

From: [BoardSec](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Letter of Comment Submitted: EB-2013-0203
Date: August 28, 2013 10:36:12 AM

From: Webmaster
Sent: August-27-13 11:46 PM
To: BoardSec
Subject: Letter of Comment Submitted: EB-2013-0203

LETTER OF COMMENT

Comments:

August 27, 2013

Ontario Energy Board (OMB)

Re: Niagara Regional Wind Corporation (NRWC) Project: West Lincoln, Wainfleet, Haldimand

Ladies and Gentlemen:

My intention in submitting this letter is to ask you to do the sensible thing and stop the madness, before it is too late. Dalton McGuinty started the whole Green Energy Act mess, and we the citizens of Ontario are going to be paying for it for decades. You have the opportunity to intervene, and stop the hemorrhaging before it totally devastates the Ontario economy and the future of all of its citizens. The OEB is supposed to be the voice of reason, the body that regulates energy costs and protects the interests of the citizens and businesses of Ontario. You all know that:

- The McGuinty government decided to pay huge subsidies and agreed to ridiculous contract terms for wind and solar power, buying 100 percent of the production even when we do not need it.
- We buy that power at a premium and sell it at a loss whenever we don't need it, which is rapidly putting us millions of dollars deeper in debt.
- We Ontarians are still paying for the second Hydro Tunnel in Niagara Falls and instead of reaping the benefits of that hydro power capacity which is almost free, those generators are being throttled way down.
- Businesses are leaving Ontario partly due to already high electricity costs and their rate of departure will increase exponentially with increasing electricity rates. As businesses leave, consumption will decrease, which will reduce the amount of hydro power purchased, thereby further increasing the percentage of high-priced wind and solar power. We all know how that will affect the cost of our already overly expensive electricity.
- What is really scary, is that only a small percentage of the projects that are already approved, are up and running. Further, we have yet to factor the effects of the costs of these projects coming into production and the cost of the gas plant cancellations, etc...
- The governments' answer will likely be to further increase rates to consumers, to offset costs to businesses, in effort to prevent massive unemployment and the collapse of the Ontario economy, but in doing that they will drive people out of Ontario, as they will not be able afford to afford to live here. Either way, it will become impossible to prevent a collapse of the Ontario economy.
- Even though we do our best to reduce our on-peak power consumption, our actual Electricity costs are over \$0.18/kWh consumed, when you consider the real costs, which a 9.2% increase to our metered consumption for line losses, the on, mid and off-peak rates, debt retirement and all the other charges and 13% HST = the REAL COST to Ontario Citizens. If it weren't for our efforts to shift power consumption to mid and off-peak times, our

real cost would be over \$0.20/kWh. We have no gas available here, so we have a ground-source heat pump. In the 90's, the operating cost of a ground-source, was about the same as that of a high efficiency gas furnace, but now there is no comparison.

- EnerGuide labels on appliances use \$0.10/kWh to show people how much it should cost to operate that appliance. That is where our cost should be, but we are already 80% higher than those labels show and it will soon be twice that shown. This is just one more good indicator that we are heading for big problems!
- I can understand that there are losses from power line, transers and switchgear, which is why there is a multiplier for the actual metered consumption, so why are we allowing wind and solar projects to be installed many kilometers away from where their power will be used. Why would the Liberals shut down two gas fired plants being built right where the power would have been used, then start all over building one hundreds of kilometers away. We all know why - it's got nothing to do logic or reason!
- I, like many other Ontarians, am planning to install a wood burning fireplace, furnace or boiler, as I am sick and tired of paying the price for our carelessness, incompetent and corrupt Ontario government. Furthermore, I highly doubt that I will remain in Ontario, because I truly believe that Ontario's future is bleak.
- There has been a huge conflict of interest and a tremendous injustice to the people of Ontario, i.e. Mike Crawley, previously head of the Liberal Party of Ontario and now, president of the Liberal Party of Canada, who also happens to be CEO of International Power Canada Inc., a company heavily involved in Wind and Solar projects in Ontario and British Columbia. (See below). Mr. Crawley and his company has been lobbying and influencing the McGuinty government and its policies for years. His company was awarded numerous wind and solar contracts, some of which they received quick and seamless approvals for and then sold them off, only to generate money to build more projects. I'd like to see the complete money trail through that company.

From: Independent Power Producers and Energy Traders

Company Overview of International Power Canada, Inc.

Company Overview

International Power Canada, Inc., a renewable power company, develops and operates wind and solar energy projects in Canada. It operates wind power projects in Ontario and British Columbia. International Power Canada, Inc. was erly known as AIM PowerGen Corporation and changed its name to International Power Canada, Inc. in October 2009. The company was founded in 2001 and is headquartered in Markham, Canada. As of October 21, 2009, International Power Canada, Inc. operates as a subsidiary of International Power plc.

105 Commerce Valley Drive West

Suite 410

Markham, ON L3T7W3

Canada

Founded in 2001

Phone: 416-502-0993

Fax: 416-502-1415

www.iprcanada.com

Key Executives for International Power Canada, Inc.

Mr. Mike Crawley Chief Executive Officer

Mr. Jay Wilgar Co-Founder

Mr. Roy Khan Co-Founder

Mr. Carolyn Chesney Chief Financial Officer

Mr. Jim Wilgar Site Consultant and President of Sun Search Consulting

International Power Canada, Inc. Key Developments

International Power Canada, Inc. Presents at 12th Ontario Power Summit, May-30-2013 03:30 PM

Mar 9 13

International Power Canada, Inc. Presents at 12th Ontario Power Summit, May-30-2013 03:30 PM. Venue: Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Speakers: Mike Crawley, Chief Executive Officer, President and Director.

International Power Canada, Inc. Presents at 4th Annual Canadian Power Finance Conference, Jan-16-2013 through Jan-17-2013

Dec 5 12

International Power Canada, Inc. Presents at 4th Annual Canadian Power Finance Conference, Jan-16-2013 through Jan-17-2013. Venue: The Fairmont Royal York, 100 Front Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Presentation Date & Speakers: Jan-16-2013, Michelle Chislett, Vice President → Solar Development and

Member of the Board, CanSIA, Mike Crawley, Chief Executive Officer, President and Director.

