled surface of approximately 40m by 40m will be required at each turbine. Furthermore, a 360 degree radius around the base of the turbine to a distance of 50 meters The maximum construction site required at each foundation is 225 feet (69 m) by 250 feet (76 m) (the "Construction Site"); the Construction Site includes a crane pad area of 80 feet (24 m) by 60 feet (18m), which may have a maximum slope of 1% in any direction. The Construction Site will be cleared of vegetation, rocks and other obstructions that may impede access by erection equipment.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Soil compaction to provide ground-bearing capacity of nominal 4,500 pounds per square foot.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>An open area of not less than 300 feet (92 m) by 600 feet (183 m) will be required as a staging area. The entrance and exit will be 40 feet (12 m) wide and have an inside turning radius of at least 150 feet (46 m)".</i> NPI states that at least ½ of the turbines are located in forested areas. Most of this forest is mature sugar maple or cedar. The NPI statement <i>"A key aspect of all project phases will be on the minimization of environmental and social effects"</i> rings rather hollow in the face of this description as does</p>	<p><b>10.</b> Some vegetation disturbance and removal will occur during the construction phases of the wind farm. Vegetation survey field work has been conducted to aid in the positioning/routing of the project components. The nature of the anticipated impacts is documented in the ESR. NPI will minimize the removal of vegetation and where required, replant areas with native vegetation to maintain biodiversity.</p>



The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories. At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	their claim that the natural forest will "largely reestablish itself within a year" (Rick Martin July 2009).	
	<b>11.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"A decommissioning plan will be prepared in accordance with provincial legislation and guidelines that exist at the time of decommissioning. Decommissioning will involve the removal of the turbines and other associated infrastructure including the turbine foundations to below grade and the removal of electrical lines/facilities. Infrastructure that is left below grade will not affect future land use. Previously disturbed lands would be rehabilitated and returned to their previous state."</i> This suggests to me that if Northland pulls out or sells out at some point there will be no one left with the very expensive obligation to decommission. This should all be specified as part of the initial process and bonded to ensure it gets paid for. The suggestion that "Previously disturbed lands would be rehabilitated and returned to their previous state" is of course ludicrous. How can you replace a mature maple sugar bush? – they don't seem to be making them anymore.	<b>11.</b> A decommissioning plan will be prepared by NPI. The purpose of this decommissioning plan will be to identify the methodology that NPI will use to mitigate potential impacts resulting from the cessation of operation of the facility at the end of the Project's useful life. The decommissioning plan will identify the specific Project components that will be removed; the costs associated with the removal of the components and associated scrap value. Some vegetation disturbance and removal will occur during the construction phases of the wind farm. NPI will ensure to minimize removal of vegetation and where required, replant areas with native vegetation to maintain biodiversity.
	<b>12.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"The (transmission) line has been routed to minimize its distance and avoid sensitive environmental features. The line will be above ground. Some minor variations to the alignment are possible dependant on public input and engineering considerations."</i> This repetitive statement has been questioned above.	<b>12.</b> Thank you for your comment. Please refer to the relevant responses provided above.
	<b>13.</b>	<b>13.</b> Thank you for your comment. Please refer to response provided to <i>Question #20</i> of this

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"Operations will directly employ up to 8 people whose tasks will be to monitor and operate the wind farm. These long term employment opportunities will generate total annual incomes of about \$600,000."</i> Even if this figure was likely to represent local employment (which is hardly likely – these are highly specialized and technical machines) it is a tiny drop in the bucket compared to the employment from tourism (see below).	section regarding impacts on tourism.
	<b>14.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"The McLean's Mountain Wind Farm is located in the in NEMI. This will represent an annual tax payment to the Municipality of approximately \$95,000 per year"</i> . This figure (which might require justification) may be offset by reduced property values in the entire surrounding area as evidenced in other areas.	<b>14.</b> Based on the consultations undertaken with the local residents NPI noted a concern over the loss of property values due to the proposed development of the McLean's' Mountain Wind Farm. The vast majority of evidence on the impact of wind farms on land values comes from Europe, Australia and United States of America (USA). The studies conducted in these countries indicate wind farms have no material effect on property values. Data from Ontario is beginning to emerge as more wind farms are constructed, and the experience from those projects also suggests that wind farms do not decrease property values.  A 2006 study conducted by Blake, Matlock and Marshal Ltd. for Windrush Energy suggests that wind farms have not negatively affected property values. <i>"Property Value Study: the Relationship of Windmill Development and Market Prices"</i> aimed to determine if the development of wind farms in the Melancthon area has had any impact on the growth of property values in the Township. Property values before and after wind farm development in the Township of Melancthon where compared to values in East Luther Grand Valley Township, a neighbouring and similar township except for its lack of wind farms. Property values in Melancthon were also compared to those in Dufferin County. The analysis showed that property values in the Township of Melancthon grew similarly to the rest of the County, and increased more than East Luther Grand Valley Township. Wind farm development was not found to have diminished property values.  The Canadian Hydro Developers Inc. also compared housing price ranges on Wolfe Island

