



AECOM  
215 – 55 Wyndham Street North  
Guelph, ON, Canada N1H 7T8  
Tel: 519 763 7783 Fax: 519 763 1668



## Meeting Summary – East Durham Wind Energy Centre Community Liaison Committee

**Attn.:** CLC members, NextEra Staff & Consultants

**Subject:** East Durham Wind Energy Centre, Community Liaison Committee (CLC): Meeting No. 4

March 8, 2016                  6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

Durham Arena & Community Centre

451 Saddler Street West, Durham, ON

### **Present:**

CLC Members

- Bev Cutting; James Clements

NextEra Energy Canada

- Adam Rickel, *Project Director, Development*; Derek Dudek, *Senior PGD Technical Services Specialist*; Octavio Alonso, *Associate Wind Site Manager*; Ray Dewaepenaere, *Wind Site Manager*; Julie Rice, *Director Business Management*; Amanda Gittens, *Senior Business Manager*; Heidi Lamarche, *Construction*

Consultants

- Charlotte Teat, NRSI
- Ben Coulson, RWDI

AECOM

- CLC Chair - Avril Fiskien; CLC Coordinator - Adam Wright

### **Absent:**

- Stan Rowbotham; Pat Greenshields



AECOM  
215 – 55 Wyndham Street North  
Guelph, ON, Canada N1H 7T8  
Tel: 519 763 7783 Fax: 519 763 1668



## Item Discussed

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Avril (CLC Chair) welcomed the Committee and members of the public to the fourth Community Liaison Committee meeting for the East Durham Wind Energy Centre and outlined that AECOM is a hired third party facilitator for the four CLC meetings over a two year period. Avril then welcomed the Committee members as well as members of the public.

The Chair asked Committee members and NextEra representatives to introduce themselves and outline their role on the Committee.

#### CLC Members

- Bev Cutting - Councilor from West Grey Municipality
- James Clements - Landowner

#### NextEra

- Adam Rickel, *Project Director, Development*
- Derek Dudek, *Senior PGD Technical Services Specialist*
- Octavio Alonso, *Associate Wind Site Manager*
- Ray Dewaepenaere, *Wind Site Manager*
- Julie Rice, *Director Business Management*
- Amanda Gittens, *Senior Business Manager*
- Heidi Lamarche, *Construction*

#### Consultants

- Charlotte Teat, *Biologist, NRSI*
- Ben Coulson, *Acoustic Engineer, RWDI*

The Chair then outlined the Parking Lot which is a process for addressing issues that cannot be addressed at the meeting. These issues are addressed either through the Meeting Summary, NextEra following up with individuals on specific items or at the next CLC meeting.

The Chair then reviewed the Agenda for the meeting and outlined that the last 15 minutes would be open to the public to ask questions and receive answers from the NextEra team. The Chair also noted that there are two depositions for the meeting, Marian Ratcliffe and Maria De Melo.

#### **Is the end of meeting set for 8 pm or is there flexibility in this timing?**

Chair noted that she will facilitate to this timeframe but noted that if there are additional questions that members of the public are able to follow up with individual NextEra team members after the meeting.

The Chair then provided an overview of the previous CLC meeting.

## 2. Recap of CLC Meeting #3 (slide 3-5)

- The CLC is a forum for two-way communication between NextEra Energy Canada and the public
- An opportunity to provide additional information and updates, and to respond to questions or concerns related to:
  - Construction and installation
  - Use and operation
  - Maintenance
  - Retirement of the Facility

### Project Overview:

- Class 4 Wind Facility, in the Municipality of West Grey
- 14 turbines, with 80 metre towers and 50.5 metre blades
- A generating capacity of approximately 23-megawatts
- Received Renewable Energy Approval from the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change

### Public Attendance and Depositions:

- Local residents in attendance.
- Two depositions were provided.

The Chair also noted that the CLC meetings are recorded and then submitted to CLC members for their review and comment after which the final versions are circulated to CLC members and also saved on the Project webpage.