International Power Canada, Inc. Presents at 7th Annual North America Infrastructure and Energy, Sep-11-2012 05:15 PM

Sep 8 12

International Power Canada, Inc. Presents at 7th Annual North America Infrastructure and Energy, Sep-11-2012 05:15 PM. Venue: The Westin, Times Square, New York, New York, United States. Speakers: Mike Crawley, Chief Executive Officer, President and Director.

Cultus Wind Project

ON 2008/07 6x Vestas V82 1.65 MW / 9.9000 (MW) International Power Canada, Inc.

Frogmore Wind Project

ON 2008/07 6 Vestas V82 1.65 MW / 9.9000 (MW) International Power Canada, Inc.

Mohawk Point Wind Farm

ON 2008/10 6 x Vestas 1.65 MW turbines / 9.9000 (MW) International Power Canada, Inc.

Clear Creek Wind Farm

ON 2008/11 6 x Vestas 1.65 MW / 9.9000 (MW) International Power Canada, Inc.

Harrow Wind Project

ON 2010/06 24 x Vestas 1.65 MW / 39.6000 (MW) International Power Canada, Inc.

Pointes Aux Roches

ON 2011/12 Vestas V90 x 27 / 48.6000 (MW) International Power/GDF Suez

Plateau I&II

ON 2012/04 12x General Electric 1.5 XL / 18.0000 (MW) International Power/GDF Suez

Plateau III

ON 2012/04 6x General Electric 1.5 XL / 9.0000 (MW) International Power/GDF Suez

These are projects that are still under the ownership of International Power Canada Inc. Other projects have been started up by the company, then sold off.

I find it extremely irritating that the Ontario (McGuinty) government has taken away our democratic rights as citizens, property owners, tax payers and municipalities, in effort to force their stupid, irresponsible and dangerous idea of so-called green energy upon us, and then expecting all Ontarians to subsidize these unreliable and uneconomical projects. It's bad enough that all Ontario homeowners and apartment dwellers will have to pick up the tab for the ridiculous subsidies and bad contracts for these and other projects, but even worse that we will have to pay for them with our after-tax earnings and then add another 13% HST on top

We had Niagara Falls running at reduced capacity before the new tunnel came online in March of this year, which can produce enough additional capacity to power 160,000 homes. In addition, we are paying natural gas fired plants for 100 percent of their generating capability even though they are producing less than 50 percent. Then why the hell are we paying incentives and premiums for unreliable power we don't need and can't afford? The result can't help but lead to higher electricity rates, fewer jobs and a tremendous increase in the use of fossil fuels including wood, oil, etc., for home heating, by people trying to reduce their ridiculous cost of electricity. Has a thorough study been completed to prove that the Hydro Grid can handle the additional 230-MW of power from the NRWC's project, plus all of the generators in the Niagara Falls plants (including those for the new tunnel) running at 100 percent capacity? Where are those studies?

NRWC in its greedy haste to capitalize on the arrogance and recklessness of our Ontario government, is more than willing to jeopardize our health, depreciate our properties and take away our right to peaceful enjoyment of our personal properties (our homes) for which we pay ridiculous amounts of money in property taxes, out of what's left of our earnings after taxes! The fact that NRWC is planning on making the West Lincoln project the largest wind farm in Canada, by using the largest turbines in North America, at the minimum setback that was approved by the Ontario government FOR MUCH SMALLER TURBINES, proves that all NRWC and the Ontario government care only about money. They obviously do not care about our health, our property values, our long-term costs of our electricity, or the future and prosperity of Ontario!

There is absolutely no way that wind turbines of this size should be allowed within 550 meters of nonparticipating peoples' homes! I find it utterly disgusting that the Ontario government is saying that 550 Meters is still an acceptable setback distance, when they are fully aware that the turbines in NRWC's project are substantially larger than the ones that the 550M setback distance was based upon. The Ontario government puts up concrete sound barrier walls along major highways in urban areas to reduce noise from the 100-KM/Hour traffic, and its negative impact on property values, yet the same Ontario government is pushing these monstrous wind turbines on rural residents, without any regard for our safety or our property values, and without any of assistance or compensation whatsoever! The massive blades of these turbines will be much longer and wider than those of other models in use today, and they will be passing a given point up to 42 TIMES PER MINUTE,

at TIP SPEEDS OF 276-KM/HOUR) Yes - up to 276 KM/Hour!

Do the math - Actual Blade diameter is 101 meters and the maximum RPM is 14.5, Therefore: Tip Speed is: (101 M Dia. X 3.14159 X 14.5 RPM X 60 Min) / 1,000 M = 276 KM/Hour!

In addition to the increased noise from the much longer, wider and faster moving blades that will increase the turbulence and pulsations due to air pressure differences, there will also be a tremendous increase in the noticeable shadow flicker and reflective light flashes! Since these turbines are so much taller, with substantially longer and wider blades, they will create larger shadows, larger patterns of reflected light and these effects will be noticeable for longer periods (morning and evening) due to the increase to a height of 174.5 Meters and much larger 101 Meter blades! We really have to wonder, "What is really going on here?" Who is benefitting from all of this, because it is certainly is not the hardworking taxpaying citizens of Ontario?

We were here long before the wind turbines were proposed. We bought our properties at prices that were unaffected by proposed wind turbines. If NRWC and the Ontario government want to put these machines up, put them on crown land, or buy property at fair market value and keep them far away from our private properties! Further, if NRWC and the government truly believe that wind turbines will not adversely affect our health or property values, then neither party should have a problem with putting your money where your mouths are? As a show of good faith, put up the money for a trust fund, to be administered by a third party committee and to be used just in case there are any legitimate claims for health problems or losses in property values due to the proximity of the turbines. If they are telling the truth, there will be no risk of claims and the fund will grow from earning interest.

The Truth is Coming Out: There is an abundance of evidence of the negative effects on health and property values, including testimonials by people affected and reports by doctors'. I suspect that by now you have all seen a number of these reports, including the recent CBC documentary, "Wind Rush"? If so, you have seen the testimony of the Doctors and other experts including an acoustical and electrical engineer on that program. These are just a few of the many documents that you should also have seen, if you have done any research at all! It is time to stop hiding the truth and lying!