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
		<p>and Simcoe Island in Ontario, before and after the development of the wind farm (<a href="http://www.shearwind.com/glen_dhu_community/fact_sheet.html">http://www.shearwind.com/glen_dhu_community/fact_sheet.html</a>). Findings indicate that Township of Melancthon experienced a stronger growth rate in sales price per property, than the adjoining East Luther Grand Valley Township. The findings of this particular research indicate that the presence of the Wind Farm in Melancthon Township has not had an adverse impact on values within that municipality.</p> <p>A study conducted by the Renewable Energy Policy Project (REPP) "<i>The Effect of Wind Development on Local Property Values</i>" (May 2003) presents data to counter the threat of decreased property values. The REPP study is the first study to systematically analyze property values data in order to examine the charge often voiced by wind farm opponents that wind development will lower the value of property within view of the turbines. The REPP study looked at wind development projects with a generating capacity of 10 MW or more that were installed in the U.S. from 1998 to 2001. The REPP study also used much larger wind farms (up to 80 wind turbines per site) than the proposed McLean's Mountain Farm (43 wind turbines). The REPP study found no evidence that property values decreased as a result of wind farms. Quite the contrary, for the great majority of projects the property values in the view shed of the wind farm increased at a higher rate than they did in the comparable community.</p> <p>Experience in other countries indicates no evidence supporting the claim that views of wind farms decrease property values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>USA</u> - Research in 2002 by ECONorthWest backed-up by a May 2003 Analytic Report for the REPP involving the review of over 25,000 records of property sales within a distance of 8km of wind farms and interviews with property tax assessors. The report found that property values increased at a higher rate within the view-shed of the wind farm than in comparable locations away from wind farms.</li> <li>• <u>Denmark</u> - A report by the Institute of Local Government Studies (AKF) found that "the</li> </ul>

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
		<p>economic expenses in connection with noise and visual effects from wind mills are minimal".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>United Kingdom</u> – The Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) released a study in 2005 that found that of 405 surveyors surveyed, 63% felt wind farm developments had no impact on the value of agricultural lands. The surveyors involved in the study all had experience with transactions affected by wind farms.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>15.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>Will the project "have negative effects on residential, commercial or institutional land uses within 500 metres of the site"?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>There are no commercial or institutional land uses in the project area.</i></li> <li>• <i>There are a few residences in the vicinity of the turbines. The turbines are set back at least 550 m from each residence and future building envelopes.</i>" This is in fact not true and represents one of the major objections to the project as planned. Precisely because the setbacks are from current residences, the building and business opportunities for adjacent landowners are being restricted or the land within the setback rendered unsafe for use. It would not make sense for the municipality to insist on a certain setback from a residence and then allow a residence to be built within the setback jeopardizing the health of current and future owners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>15.</b> There has been very little historical development activity in the project area. This absence of development activity has been one of the reasons for the project being located in this area. Adjacent property owners will not be restricted to build on their property to the extent that is allowed under the current zoning by-law.</p>
	<p><b>16.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>Will the project "be inconsistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, provincial land use or resource management plans?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The project respects the pertinent Provincial Policy Statement".</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>16.</b> The proposed project conforms to the policies set out by the Provincial Policy Statement (alternative and renewable energy) as well as to The Official Plan for the Manitoulin Planning Area. The proposed project is not sited on the Niagara Escarpment and therefore is not required to conform to The Niagara Escarpment Commission policies.</p>