## 3. Parking Lot Items and Questions / Comments Raised Since the Third CLC Meeting

### The Chair then reviewed the parking lot items from CLC#3.

#### ***Parking Lot Item #1: File number and name of MOECC person handling noise complaints.***

Derek Dudek (DD) noted that all complaints are sent to the Rick Chapell and Helmut Pfeiffer.

Owen Sound Area Office, MOECC  
101-17th St E  
Owen Sound ON N4K 0A5  
Toll free number from area code 519: 1-800-265-3783  
Tel: 519-371-2901  
Fax: 519-371-2905

#### ***Parking Lot Item #2: Confirm if raw data from Acoustic Monitoring will be available for public review***

DD - This information is not available at this moment as the studies are still ongoing. Two of the audits are due August and at that time there will be information.

#### ***Parking Lot Item #3: Potential for B. Cutting to observe Mortality Monitoring***

DD - We will be extending an invitation for Ms. Cutting to attend a Mortality Monitoring study once the

survey dates are confirmed (planned to start in May) and that Ms. Cutting will be invited to attend the first search. There was an additional request for other community representatives to attend. In response to this, Derek D. noted that we would prefer to limit the number of people attending due to health and safety issues.

**Parking Lot Item #4: Date and location of upcoming noise assessment, circulate this to CLC members**

Refer to the map on pg. 7 of the meeting presentation. As well, Derek noted that additional information will be provided throughout the meeting.

**Parking Lot Item #5: Turbine Lighting Update**

DD – We have reviewed several mitigation measures and different technologies and noted that it takes significant time to review these different approaches that will be compatible with our turbine technology. We have reviewed the lighting shield option in depth, and have encountered a potential concern due to mounting the lighting shield, but we are optimistic that this will be resolved and we can continue to move forward with this.

**On page 11 of the CLC #3 meeting summary there was a note that NextEra was going to follow up on the complaint resolution protocol?**

DD – Yes, we have provided an update later on in the slide deck.

**The test for the lighting shield, how long will this take?**

DD – I am not certain on the specific timeline but we have a commitment to test for 3 weeks to obtain technical feedback.

Julie Rice (JR) – We want your feedback and we want to ensure that these solutions meet your needs. NextEra has been talking with the providers of this service but we also need to be sure to recognize that there are safety concerns as well as warranty requirements.

**Regarding the lighting shield, can you provide more details on this?**

DD – The purpose of the shield is to remove impact of light pollution to those on the ground. We are still looking to determine how the shield will minimize the effects of lighting on the ground and currently we are installing a test case to see if the technology is effective. We do not know a lot about the technology so we have to run tests to ensure it is effective and that it meets the needs of community members. If you would like more details please refer to the TowerTEX website (<http://www.towertex.com/en/4.2.towershade.html>).

Adam Rickel (AR) – The shade is two discs that are below the light. The disc is meant to block this light from shining downward to the ground and nearby residents but we need to determine how well it blocks the light.

**Comment: What I am worried about is the lights on the horizon, I don't want to see the lights at all.**

Chair thanked the member of the public for their comment and noted that there opportunities for discussion on this topic later on in the meeting.

The Chair then noted that there were three (3) additional topics that were brought forward since the

last meeting:

- 1) **Tree planting** – As an update, East Durham WEC worked with a community member last fall to plant trees and we are open to doing this again one last time in the spring.
- 2) **Additional CLC meetings after this meeting** – Purpose of the CLC meetings is to promote discussion between members of the public and East Durham WEC. We are going to look at what the most appropriate avenue is for communicating this information. NextEra along with the MOECC and CLC members will work together to determine this.

Bev Cutting noted that there was a resolution passed on Oct 5<sup>th</sup> 2015 by the Municipality of West Grey that the CLC meetings continue for the life of the project. The reason for this is that email is not a reliable or effective method of communication to get the answers we need. We understand that if there is no interest in these meetings as we go forward (limited interest from the public) than we can revisit that but it is our preference to continue these meetings for the life of the project.

- 3) **Donations by NextEra** – A handout was provided to the CLC members outlining donations from NextEra (Appendix B).