APPRAISALS:

Below is just one of the appraisal companies that I found, who have done extensive work in appraisals to determine how property values are affected wind turbines, highways, pipelines, etc... They are licensed appraisers who give their honest professional opinions and valuations. They don't take sides - they have to be unbiased, because they could lose their license if they aren't.

PLEASE do us all a favour and have a look at them. This first Link to their web site is to the page that gives an overview on the effects of wind turbines on property values (keep in mind that the turbines in their area were much smaller, "typically 400 feet tall from base to blade tip")

http://k.b5z.net/i/u/6016107/f/Wind_Power_Property_Value_Presentation_by_Kurt_C._Kielisch_Feb_11_.pdf

This second Link is directly to their report on the effects of wind turbines on property values (again, please keep in mind that the turbines in their area were much smaller, "typically 400 feet tall from base to blade tip"):

<http://www.forensic-appraisal.com/wind-turbines>

Forensic Appraisal Group, Ltd.

1936 Algoma Blvd. - Suite B

Oshkosh, WI 54901

Phone: (920) 233-9836

Fax: (920) 233-0526

Email: reprof@forensic-appraisal.com

LIES AND DECEIT:

From what I have seen and personally experienced, the NRWC and Ontario Government use misleading ination whenever and wherever possible, to dismiss or downplay and concerns and complaints about risks, illness, and other negative effects associated with Wind Turbines. Comments from the company and the government to the public and the media make obvious efforts to minimize: the size of the proposed turbines; their close proximity to people's homes; the negative effects on health and property values, etc... As of Feb 2012, on the NRWC website, every picture minimized the size of the wind turbine in relation to the other objects in the picture. Far worse, they had been lying about the size of their turbine blade!

Copied from the NRWC Website on Feb 12, 2013:

The match we found is the Enercon E-101 wind turbine. With no gearbox, mechanical noise is eliminated and

lubricant use nearly eliminated; many parts have been crafted from reclaimed and recycled products like aluminum and copper; the steel sections of the towers are fully recoverable and recyclable, and with a shallow foundation, the environmental footprint is reduced. On top of these features, the E-101 has enhanced safety systems, such as an internal transer.

Number: 77

Type: Enercon

Model: E-101

Capacity: 3.0MW

Height: 124M to hub

Blade Diameter: 55M <<< LIE! Blade Dia. is 110 Meters!

Technology: Gearless Direct Drive

Copied from the Enercon Website Feb 6, 2013

Rated power: 3,050 kW

Rotor diameter: 101 m <<< Correct Dia.

Hub height: 99 m / 135 m / 149m

Rotational speed: variable, 4 - 14.5 rpm

The NRWC has been deceiving the public and those who will be most affected by their wind turbines, by falsely stating on their own website, that the blades on their turbines are almost half the size that they really are,. This is a huge misrepresentation! Therefore, their approval should be withheld and additional consultations should be held, so that everyone has a chance to know the real facts!

Further, at the September 20th 2012 open house at the Smithville Christian High School, in Smithville, the NRWC had what they claimed to be a scale model of one of their wind turbines and other items including home/s, but upon measuring the items it was easy to see that the turbine model was a significantly smaller than the proposed Enercon E-101 with 101 Meter blade diameter.

At the September 20th 2012 open house at the Smithville Christian High School, in Smithville, I asked Mr. Bob Daniels (vice president of NRWC) why his company was putting their wind turbines in West Lincoln, disrupting our lives and destroying our property values, he responded, "There's no evidence that they lower property values." At which point I said, "I am glad to hear you say that, so you should have no problem giving me a personal guarantee for the present value of my property, or better yet, buying my property at its present fair market value?" He quickly responded, "We don't do that!" As other people approached I introduced Bob to them and told them what he had just said to me, and then asked each of them if they felt that Bob here should be willing to give them a personal guarantee as well. Of course each of them responded with a "Yes!" Well it didn't take Bob long to pass me off to their lawyer, Randi Rahamim, then excused himself and head for the door.

At their open houses, the company purposely split people into small groups to minimize the chance of people hearing other people's questions and the answers that they receive. In addition, the company purposely delays answering simple questions by having its representatives tell people that they can't answer the question, and then directing them to talk to another representative somewhere in the room. This technique really slows down the ination gathering process, delays if not avoids giving answers altogether, and certainly reduces the number of questions that each person can ask. I experienced this first hand at the September 20, 2012 open house in Smithville. I was also given the runaround when asking questions about the locations of the interconnecting transmission lines and other details as well.

We as property owners and tax payers, but even more so as the people most affected by these projects have the right to receive honest (true) answers to our questions and the right to know all of the details about the projects. Questions including:

1. The NRWC has been deceiving the public and those who will be most affected by their wind turbines, by falsely stating on their own website, that the blades on their turbines are almost half the size that they really are. This is a huge misrepresentation! Therefore, their approval should be withheld and additional consultations should be held, so that everyone has a chance to know the real facts! I ask that you please do not give approval to the NRWC project until this problem has been fairly dealt with?

2. How will we be compensated for the loss of: peaceful enjoyment of our property; the tranquility of our rural neighbourhood, and; the tragic depopulation of birds, bats and various species of wildlife to which we now enjoy?

3. How will we be compensated for losses in property value, possibly to the point we may not even be able to sell our properties?

4. Even though numerous studies show a 20-40% loss and some properties not even saleable at any price, both NRWC and the Ontario government openly state that there is no evidence that wind turbine installations adversely affecting property values. Will NRWC voluntarily provide a property value protection agreement?

5. If, as we expect, NRWC will not voluntarily provide a property protection agreement, will the MOE and/or the Ontario government make it mandatory for them to do so before giving approval to their project?

6. Banks are very cautious with their mortgage and home equity loan lending, especially since the mortgage/foreclosure crisis in the US. It is highly unlikely that anyone will be buying a property that is, or will be near a wind farm, but if someone tries to, the bank will appraise the property at a much lower value, as they are not going to take any risks on having a property that ends up being worth less than what they can sell it for down the road. More concerning, is that people with substantial mortgage or home equity loan balances, will find that banks will no longer want to hold their mortgage or loan, and will refuse to renew for the same amount. They may also raise their interest rate because of greater risk. Who is going to compensate those who pay higher rates or lose their homes as a result?