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p>The project is located on one of the highest and most prominent portions of the Niagara Escarpment as it exists on Manitoulin. As such, provincial policy discourages development of the brow of the escarpment. One of the previous incarnations of this project was located well back from the brow of the escarpment for that very reason.</p>	
	<p><b>17.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>Will the project "cause negative effects from the emission of noise?"</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The operation of the construction equipment will result in noise increases in a localized area.</i></li> <li>• <i>The operation of the turbines will result in noise, although the turbines have been sited to meet MOE noise criteria.</i></li> <li>• <i>Increased road traffic from the construction workforce could increase road traffic noise levels in area. See Section 6.12 or effects assessment/mitigation".</i></li> </ul> <p>The noise forecast data (which in itself has questionable accuracy) suggests levels of noise that would cause significant disruption in the lives of local residents who have a right to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes and properties. There is also increasing evidence for the validity of Wind Turbine Syndrome in a small but significant percentage of predisposed individuals, possibly related to the low frequency sound. This condition is prompting authorities in many countries including our own to reevaluate the appropriate setbacks. The setbacks suggested in the draft of the GEA call for greater setbacks than NPI is willing to entertain.</p>	<p><b>17.</b> A Noise and Acoustics Assessment was conducted in accordance with the Ontario Ministry of the Environment guidelines. This document can be found in <i>Appendix G</i> of this report. Wind turbines make some sound. The noise from a wind turbine is caused by the passing of the blade through the air, and is similar to white noise from wind, or waves. But even when the turbine is turning you can carry on a conversation at its base. The sound is a "swish" like the waves on a beach. Wind turbines produce noise only when it is windy, but the ambient noise from adjacent Highway 6 or Highway 540 or wind rustling through trees and grasses increases as winds increase. There is no scientific evidence of direct health effects resulting from noise at the level of noise generated by wind turbines. It has been repeatedly shown by measurements of wind turbine noise undertaken in the UK, Denmark, Germany and the USA over the past decade, and accepted by experienced noise professionals, that the levels of infrasonic noise and vibration radiated from modern, upwind configuration wind turbines are at a very low level; so low that they lie below the threshold of perception, even for those people who are particularly sensitive to such noise, and even on an actual wind turbine site. Consideration of any health concerns associated with wind turbines was conducted as per provincial and federal regulations as well as in the environmental assessment. There are a few residences in the vicinity of the turbines. All wind turbines have been sited a minimum of 550 meters from all residences and potential residences in the area.</p>

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p><b>18.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>Will the project "have negative effects on the availability of forest resources? The affected lands do not support harvestable forest resources."</i> This is a shockingly narrow perspective to take on the value of our forest resources especially when completing a review of the environmental effects of a large industrial development on a rural ecosystem.</p>	<p><b>18.</b> The effects to any harvestable forests from the project would be on private land. No concerns have been expressed by landowners to NPI in this regard. No public forested lands are affected.</p>
	<p><b>19.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>Will the project "have negative effects on neighbourhood or community character? There are no built communities in the vicinity of the project, the area is rural in nature with a few scattered residences".</i> How is that for blowing off the concerns of the estimated 400 people who live within 1 km. of a proposed turbine site? And if any community has character I would suggest Manitoulin does. NPI is quickly finding that out as more and more people in the area learn about what is planned. Manitoulin prides itself in the pristine rolling green farmland and clear waters that are the basis of its tourist industry and a draw for many of its new residents. A quiet lifestyle, dark skies, an enjoyment of the arts and the outdoor experience characterizes the values of many Manitouliners.</p>	<p><b>19.</b> Thank you for your comments regarding the character of the area. NPI has attempted to address the concerns of the residents in the area and will continue to do so as the project continues into development phases.</p>
	<p><b>20.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"Will the project have negative effects on recreation, cottaging or tourism? The project could temporarily affect hunting activity in the area"</i></p>	<p><b>20.</b> Wind farms generally have positive long term effects on the local tourist economy. There are 6,000 wind turbines in Denmark, which are used for marketing tourism. Hotels, guesthouses, and campsites may use wind turbines to promote "green tourism". This is particularly targeted</p>

