

In my presentation I noted that health, safety and environmental concerns were of utmost importance. In fact I was contrasting the esthetic concerns of the people of Scarborough with the need to be concerned about global warming. And how we need balance.

Wind proponents have always maintained that the main reason we don't like the turbines is for esthetic reasons. While a number of people will complain about their looks, the main problem most of us have is they are being sited too close to people and in sensitive areas – no matter what your pre-GEA suggestions may have been. Further, many of us believe wind turbines do little to cure emissions of any sort, and so far the evidence is on our side. We don't consider the current situation balanced.

Here is the advice the Green Energy Act gave the government on this matter:

The purpose of the Green Energy Act is to protect the environment by establishing a sustainable energy system for Ontario that improves air quality and reduces greenhouse gas emissions.

First, we don't think it adequately protects the environment, and we simply point to Ostrander Point and Wolfe Island as evidence. Second, we don't think it improves the air quality or reduces GHG emissions, and we challenge you to show us where it does.

The Green Energy Act must recognize that the principles of environmental protection apply to every energy project and should not compromise human health, community values or natural heritage systems.

Whether the GEA recognizes these principles or not, the facts are that people are suffering health consequences and communities are being ripped apart as a result of the implementation of the GEA. You may say the act is ok and simply needs to be better enforced. We disagree. The act gives too much power to people who are not part of the communities they are destroying and are unaffected by the damage they inflict upon us.

The Green Energy Act should amend the Environmental Assessment Act and Planning Act to:

1. Implement a “one project, one process” approach, in order to dispense with the need for green energy proponents to apply for and obtain Planning Act approvals and appear before the OMB for new or existing projects which:

While consistency and streamlining are generally desirable, we suspect that the GEA was really intended to make it easier for the government's friends in the wind industry to install their projects, regardless of the damage done.

a. Have already been approved (or exempted) under the Environmental Assessment Act (EA Act); or

“Exempted” is the word you should be using. There has not been one EA performed for a wind energy project in Ontario, in spite of numerous requests. We suspect that was the intent all along – that the GEA would turn absolute control of the approval process over to the province, who would then quickly approve everything that came along. That certainly has been the experience so far.

b. Are subject to the prescribed planning, documentary and consultation requirements under the EA Act (e.g. individual EA, Class EA, or ESP under O.Reg. 116/01); and,

Part of that process is the ability to eliminate the requirements for the EA, an ability that has been consistently exercised by the province.

2. Amend the EA Act in order to impose enhanced public notice requirements for green energy projects to ensure that interested/ affected municipalities, stakeholders, and First Nation/aboriginal communities receive timely and adequate notice of their opportunities to participate in the applicable environmental planning process (e.g. individual EA, Class EA, or ESP under O.Reg.116/01). In addition, the Lieutenant Governor in Council should be empowered to make regulations that:

In spite of any public notice requirements the developers tell the public nothing more than what they have to, and often not even that. Since the “opportunities to participate” aren’t spelled out, the developers simply ignore the community and do what they want, all abetted by the province.

a. Contain clear, prescriptive provincial standards for the siting of green energy projects (e.g. “no go” areas, setback requirements, etc.) and that determine areas in need of protection. Restrictions should be technology specific and based on legitimate and peer reviewed scientific data

The provincial standards may be clear, but they are not sufficient, as evidenced by the abandonment of homes and the ongoing slaughter on Wolfe. The province has never demonstrated what scientific data is used to establish these standards.

b. Provide exceptions for First Nations and Métis projects to the greatest extent possible

OK, good for them. What about the rest of us?

c. Streamline and coordinate environmental assessments and where possible use Class Environmental Assessments. The purpose of a Class EA is to specify a planning process through which environmental impacts and benefits are considered in proposed projects. A Class EA will provide effective and efficient project assessment and public engagement processes that are appropriate for projects within the class. It will ensure that proponents take into account the potential

impacts and benefits of proposed projects as well as the interests of individuals, communities, agencies and organizations, as appropriate

Why worry about class EA's when the province doesn't worry about EA's at all?

d. Streamline and coordinate planning and building permit processes

By taking these powers away from the locals who will end up bearing the consequences of these projects.

With respect to streamlining approvals under the Class EA process, the Lieutenant Governor in Council should be empowered to make regulations:

I Adjusting project categories or thresholds under approved Class EAs and the ESP so that a greater number of renewable energy projects are fully exempt under the EA Act (but they must still obtain other federal or provincial approvals where applicable)

This is where you gut the environmental acts, uniquely for this industry, the only industry allowed to build its "factories" amid people's homes.

I Prescribing shorter time frames e.g. six months, and clearer deadlines for the completion of the planning/review process under approved Class EAs and the ESP

This certainly helps the industry, at the expense of the locals. And you call this a balance?

I Limiting grounds for bump-up/elevation requests to matters of provincial interest (as opposed to matters that are essentially local in nature)

So the locals don't matter? The interests of the industry trump those of the community? You shouldn't be surprised to hear some of use the word "fascist" to describe this.

I Creating an independent, expedited process for determining bump up/ elevation requests (e.g. written hearing by a member of the Environmental Review Tribunal, or re-establishment of an EAAC-like entity to advise the Minister on such matters)

So you take away the community's ability to object to some aspect of a project. In return what has the province done to protect communities? Nothing.

Depending on the technology and if it is a First Nations Community Energy Project, green energy projects should not be located in, nor cause adverse impacts upon:

I Critical habitat of species listed as endangered and threatened under the Endangered Species Act, 2007

Really? Ostrander Point, Wolfe Island, White Pines, Amherst Island. The province has demonstrated again and again it has no intent to protect any species.

I Provincially significant wetlands, valleys, woodlands or wildlife habitat

With a 120 metre setback? When the blades take away half of that? When a bird has to fly through/around those blades several times a day?

I Provincially significant areas of natural, agricultural and scientific interest

Really? Then explain Ostrander Point, White Pines, Oak Ridges, The Escarpment.

I Significant areas of cultural heritage or archaeological value, including First Nations' or aboriginal communities' sacred sites

That's fine, so far I've not heard of any project being involved with any of these.

I Lands designated as Escarpment Natural Area or Escarpment Protection Area under the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act

I understand there's been some proposals for this area.

I Lands designated as Natural Core Area or Natural Linkage Area under the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act, 2001

I understand there's been some proposals for this area.

I Provincial parks and conservation reserves, except in accordance with section 19 of the Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act, 2006

I understand there's been some proposals for these areas.

And what financial gain do you think I am getting out of this?

From OSEA: When the McGuinty government was elected in 2003, although she had not been active politically, it hired Marion to ensure that sustainability was a key element in energy policy. If you're pulling a pay check, you're interested. As opposed to us, who are all volunteers.

You may also be interested that I was the one with the ear of this government who turned the tide on the whole issue of stray voltage

That's one of our problems. Why do YOU have the ear of this government and not the citizens in, for example, Ripley; the ones who are suffering?

So you see, Ms. Fraser, we all know words are cheap and in spite of your words the process of destroying rural Ontario continues unabated, including homes, communities and natural habitats. We suspect that this is being done to enrich the friends of the government at the expense of ratepayers, homeowners and taxpayers. We suspect that was the intent all along – it has happened too quickly and too completely to be accidental. We see confirmation for this suspicion in the funds that get directed among the government, the government-controlled electric power industry, the environmental NGO's, the lobbyists and the wind energy developers.

We'd certainly appreciate having any words that can dispel our suspicions, but please be aware that this scheme has gone on so long and with such reckless devotion it will take some very persuasive words from someone to disabuse us of our suspicions.