7. The NRWC lease allows an absolute right to assign the lease option to a third party without the approval the owner's consent. If we didn't already expect that to happen, that condition in the lease makes it pretty obvious that a change in ownership is a very possible occurrence, especially with a new venture company like NRWC! Restructuring, or selling the assets, are easy ways for a company to shed debt and become more profitable. In the United States it is happening frequently, as different wind farm owners can each fully depreciate the assets over a short period of time. Therefore, since it is very possible that NRWC or any other wind company should have to put up money in a trust fund in advance, adequate to cover the cost of all claims from affected non-participating property owners and also the full cost of decommissioning the turbines. The fund should be controlled and administered by a third party regulating agency, so that individual property owners, Taxpayers, Towns and the governments, are left with the costs.

8. How long has NRWC been in business? What about "Daniels Power Corporation" and its partner in NRWC, "Renewable Energy Business Ltd."? Are these long-term companies, or merely newly ed shell companies? I couldn't find history on either of them! Do these companies have the proven track record and assets for this project?

9. How does NRWC, the Ontario government and its agencies explain the numerous studies from around the world that show that for every green job created some 2-4 jobs will be lost due to higher cost of energy as acknowledged in the Ontario Auditor General's 2011 Annual Report.

10. While planning on using the largest turbines in North America at the minimum setback of 550 Meters, how can NRWC continue to state that Ontario has the largest setbacks in North America when some fifty other jurisdictions in North America have greater setback requirements, not to mention numerous larger setbacks established throughout the world?

11. Problems with industrial wind turbines include: mechanical noise, acoustical noise, low frequency noise, infra sound, electrical magnetic radiation, transient voltage, light reflection, shadow flicker and vibration, all of which degrade the health and decrease the property values of receptors in the view shed. Where is the unbiased, peer reviewed health study that proves that none of these items have an adverse effect on human health?

12. The noise causes annoyance and sleep deprivation for those living within a 1.5 to 2 km radius. According to the Environmental Defense quotes from the Ontario Health Study, 13 to 23 % of the people within the radius will suffer some adverse health effects. How many people should suffer adverse health effects from IWT's placed too close to their homes?

13. Where is the procedural outline for how members of the community record impacts to their health caused by the Industrial wind turbines NRWC propose to erect in West Lincoln? Where is the mitigation policy for health impacts?

14. Larger industrial wind turbines produce more low frequency noise pollution. So the potential people affected in West Lincoln may well be in the upper percentage range. There are 3579 receptors within 2 km of the proposed turbine locations and transer stations. If we say 3 people per household in 3300 homes we have 9900 people so 1287 to 2279 people with adverse health effects due to the IWT's and we have not even talked about

the health effects of a high voltage hydroelectricity power line that wanders all over West Lincoln like some child lost in a corn field. How many people should suffer adverse health effects in West Lincoln due to the NRWC project?

15. What does it mean when NRWC say that “the results of noise modeling meet the current standards with mitigation?” Explain the mitigation component.

16. What mitigation can we expect when our health deteriorates and some of us have to move out of our homes?

17. There are many maternity bat colonies in West Lincoln and the surrounding area. Bats are extremely important to agriculture and it is irresponsible of NRWC to locate an Industrial wind turbine within two km of a bat colony. Bats are being killed by Barotrauma, as in the change of air pressure behind the turbine blades. According to NASA and a Danish Study this change of pressure requires 2000 meters to return to ambient conditions so what mitigation procedure will be put in place if more than 10 bats are killed per turbine per year is an insult and instead NRWC will reduce or eliminate these colonies. How many more nuisance insects and bites can we expect to incur once the local bat population is decimated?

18. With the loss or a substantial portion of our local bat population and many birds that consume insects, the number of mosquitos carrying the West Nile virus will increase further increase health risks to individuals. How will we be compensated for the additional risk? What is NRWC, the MOE, the any part of the Ontario Government going to do to compensate us and our families in the event of a serious illness, disability, or death as a result of contracting the West Nile Virus?

19. Is decreasing the bat and bird population and thereby increasing the use of pesticides is in the best interest of peoples' health?

20. What are the details of agreements signed by the Optioned land owners and the company?

21. Did the land owners sign over rights for above/on/under their properties to NRWC?

22. If they have signed over rights for under their properties, will the MOE and Ontario government allow drilling and fracking operations to be undertaken?

23. The Ontario Attorney General has reported the FIT renewable energy program will burden energy consumers with approximately \$2.7 billion more in electricity costs than the market price by 2014. How can NRWC consider itself a good corporate citizen and how can the Ministry of Energy approve their project, when the industrial wind energy business, aside from stripping away the democratic rights of local governments and citizens, is totally dependent on being paid exorbitant generator rates and/or subsidies?

24. How can anyone continue to justify the installation of industrial wind turbines as a means of reducing CO2 emissions and associated health problems, when we all know that the subsidies and premiums paid for it and other projects is driving up the cost of electricity, which will also drive an increase in the use of fossil fuels for home and small commercial heating?

25. If Denmark is the shining example used by wind developers and CanWEA, why not adopt the 1% property value rule that Denmark has. NRWC insists that values don't drop so what is there to be afraid of?

26. A number of the turbines in the NRWC project are closer than Enercon's suggested minimum 6-blade diameters. A number of reports recommend a far greater distance between wind turbines, including one from Johns Hopkins University, the U.S. Department of Energy and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. They are experts in the field yet their recommendations in terms of siting wind turbines include significantly greater distances. As I am sure you can appreciate, unlike Enercon whose interests lie in selling wind turbines and NRWC whose interests lie in selling energy to the Province, these organizations do not have a vested interest. For that reason, I ask for NRWC and Enercon's response with regard to these reports.

27. It is my understanding that CFD is a computer simulation that relies upon whatever data is entered into it and should be followed up by real world testing. Was that completed?

28. I have seen the noise study at the Feb 6, 2013 open house in Wellandport, with the lines drawn around the various groups of turbines and I have to ask, “how can a computer simulation accurately predict the noise levels that will occur from: 1) all wind velocities; 2) all wind directions, 3) all possible blade angles as they relate to those of other close turbines; 4) all blade clock positions in relation to other close blades, and; 5) all possible receptors, not just those in the pattern of the simulation? Bottom line, it can't! Therefore more real-life testing

and studies need to be done before these things are allowed to go in!