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p><i>during construction. Disruption during operations is not expected. No recreation cottages are within the project area."</i></p> <p>This point has largely been addressed. The long term effects on the tourism industry have not been adequately studied. Initial inquisitive interest followed by a sharp decline in tourist approval has sparked a reassessment of industrial wind turbine development in some tourism dependant areas of the world. The NPI response neglects to consider the fact that the turbines are arranged along the brow of the escarpment and will be fully visible from the premium tourist area – the North Channel sailing and boating area, as well as the large cottage area of Bay of Islands and the whole corridor of access to Little Current from across La Cloche Island to the North.</p>	<p>towards the German market, where the public is known to have a high level of interest in both environmental issues and in new technology. In a Scottish study<sup>2</sup> 43% of respondents said a wind farm would have a positive effect on their inclination to visit the Argyll area, an area of high landscape value. About the same proportion of respondents said it would make no difference, while less than 8% felt that it would have a negative effect. Nine out of ten tourists visiting some of Scotland's top beauty spots say the presence of wind farms makes no difference to the enjoyment of their holiday. Twice as many people would return to an area because of the presence of a wind farm than would stay away, according to a poll carried out by MORI Scotland.</p> <p>Commercial tour companies provide guided tours of several wind farms in the Pincher Creek, Alberta region. Several wind farms in Australia attract so many visitors that commercial tour operators provide opportunities for the public to get a close up view of the wind farms.</p> <p>Out of the proposed 43 wind turbines only a few of the wind turbines (east of Highway 450) are sited from 1.5 km to 3km away from the shore line of the North Channel. Wind turbine #11 is also sited approximately 1.5 kilometers away from the North Channel shore line.</p> <p>NPI does not expect that the presence of the turbines would factor into a person's decision on whether to visit the Island.</p>
	<p><b>21.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>Will the project "have negative effects on the economic base of a municipality or community? Negative effects on the area economy are not expected. The project will result in positive economic impacts through</i></p>	<p><b>21.</b> Thank you for your comment.</p>

<sup>2</sup> *Tourist Attitudes Toward Wind Farms*, MORI Summary Report, September 2002 [www.bwea.com/pdf/MORI.pdf](http://www.bwea.com/pdf/MORI.pdf)

<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<i>payments to land owners and taxes that will be paid to the municipality and job creation. Supplies and services will be obtained in the local area as much as possible.</i> Again the inadequacy of the response deserves no further comment.	
	<b>22.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: " <i>Soils in the immediate area are too shallow for cultivation and are suitable only for woods or rough pasture</i> ". I have one of the most fertile farms on Manitoulin, 200 acres of which are included in the "study area". Some of the fields above the escarpment well within the study area produce an excellent crop of hay or have good pasture when not too dry.	<b>22.</b> The assessment of physiography/topography of the study area concluded that the soils in the study area are <u>mainly</u> too shallow for cultivation and are suitable only for woods or rough pasture. This is a generalized statement is intended to largely apply to lands where the turbines are to be located on.
	<b>23.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: " <i>There exists the potential for some slight alterations to topography as a result of grading and blasting required for turbine foundations and access road construction.</i> " An understatement.	<b>23.</b> Thank you for your comment.
	<b>24.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: " <i>Setbacks specific to birds that will be observed include the following:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90 m River/Stream Setback</li> <li>• 120 m Wetland Setback – none of the wetlands in the project area are considered to be significant. Attempts have been made to meet this setback as much as possible."            I don't agree that these setbacks, as minimal as they are, are being met. Many of the proposed turbine placements seem to be quite close to wetland areas. The Perch lake drainage system drains</li> </ul>	<b>24.</b> Thank you for your comments regarding the project set backs. We note that the ESR has been reviewed by the MNR and no concerns have been expressed regarding the proposed project setbacks.