James Clements thanked NextEra for donating to the Durham Community Health Foundation which will undoubtedly help community members.

#### **How much money and to whom?**

DD – The amounts and recipients are noted on the Financial Donations document (Appendix B).

The Chair then asked NextEra to clarify process for requesting funds.

Adam R. noted that NextEra has accepted all requested for funding that have been submitted and will continue to consider these requests as the project progresses.

Bev Cutting noted that this amount is substantially low compared to the proposed Community Vibrancy Fund (CVF) and would prefer there to be a pot of money allocated to the community and the members of the community.

#### **4. Update from the Operations Team**

The chair then invited Ray Dewaepenaere (RD) to provide an update on operations.

The performance of the turbines are exceeding expectations:

- Equivalent Forced Outage Rate is .63%
- Availability Factor > 98%
- Excellent safety performance - zero injuries

Construction remediation has been completed with some minor issues expected in the spring.  
New jobs created: three full-time and two part-time employees

- Four local employees
- One remote employee

**How can you justify these “great numbers” for operations when there were turbines broken?**

RD – There was one (1) turbine down for about two weeks but compared to the running time of all other turbines this amount is limited.

The Chair then invited Derek D. to discuss the complaint resolution process.

**Operations – Complaint Resolution (Slide 9 – 10)**

- NextEra acknowledges that some members of the community may have concerns regarding wind farm operations.
- To resolve disputes in a collaborative manner, NextEra follows its complaints resolution process.
- Should any complaints arise throughout the course of the operation and decommissioning phases, a NextEra representative will contact the complainant to understand the nature of the complaint.
- NextEra will notify the local MOECC (Ministry of Environment and Climate Change) district office of the complaint within 2 business days of receipt of the complaint (1 business day if the complaint is related to Ground Water).
- NextEra will provide the local MOECC district office with written records of the complaint within 8 business days of the complaint. The MOECC notification will include:
  - Description of the nature of the complaint;
  - Wind direction at the time of the incident related to the complaint;
  - Time and date of the incident related to the complaint; and
  - A description of the measures taken to address the cause of the incident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.
- Upon resolution of complaint, verbal and written correspondence will be provided to complainant as soon as possible.
- **Note:** the majority of complaints received to date relate to ongoing matters which have not yet been resolved as a result of continuing studies being undertaken both by NEEC and its external consultants (i.e., acoustic audits, navigation lighting research). Written correspondence will be provided on such matters upon the completion of such work to resolve such matters
- Information requests and complaints about the East Durham project specifically:

**NextEra Energy Canada, LP**

**390 Bay Street, Suite 1720**

**Toronto, ON M5H 2Y2**

**Toll Free Phone: 1-877-463-4963**

**Email: [eastdurham.wind@nexteraenergy.com](mailto:eastdurham.wind@nexteraenergy.com)**

**Website: [www.NextEraEnergyCanada.com](http://www.NextEraEnergyCanada.com)**

Any other general inquiries to NextEra Energy Canada, LP:

**416-364-9714 - Main**

**877-257-7330 - Toll Free**

Derek noted that NextEra investigates all complaints and as the majority of received complaints pertain to noise concerns, we are working to address these issues via the acoustic audits to get a better understanding of the issues and potential mitigation measures.

**As soon as possible (refers to pg. 11 in Meeting Summary #3), are we changing the rules?**

DD – NextEra has changed internal protocol as many of the concerns are repeat concerns. I don't think it serves anyone to repeatedly send the same response letters, though NextEra is investigating each complaint.

**How long will NextEra receive comments for, is it for the life of the project?**

DD - Yes, we will always have its general inquiries line open to receive comments.

**NextEra also noted that they will file a letter to the MOECC, are you providing this file number to the residents?**

DD – We do not have the file number. Inquiries regarding MOECC complaints should go to the contacts provided in the parking lot summary in the beginning of the meeting.