29. Again referring to the noise study at the Feb 6, 2013 open house in Wellandport, and the lines drawn around the various groups of turbines, I ask, "how can a computer simulation accurately predict the effects from air pressure pulsations and infrasound levels that will occur from: 1) all wind velocities; 2) all wind directions, 3) all possible blade angles as they relate those of other close turbines; 4) all blade clock positions in relation to other close blades, and; 5) all possible receptors, not just those in the pattern of the simulation? Bottom line, it can't! Therefore more real-life testing and studies need to be done before these things are allowed to go in!

30. Industrial wind turbines leave behind them a turbulent wake. This wake weakens downwind turbines, enhances turbine noise pollution and causes a downwind deficit that reduces the efficiency of the Industrial Wind turbines. These things are well known from European Research. Dr. Charles Meneveau studies fluid dynamics at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD and Johan Meyers his collaborator from Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium presented their research at the American Physical Society Division of Fluid Dynamics (DFD) in Long Beach, CA. in 2010. The blades of a turbine distort wind, creating eddies of turbulence that affects other wind turbines farther downwind. A 101-meter turbine must harness energy drawn from the atmospheric boundary layer thousands of feet up. Meneveau calculates that the optimal spacing between turbines should be 15 rotor diameters between turbines. So the spacing needs to be 1.5 km between turbines. How come Niagara Regional Wind Corporation has 42 turbines with less than 1.5 km spacing? Many are less than 550 meters from each other or 1/3 the distance required for maximum efficiency.

31. Where exactly is the noise from a turbine measured? How does location of measurement alter noise levels? What is the "plus/minus" variation for the Enercon E101 and how does it relate to the results you show in NRWC binders?

32. According to the specifications that you provided, the blade tips have two red bands at the outer edge. What is the purpose of the red or orange bands? What scientific research have you completed on the "strobe effect" of the red bands as in contributing to headaches, migraines, vertigo, etc.?

33. What will be done about shadow flicker? What is negligible shadow? How is it measured? Will the company commit to moving large trees for residents bothered by it?

34. What are the specific details of the FIT contract, other agreements and all incentives that the project owners/managers will receive?

35. When and how will these incentives, perks, tax breaks, bonuses, etc. be paid, received?

36. Is the \$50,000/turbine/year a realistic and sustainable number, or a dangling carrot?

37. What guarantees do the host property owners have that the company won't restructure or sell its assets in order to make it easy to renegotiate much lower lease rates?

38. What guarantees do the municipalities, the province and Ontario taxpayers have that they won't be left with another Liberal government wasteful mess to pay for over the coming decades?

39. Recent articles claim that a FOI request has exposed that the Ontario Government has been hiding documents on harm to citizens' health from Wind Turbines and that the Ministry of Health did not act on reports of Ill-Health Effects from Wind Turbines, that were produced by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment under the guidelines of the Ontario Government. I suspect this is true? Please explain.

40. I have read that groups have called for the immediate resignation of Dr. Arlene King, the Chief Medical Officer for Ontario! Apparently Dr. King was issued a Summons to Witness to testify in a court case about the Health issues surrounding Wind Turbines dating back to October 2011 and she has appealed the Summons and is still not willing to appear in this case. Is that true? Please explain.

41. I have also read that groups are calling for an unbiased Public Inquiry into the actions of our Government and its Ministry of Health, which are responsible for the good health of Ontario Citizens, about possible "cover-ups of negative reports of Wind Turbine harm"! Has the Ministry of Health held back such documents from the public? Please explain.

42. I have read that another FOI request that opens the Federal Government's Health Canada Department to all sorts of questions about how deep a Lobby group is embedded within a Federal Agency and its decision-making

process! Is “Corruption” running rampant inside all levels of our Governments”? Please comment.

43. In addition, I have seen inaction about FOI disclosures dating from over 3 years ago that have resulted in shocking inaction that Ministry of the Environment provincial officers (Ontario) were working on an abatement plan to help families impacted by health effects from turbine noise and transer station electrical issues. While most of the 330 pages are missing, the 26 pages that were supplied are surprisingly damning. Why would the Ministry of the Environment appear to be discussing mitigation of the problems reported and this discussion not be shared with the public? Please explain.

44. From emails: If there was a sincere effort to mitigate problems associated with industrial wind and affected persons, “numerous,” again, why did this initial effort not progress? The abatement plan was completed prior to the implementation of the Green Energy Act, and prior to Dr. Arlene King's “literature review” which concluded, incorrectly, that there are no health effects from the Ontario setbacks. But now those setbacks are too small because the turbines being proposed for the NRWC's project are much larger, so these obvious health effects, many very serious, which were noted years ago in documents are likely to be more common and more severe! Where is the Abatement Plan that was clearly under construction? By whose authority did that disappear? Please explain.

45. From emails: 1.5 MOE Provincial Officers have attended at several of the complainant's residences and have confirmed that despite the noise emissions apparently complying with the applicable Cof A limits that the noise emissions are in fact causing material discomfort to the residents in and around their homes. How can and why is the MOH still claiming that there are no health issues? Please explain.

46. From emails: 1.6 Provincial Officers have measured wind turbine noise levels at complainant's homes that appear to indicate non-compliance with the CofA(Air). Again, why is the MOH still claiming that there are no health issues? Please explain.

47. From emails: Evidence in the documents revealed that MOE officers were trying to get relief for affected homeowners. These efforts and warnings were made and discussed before Chief Medical Officer of Health Arlene King had started working on her literature review that was released in May 2010. Is this true? Please explain.

48. Is it true that even as families who were being impacted by wind turbines were reaching out to her for help, the Chief Medical Officer of Health chose not to investigate or speak with them and would not take issues to the highest level of concern? If yes, why? Please explain.

49. From emails: Dr. King engaged in a teleconference around wind turbine “noise” and health problems in 2009 that included, Order of Canada Orthopaedic surgeon Dr. Robert McMurtry, researchers Nissenbaum and Krogh, and others. Is this true? Please explain.

50. It is hard not believe that there has been collusion between the Ontario government and/or some of its ministries and the wind industry, or possibly mutual quiet agreements, mitigation, and fairly obvious censorship of actual medical complaints going back to 2006. Can you honestly say that there are no grounds for people thinking this? Please explain.