**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	down to the Bidwell Bog and significant alterations to that system of drainage would have effects on a rare domed bog formation.	
	<b>25.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"No rare plant species were found in vegetation survey plots."</i> Is this a standard method of surveying for rare species?	<b>25.</b> NPI continues consultation with the MNR to ensure additional methods are in place to protect species at risk, should they be observed during construction.
	<b>26.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"305 m (1000 ft.) Perch Lake Setback- The NEMI municipal set back requirement identifies Perch Lake as a sensitive lake and requires a 305 m (1000 ft) setback for all building activity."</i> I don't think turbine sites 29 and 34 meet this requirement if taken from the wetland at the east end of the lake and perhaps the more sensitive part ecologically.	<b>26.</b> From our measurement, the turbines meet all required minimum set backs.
	<b>27.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"No bald eagles were observed during winter monitoring but a single bird was observed during spring migration monitoring in April 2008 at the Tonline Road - Greenbay Road Junction area."</i> I regularly see a bald eagle pair (with a new juvenile this year) above a nest at Freer Point (2000 M from turbine 11) Also a bald eagle has been frequently seen above Whites Point east of McLean's Mtn.	<b>27.</b> Thank you for the information. This information will be considered as part of the planned post-construction bird studies. A separation distance of 2km from a turbine is greater than the buffer distances provided at all known Ontario wind farm developments (the MNR typically requests a separation distance of 1 km for known bald eagle nest sites). The reported bald eagles are appropriately protected from risk with this separation distance.
	<b>28.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"NEMI primarily consists of northern boreal forest that plays an important role in the local economy, for mining, forest harvesting and tourism. Misery Bay Nature Reserve (MBNR) is located along remote stretches of Lake Huron shoreline at Misery Bay. The local economy in NEMI includes mainly farming and lumbering where tourism is a main</i>	<b>28.</b> As part of the more comprehensive assessment of the study area the Misery Bay Nature Reserve was considered in the Environmental Impact Assessment/Environmental Screening Report (EIS/ESR) for the McLean's Mountain Wind Farm as it is an important natural feature in the larger area and should be mentioned.

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.		
At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<i>aspect of the local economy. The nature reserve lies 35 kilometers west of the Town of Gore Bay.</i> What has Misery Bay got to do with eastern Manitoulin? Perhaps more evidence this report was cutting and pasting into a mold for a previous unrelated study?	
	<b>29.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"There are few residences within the proposed study area which are located along existing roadways (Green Bush Road, Morphet's Sideroad and McLean's Mountain Road). There are no businesses in the vicinity of the study site."</i> That is because the boundaries of the study site were drawn to specifically exclude the corridors of housing along the shore and along Green bay Road. Farmers are business men, so are tourist operators and marina operators and artists.	<b>29.</b> Yes this is correct, the project area was selected to maximize distances from developed areas that are located outside of the edges of the initially defined project area.
	<b>30.</b> Commented on the following statements as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"The Little Current Harbour provides deepwater access for private yachts and cruise ships. Tourism is an important economic factor. Four-season recreational opportunities and special events draw visitors to the NEMI. Tourist attractions in NEMI consist of many public beaches, fishing, hiking, fossil hunting, variety of tours, summer theatres, and wildlife watching. Hunting is popular in the fall. The project lands are not likely to be of interest to visitors to the Island, with the possible exception of hunters although all of the project lands are private. Nevertheless, some residents have expressed concern that the visibility of the turbines could affect tourism activity and related businesses. The project is well set back from shoreline areas which is the focus of tourism activity in the general area. (three turbines are about 1.5- 2 km from the shoreline and the rest are at least 3 km away). As such, no specific mitigation measures are required."</i> Perhaps this is an attempt to deceive a reviewer who might not	<b>30.</b> This section of the ESR speaks to the general tourist areas of the District of Manitoulin as well as the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and The Islands (NEMI). The project area is generally well removed areas of tourist attractions.  The closest wind turbine (WT 25) is located about 1.5 kilometers away from the North Channel shoreline. There are some homes/cottages along the shoreline in the south-east corner of the study area. Some of the turbines along the western edge of the project are expected to be visible from these cottages/homes (although the view would be opposite from the water).  The proposed project is not sited on the Niagara Escarpment and therefore is not required to conform to The Niagara Escarpment Commission policies.