51. I have read that “conversations” appear to have reached the Federal Health leadership as well. A quote from a letter from a wind company to the Ministry of Environment Ontario suggests a “consistent position” be adopted by both parties: It might be easily inferred that health complaints need to be “managed,” as part of the investment in the long goal of Green Energy Plans for Ontario. “An enormous investment has been made to build Canada's largest and premier wind energy facility....To assist in bringing this discussion to closure we request a meeting in part to review the facts surrounding both the TS (Transer Station) and the wind turbine generators and even more importantly to explain policy and the legal reasons why the maintenance of a consistent position by the MOE is extremely important, both to xxx and to the cause of Green Energy in Ontario”. This feels like a pattern of industry pressure, gross negligence and possibly collusion. NA-PAW and other groups repeat the call for an independent public inquiry as well as the immediate removal of Dr. Arlene King from her services for the province and people of Ontario. Please comment.

52. From website: Dr. Arlene King, Chief Medical Officer of Health for Ontario, stated in her 2010 report, “According to the scientific evidence, there isn't any direct causal link between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects.” If we simplify that statement and I ask, “Can you or she honestly say that there is no evidence of

any adverse health effects from wind turbines”? Please explain answers.

53. According to the Set of Minimum Competencies for Medical Officers of Health in Canada: Final Report, March 2009: “Investigating and Mitigating Immediate Risks to Human Health: MOHs are responsible for assessing potential risks to the health of the public and taking whatever steps are necessary to reduce or eliminate that risk.” It is time for a full public investigation into how the Ministry of the Environment has granted permits, while in full and complete knowledge of ill health and in many instances acute distress. One officer notes that as early as 2006, MANY complaints were registered, and yet some people report they were being told, “You are the only one complaining.” How can this happen in a democratic country? Who is responsible for this happening? Please explain.

54. FEDERAL ISSUES: I have heard that in a separate Federal Access to Information file obtained, documents received show conversations between Health Canada officials and CanWEA arranging a meeting regarding the planned health study, notably under Dr. David Michaud's guidance, the lead for the proposed study design team. This study, to be undertaken in the next two years on wind turbine health related problems, was announced to the public only after CanWEA and some members of the Health Canada team apparently met. Why would Health Canada reach out to discussions with the wind industry regarding a balanced and fair health assessment and wind turbines?

55. It appears that “This is a province that is in total neglect of protection of its citizenry. Something must be done,” Lange added. “The removal of Dr. King and appointment of a proven independent thinker, one whose expertise includes respect for peer reviewed documents and a recent world respected study by Nissenbaum, Aramani and Hanning would be welcome. Surely, a Chief Medical Officer of Health for a major province would undertake study of the recent and most up to date studies in an area where people have been reporting ill health and maled, dead livestock, as well as economic losses from reduced herds. If the MOH is not up to date with current and world studies and reports and consistently refuses to speak to the people and accurately reflect upon their experiences, it is certainly time to ask that Officer to step aside for the betterment of the Health of Ontarians. Are you willing to support this and help make it happen?

56. From emails: The Chief Officer of Health for each province must be guided by the most recent and best information on health issues, not merely as in the case of Ontario, a rather antique literature review.” With apparent full knowledge of harm to human health, wind deployment continues across Ontario and Canada, while officers to protect public health get a failing grade. These officers have the moral and legal duty to protect human health, but have instead apparently covered the issues with “policy” that continues to degrade not only health, but also our ability to trust our highest public officers. Too many of those suffering, having left homes, it must appear to be willful blindness, or even willful malicious injury. How do you explain this?

57. From emails: Ministry of Environment Provincial Officers were called out by concerned citizens many times in the past 4 years to investigate health related matters that were serious enough to have written reports documented about the harmful effects Industrial Scale Wind Turbines were having on people's health, both physical and mental. Hundreds of follow up requests by the concerned people to find out what actions would take place to alleviate their health problems were met with utter silence from all departments of the Provincial Government and the assumption was that nobody gave a dam! Not only was there silence, but the Government on numerous occasions along with their Wind Lobby Groups and mass media have called the people who claim harm as being Nimby's, being jealous they weren't getting income from wind turbines like their neighbours, or worse.....that it was “all in their mind”! This is dishonest, disrespectful and disgusting! How can you still continue lie to us? Please explain.

58. There have been real claims that property values have been affected and people have had to abandon their homes because nobody will purchase them being that close to a turbine were also met with disrespect and false claims that real estate values actually “went up” having turbines next to them! How can you justify this with all of the information now available, keeping in mind that sales data only reflects properties that were successfully sold, so they are few and far between?

59. MOE Officers did write reports showing that the people were experiencing serious health problems from wind turbines and there really WAS harm being done by being within their proximity. In Fact they even measured sound and found in many cases, the Turbines were operating well above their stated legal noise limits! Where did these reports end up?

60. So many serious questions here have to be answered, as this whole situation smacks of an abysmal act of

willful negligence. It should actually be the basis for a Public Inquiry of a government responsible for so many scandals and such a mess. A government that went into hiding in effort to avoid ridicule and scrutiny. In the meantime, I'm sure that the health problems being experienced 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, won't let up, and neither will the people who are enduring this bloody nightmare! Eventually, the Liberal government has to stand up and be accountable and admit their mistakes! That time is now! How about you? Will you tell the truth about the wind turbine issues? Please explain.

61. We are all aware that Industrial Wind Turbines produce mechanical noise, acoustical noise, low frequency noise, infrasound, in addition to electromagnetic radiation, "dirty electricity" or transient voltage, light flicker, vibration, as well as decrease the property value of non-participating receptors (people, property owners, tax paying citizens) in the view shed. Any of which can create problems for the neighbouring receptors. With all these additional "byproducts" of wind energy, we are making a reasonable request to have an independent third party scientific investigation done, to determine if any health and safety issues exist for people in communities that are forced to host Industrial wind turbines.

62. According to a Danish study conducted for Statoil Hydro ASA by Brynhild Davidsen in Oct. 2009 - "Low Frequency Noise Emission from Wind Farms - Potential Health Effects" for a 3MW Industrial Wind Turbine to remain within the 40dB noise level, the IWT would have to be installed at least 2100 meters away from the nearest receptor. According to the proposed site plan from Niagara Region Wind Corporation there are 3579 receptors within a 2 km. radius of their Industrial Wind Turbines. My question is how can 3 MW IWT's (nothing this big has been installed in North America) be installed at the minimum set back distance allowed?