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	be familiar with the area. The distance from shore is irrelevant given that the turbines are 120M high and located on top the escarpment. As the report says <i>"The site lies mainly above an escarpment, which trends along the northern, eastern and southeastern boundaries of the property. The escarpment is 300 m (I think feet) high and is a major physiographic feature of the area."</i> Precisely why the Niagara escarpment commission restricts turbines from the bluff.	
	<b>31.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"Analysis of noise levels shows that the noise impact from the operating phase of the wind farm would not exceed the most restrictive nighttime noise limits that apply for an area with a Class 3 (Rural) acoustic designation. As the turbines have been sited to comply with MOE noise restrictions (40 dB level) at receptors within 1500 m of each wind turbine there is no need to apply mitigation measures. No adverse significant effects are predicted."</i> The noise forecast data suggest levels of noise that would cause significant disruption in the lives of local residents who have a right to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes and properties. There is also increasing evidence for the validity of Wind Turbine Syndrome in a small but significant percentage of predisposed individuals possibly related to the low frequency sound. This condition is prompting authorities in many countries including our own to reevaluate the appropriate setbacks.	<b>31.</b> A Noise and Acoustics Assessment was conducted in accordance with the Ontario Ministry of the Environment guidelines. This document can be found in <i>Appendix G</i> of this report. Wind turbines make some sound. The noise from a wind turbine is caused by the passing of the blade through the air, and is similar to white noise from wind, or waves. But even when the turbine is turning you can carry on a conversation at its base. The sound is a "swish" like the waves on a beach. Wind turbines produce noise only when it is windy, but the ambient noise from adjacent Highway 6 or Highway 540 or wind rustling through trees and grasses increases as winds increase. There are no direct health effects from noise at the level of noise generated by wind turbines. It has been repeatedly shown by measurements of wind turbine noise undertaken in the UK, Denmark, Germany and the USA over the past decade, and accepted by experienced noise professionals, that the levels of infrasonic noise and vibration radiated from modern, upwind configuration wind turbines are at a very low level; so low that they lie below the threshold of general human perception.
	<b>32.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"The presence of wind turbines will alter the current rural "bush" nature of the study area. Some residences in the project area may experience temporary disruption effects during project construction (e.g. noise, dust and additional traffic). Although these effects are common to any large-</i>	<b>32.</b> The study area for the proposed project is designated as rural in the Official Plan for the Manitoulin Planning Area. The term "bush" in the context of the visual impact assessment conducted for this project is used to describe a vegetated area.

<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized “Comment Received” the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p><i>scale construction project, they do have the ability to temporarily affect the character of the area during the construction of the project. The visual impact of wind turbines is subjective, with people’s reaction being either positive, negative or neutral in regards to their influence on the landscape. The alteration of the viewscape is further discussed in Section 6.25.”</i> I suspect if you are not aware of any Manitoulin culture you would characterize the area as “rural bush”. The living beings in the “bush” area are apparently incidental. The information on the three categories peoples responses fall into with respect to the visual impact is informative!</p>	
	<p><b>33.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>“Some residents along Morphets Side Rd have expressed concerns related to the proposed transmission line route. While this transmission line will not result in any nuisance effects to residents along the road way, its presence may be perceived as a visual intrusion to the area and impact the rural character of the area. As there are few residents in the vicinity of the project and all are well removed from the turbine sites, these types of effects are expected to be minimal. Changes to the character of the area will result from the turbines being visible from some areas.”</i> See previous comment about the general level of distain for public concern.</p>	<p><b>33.</b> Please refer to the response provided above.</p>
	<p><b>34.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>“As the wind farm is well removed from major recreation features such as La Cloche Provincial Park (&gt;20 km away), effects to recreation/tourism are unlikely.”</i> To my knowledge there are few</p>	<p><b>34.</b> NPI is not aware of any proposal for recreation activity development in the project area. To date, the only recreation activity in the project area is hunting. Comments on the impact of the project on hunting activity have been previously provided in this table.</p>

<p>The received comments &amp; concerns have been organized into categories.</p> <p>At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an <i>italicized</i> number in brackets.</p>		
Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	recreational opportunities developed as yet in this recently designated area. Given that, the meaning of the statement is obscure.	
	<p><b>35.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: "<i>McLean's Mountain is one of many scenic lookouts of Manitoulin Island. There is a viewing platform at the top of the bluff on the west side of Burnets Side Road. While the project will not affect views from this platform (the views are to the north over the North Channel), there may be an opportunity to improve this facility with the addition of a project information kiosk at this location.</i>" This lookout is not near or to the west of Burnett's Side Road. Of more relevance are other lookouts like the famous Cup and Saucer trail and lookout that currently looks over the entire beautiful Green Bush area and where people who visit in large numbers especially in the summer and for the fall colours will now see all 43 turbines. (I guess Dillon forgot about that lookout)</p>	<p><b>35.</b> Information regarding the viewing platform on the west side of Burnets Dide Road were provided by NEMI municipality.</p> <p>A set of photomontages have been prepared from various locations throughout the study area that simulate the to-scale appearance of the wind farm and are presented in Appendix H of the EIS/ESR for the McLean's Mountain Wind Farm. These locations represent the locations that have the highest potential for turbine visibility or are viewpoints of interest brought to the attention of NPI by project stakeholders. Based on the visual simulations from select vantage points, views of the turbines in the surrounding lands will vary depending on the location of the vantage point. In most cases, only a portion of the turbine may be visible (e.g. blade tip). The variability in the level of visibility is due to topography, existing vegetation and the separation distance from potential viewing locations of concern. It is not expected that the views, if any, would contribute to a perceived change in the visual character of the area (which is highly subjective and can somewhat depend on one's viewpoint regarding wind energy - supporters tend to like the look of turbines while those opposed to wind energy do not).</p>

**The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.**

**At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.**

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p><b>36.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"The proposed project lands are of limited value to tourism. Some recreational hunting for small game and waterfowl may occur in the project area early in October and early in December. The visibility of the turbines beyond the immediate project area will be very limited."</i> This obvious inaccuracy has been refuted above.</p>	<p><b>36.</b> Please refer to the response provided above.</p>
	<p><b>37.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"No significant changes to recreation and tourism activity are expected as a result of the project. As such, no significant effects to tourism and recreation activity are expected."</i> Excellent logic.</p>	<p><b>37.</b> Thank you for your comment.</p>
	<p><b>38.</b> Commented on the following statement as presented in the EIS/ESR: <i>"Some residents have expressed concerns with the turbine lighting. Attempts will be made to minimize the number of turbines to be lit to reduce this effect. As per Transport Canada requirements some of the wind turbines will require navigation lighting."</i> Yes, residents are concerned about light pollution. Manitoulin and NEMI have both passed dark skies legislation that this project is clearly in contravention of. Manitouliners value their dark skies. To suggest that the majority of the towers will not have to be lit is misleading.</p>	<p><b>38.</b> NPI is aware that townships on Manitoulin Island embrace and endorse the practices of the Dark Sky Initiative with by-laws. Section 5 "Exemptions" of The Township of Central Manitoulin's By-Law #2003-16 the "Outdoor Lighting Control and Dark Sky By-law", sub section 5.4 reads as follows: <i>"Nothing in this by-law shall apply to navigational lighting systems at lighthouses and airports, nor to airport lighting systems marking runways (...) For daytime, white strobe lights may be used, and for nighttime, only red lights shall be used"</i>. The proposed wind turbines (WTs) will be lit with navigational lighting systems as required by Transport Canada (TC) standards. Select WTs on the perimeter will be lit with a single red flashing light (horizontal distance between lit WTs not to exceed 900 meters for any approaching aircraft). The highest WT in the wind farm will be lit. All lit WTs will flash simultaneously.</p>
	<p><b>39.</b></p>	<p><b>39.</b></p>

The received comments & concerns have been organized into categories.

At the end of the summarized "Comment Received" the number of times the comment was received is noted as an *italicized* number in brackets.

Stakeholder Affiliation and Contact Information	Comment Received	Proponent Response
	<p>I have based this review on the most glaring of the errors in the sections where I have certain knowledge. The authors of the report show little understanding of the geography of Manitoulin and even less of the values Manitoulin people hold. I am not sufficiently expert in biology to comment on the fish, bird and bat studies but one would have to wonder about the quality of the conclusions in those areas given the quality of the rest of the report. In conclusion I contend that the number of errors in facts and the omissions and bias of content combine to completely undermine the credibility of this report. It would only be proper for this project to be advanced to a full environmental assessment in order to ensure the protection of the environment and the people of NEMI.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>