63. The setback distance must increase with the size of the turbine. Besides being unconscionable, what is the health effect of the decision to install the largest industrial wind turbines in North America with the minimum set back distance?

64. You keep insisting that there are no health impacts but what are the effects of 3MW industrial wind turbines upon medical devices, include hearing aids, cochlear implants, and heart pacemakers?

65. How will the non-participating receptors around these Industrial Wind Turbines be compensated for health problems? Who is responsible for this compensation - NRWC, West Lincoln township, the Regional Township, the Ontario provincial government or the Canadian federal government?

66. How will the noise pollution level for individual industrial wind turbines be monitored? Who will be checking it? Who will have the authority to shut the Industrial wind turbines down when the noise pollution level is above the 40 decibels? Under what conditions will the municipality have the authority to shut the Industrial wind turbines down? Will the planning department or the CAO of West Lincoln have the authority to turn the Industrial wind turbines off that are operating at more than 40 dBA?

67. While talking to the mayor of West Lincoln at the February 6, 2013 NRWC open house in Wellandport, he mentioned that NRWC was going to pay for a bylaw enforcement officer to make sure that the towers are erected properly. What kind of deal is that? It's like allowing the inmates of a prison hire the guards!

68. What is the mitigation procedure when the noise level is above 40 decibels?

69. In Binder 1 (Page 5.1) NRWC claims that they will create 770 jobs annually over the 4 years. That is a confusing statement and probably far from true! I expect that any jobs created by the NRWC project will be a small percentage of the number of jobs that Ontario will lose due to its ridiculous energy policy and inflated electricity rates, which will only get worse! Are they temporary or permanent jobs? What is the breakdown between temporary and permanent? Do you count the same job more than once if they are separate contracts for temporary workers? Who do you include in the total number? Do you for example, include the truck driver who delivers parts but is actually an employee of another company? Have you included for example, employees of Stantec, or other companies or firms, due to the NRWC contract with them? How many of the jobs are part-time? How many are professional vs. skilled trades vs. labourer? How many employees will NRWC actually take on? How are you getting around bargaining agent rules for hiring?

70. The reports in NRWC binders are contradictory (Table 5.1). You refer to working "normal business hours" but then also say "to the greatest extent possible, activities that could create excessive noise would be restricted to regular business hours (Environmental). In yet another section, you say you will monitor for noise. Which is it? Is it NRWC's plan to only work in normal business hours or will you only try to complete the noisy work in business hours? Or... if you plan to monitor for noise during construction, what is NRWC's standard and how

does it change for night time, weekends etc.?

71. Hydro One has studies from Amaranth and Ripley areas that show dirty electricity increased dramatically after installation of wind turbines. Have you done a study on how it will increase in West Lincoln? Why not? How much dirty electricity is produced by a 3MW wind turbine?

72. In NRWC's Design and Operations Report, it says that there may be potential impact to livestock. NRWC's mitigation strategy is to communicate with livestock owners. This is way too vague. What is the potential impact to those livestock? As well, communicating isn't a mitigation strategy. Please explain further.

73. Appendix C in Binder 1 indicates that Enercon is in the process of undertaking sound power level measurements for the E-101 and that they're results are anticipated in September 2012. Binders were produced in December so dates don't line up. Where are the results? If they doing measurements, what did you base the assessments for each receptor on? Copies of the results should be made available. Are we not entitled to view before you submit REA?

74. What is the reasoning behind the selection of 23 turbines to monitor kills? What is the science behind this number? Is it the same 23 all the time or will it change?

75. Table 3.4 is a big issue. It says that "additional ination on sound power data including test methods will be incorporated into the final REA documents." This would suggest that residents get time for another review. We should be entitled to ination on the sound power data and the test methods. Are you denying us that opportunity?

76. It appears from the draft reports that you are expecting to negotiate with existing providers in terms of transmission lines. It is extremely vague. What is the status of those negotiations? Are you aware that Hydro One has said no to other developers with respect to sharing of poles? What will you do instead? Have you worked out other transmission line details re: easements, right of way? Please provide those details.

77. NRWC refers to their "Complaint Response Protocol" in the draft reports but it is not explained. What is it? As residents faced with the largest industrial wind turbines ever contemplated for Ontario, we are entitled to know what it is. We are also entitled to critique it.

78. Section 6 on Emergency Response and Communication Plan is absolutely incomplete and what is there is very vague at best. There are far too many words/phrases that say nothing. For example, what does NRWC consider to be a "reasonable" concern?

a) "all reasonable commercial efforts would be made to take appropriate action as a result of concerns as soon as practicable..." This has been lifted directly from NRWC's plan. Is that the NRWC commitment to addressing safety issues? Could it be any more vague?

b) NRWC will "endeavor" to respond in 48 hours. That says the NRWC may or may not get there in 48 hours. That is ridiculous when the safety of the community is at stake. This community demands full, complete and substantial perance standards.

79. Where will NRWC be when a fire happens? Will you endeavour" to be there within "48 hour" perance standard?

80. What can residents expect from the toxic smoke that will result? What are the components that will burn and can you please provide the Material Safety Data Sheets for them?

81. What recourse do I have when my television, satellite or cell phone reception is degraded from industrial wind turbine interference?

82. From NRWC correspondence, "Wind turbines can have an impact on cell phone service if they are in the direct cell tower-to-cell tower path." Has NRWC consulted with all of the cell phone service providers? Cell phone service can be troublesome already in some areas around West Lincoln, so we don't need anything to further degrade that service. What will NRWC do if their turbines degrade or disrupt our cell phone service?

83. Will the NavCanada radar blackout mean that residents will not have access to the air ambulance?

84. Are the financial backers of this project willing to co-sign guarantees for any financial losses or liabilities with their other corporate assets or is NRWC potentially just a shell company that will fold and leave victims

and taxpayers on the hook?

85. What protection is NRWC providing to the participating landowners to protect them from loss of their normal comprehensive liability insurance coverage or against class action lawsuits?

86. How can NRWC object to a moratorium when the Ontario Environmental Review Tribunal has already in a 2011 decision accepted the evidence that wind turbines can cause harm to humans if placed too close to people's homes and "the debate has now evolved to one of degree"?

87. How will you guarantee that my health and the health of my family will not be affected by their turbines?

88. What is the procedure to notify you and/or the Province if we start feeling the ill effects from excessive noise or vibrations causing sleep deprivation, headaches, vertigo, ear pressure, fatigue, high blood pressure, etc.?

89. How will low frequency and infrasound measurements be taken and on what frequency will recordings be taken and what access will we have to this data?

90. What plans do you have in place if we are affected by low frequency sound or infrasound?

91. How can we have confidence in any noise readings when the Ministry of the Environment is not even able or willing to determine if operating noise is out of compliance for those victims already suffering from invasive turbine noise in this province?

92. How will you protect neighbours or participating leaseholders from the dangers of ice throw or equipment failure?

93. What if there is an emergency during the construction phase and NRWC's components are blocking ambulance access?

94. What consideration has been given to special health care needs of children or people with autism, attention deficit disorder, obsessive compulsive disorder, bipolar, migraine sufferers, hearing impaired, sleep disorders, or even the special needs of the elderly?

95. Should Dr. Philip Bigelo's University of Waterloo Health study show that the current setbacks from residents are inadequate, does NRWC accept the financial risk of proceeding at this time and risk potential turbine(s) shutdown at no cost to the Province or taxpayers?

96. Will there be a decrease in the standard of flight safety? Nav Canada was specific in their letter of November 2011 addressed to IPC. The IWTs negative effect on air traffic control, i.e. the radar interference on air navigation services, can only be "mitigated" by certain proposed technical adjustments. "Mitigated" does not mean such adjustments will "eliminate" the compromise of flight safety; it only "makes it less dangerous". Why has Nav Canada used this terminology?

97. Has NAV Canada implemented the proposed technical changes? If not, is there any kind of guarantee that these changes will be implemented prior to any IWT being erected so we at least have some protection?

98. In their letter of March 24, 2012, NavCanada took the time to indicate that their land use evaluation is only valid for a 12-month period. In the event, a year from erection of these IWTs, NavCanada determines that they no longer believe their location is "safe", what guarantee do we have that the turbine operation will immediately cease?

99. In the event that there is a flight accident caused by the presence of these IWTs, which could result in millions of dollars in claims, does the wind company's commercial liability insurance cover such liabilities or will the government or taxpayer be stuck with the bill?

100. What peer reviewed, scientific studies can you provide that the health of family pets and \ or livestock will not be impacted by noise or stray voltage?

101. As the barometric pressure differentials created by turbines will rupture a bat's lungs and drown them in their own blood, isn't it possible that it could also cause people nearby to suffer more problems including

migraine headaches, together with similar impacts on all living creatures?

102. How will you monitor bird and bat kills when scavengers (coyotes, fox etc.) quickly clean up any evidence before monitoring/collection staffs make their scheduled carcass pick-up rounds?

103. How many endangered species are you planning to “harm, harass or kill”?

104. How many raptors and birds of prey is it acceptable to kill, or injure annually?

105. Why is the mortality rate for birds and bats only monitored between May 1 and November 30?

106. What plan is in place for removing the turbines at the end of their life cycle and what securities will be provided by NRWC and what guaranteed will be available in the likely event of the sale of NRWC, and/or its assets?

107. Will NRWC guarantee that the cost to decommission the wind turbines will be adequate with verification by independent sources and how will the decommissioning security funds, be setup to not lapse or disappear?

108. What is the transportation plan for moving the turbines components during construction when residents will also be using the roads?

109. In an emergency, is someone available 24 hours a day to notify in order to get the turbines turned off? What conditions would warrant a shut down under NRWC standard operating practices?

110. If in an emergency situation where neighbours need to evacuate, or are prevented from returning to or leaving their homes, will compensation be provided?

111. How does NRWC propose to combat a turbine fire and how are neighbours notified and protected?

112. Why will NRWC not permit a leaseholder to cancel his lease now that the leaseholder may be more fully informed of the consequences and impacts of industrial wind turbines?

113. How many receptors live within 1 km of the 77 Industrial wind turbines that NRWC propose to erect in West Lincoln, Wainfleet and Haldimand? What is the age range of these people in 10 year intervals? (As in 0 - 10 years old, 11 - 20 years old, etc.)

114. How many receptors live within 2 km of the 5 Industrial wind turbines that NRWC propose to erect in West Lincoln? What is the age range of these people in 10 year intervals? (As in 0 - 10 years old, 11 - 20 years old, etc.)

115. How many receptors live within 5 km of the 5 Industrial wind turbines that NRWC propose to erect in West Lincoln? What is the age range of these people in 10 year intervals? (As in 0 - 10 years old, 11 - 20 years old, etc.)

116. The installation of Industrial wind turbines is an Industrial use of agricultural land. What is the classification of the agricultural farm land being taken out of production for each specific Industrial wind turbine?

117. How many acres of farm land will be removed from agricultural production for the installation of each turbine? How many acres of farm land will be removed from agricultural production for the service roads required for each turbine?

118. Reports say that they don't expect issues with groundwater and our wells. Have studies actually been done? Will anyone test my well water prior to construction, during construction and then again after? Why do they limit potential negative impact on wells to 120m? (Summary of Potential Environmental Effects - 5.9)

119. Where are the company's commitments to meet 100% decommissioning costs and restoration of our farmlands? What financial guarantee is provided for the decommissioning of these Industrial wind turbines or will the members of West Lincoln and ultimately the Province of Ontario be left responsible for financing the clean up? (Just like the PCB fiasco West Lincoln already experienced in the 1980's.)

In closing, I plead with you to prevent this and any similar projects from moving forward. Also, I want you to know that I live within 2-KM of two of the proposed 3-MW NRWC turbines, which are directly southwest of my home and 30-Acre property. The prevailing winds here blow from the southwest about 90 percent of the time, which will be directly across those turbines and towards my home. Further, my property is located on the east side of Victoria Avenue, across the road from West Lincoln, in Pelham. Since I am not a resident of West Lincoln, it is very unlikely that I have any chance of receiving or realizing any benefit/s from any deal made with the town of West Lincoln.

Note: Ination in this letter is based on: my personal experience and opinion, news articles, websites and email messages, so some ination could be considered second hand, but to the best of my knowledge, it is true.

Sincerely,