**Comment – Member of the public commended Derek on getting back to people who make complaints. “I appreciate that you are making the effort even though some of my complaints aren't always the nicest at 2:30 in the morning”.**

The Chair thanked the member of the public for their comment and asked Derek to provide an update on monitoring and mitigation measures.

## 5. Update on Monitoring and Mitigation Measures

### Monitoring and Mitigation Measures

- **Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan:**
  - In accordance with the requirements of Ontario Regulation (O.Reg.) 359/09, the Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan addresses various elements including, but not limited to, heritage and archaeological resources, natural heritage features and noise.
- **Noise**
  - The Provincial Environmental Protection Act (EPA) requires that noise emissions for any new projects must not have any adverse effects on the natural environment and not exceed 40dBA when wind speeds are of 6 metres/second and below.
  - NOTE: the allowable noise levels increase during higher wind speeds.
  - Prior to construction, a Renewable Energy Approval (REA) was obtained with measures to be adhered to, i.e. noise modeling by independent consultants.
  - Acoustic Emission and Immission testing will be conducted following Commercial Operations Date (COD) which occurred in late August 2015. Results are then reported to the MOECC.
  - Transformer Audit Complete – submitted to MOECC

- Turbine Emission Audit due August 2016 – work is ongoing
- Immission Audits due Aug 2016 and Feb 2017 – work is ongoing

#### **What is 6m/s in km/hr?**

Ben Coulson (BC) - My best guess is around 20 km/hr but this would have to be confirmed. **Update:** 6 m/s = 21.6 km/hr.

Ben C. then introduced himself and noted the difference between Immission and Emission testing

Emission – This is the sound that is emitted from the turbine, we measure the sound that is directly produced from the turbine.

Immission – This is the sound that is received at receptors (i.e. residences, homes, etc.).

Ben noted that transformer audits have components of both the Emission and Immission tests and that he is here tonight specifically to speak about the Immission testing process.

#### **Noise Audit (General)**

- Measures the sound contribution from the source of concern, excluding the background ambient sound
- Checks that source is performing as specified (compliance)
- Requires special methods to measure or exclude (i.e., subtract) the background
- Assessed under worst-case operating conditions (i.e., when source is loudest)

#### **This is measured in dBAs only correct?**

BC – Yes we measured only in dBA, A-weighted sound (different ratings of sounds A,B,C, etc.) as the ear is complex and it responds to noises differently and at different levels.

#### **How does the ear behave with regards to infrasound, does the inner ear hear infrasound?**

BC - The ear does not hear infrasound by definition, but considering the detail and our time constraints I would be more than happy to discuss infrasound with you after the meeting to go over specifics.

#### **Transformer Noise Audit**

- Transformer sound originates from electrical (hum) and mechanical components (fans)
- Fans are manually forced on to measure this condition
- Measurements are conducted following MOECC requirements at the source and at nearby receptors
- Verifies the construction of any mitigation measures (e.g., noise barriers)

#### **Turbine Immission Audit (sounds received at homes)**

- Measurements generally conducted at receptors (e.g., homes) where we expect the loudest sounds to be heard; we investigate the potential of locating at these locations first.
- Locations selected based on MOECC guidelines
- Generally, receptors with highest predicted sound levels



- Land-owner permission required to access; as a note several landowners did refuse to host equipment.
- Downwind of turbines for prevailing winds, which is a MOECC requirement
- Location (on property) representative of residence relative to turbines
- Avoid locations near obstacles that can interfere with the sound measurements, e.g. buildings, many trees, roadways, other (e.g., farm sources)

**If the measurements are taken downwind, how do you know if the turbines spin around?**

BC – It is downwind from the prevailing winds, in southwest Ontario this is SSW.

Ben C. continued to discuss the Immission Audit process noting that in the winter time winds can be high but due to precipitation and cold temperatures the monitoring equipment can be damaged, whereas in summer winds are lighter except during storms. Because of this, fall and spring are more ideal for acoustic monitoring.

**It is noted that tests are avoided by roadways and this type of thing....but the testing sites are located right by Highway # 4**

BC – The MOECC guidelines preclude us from testing next to a house, but they do not preclude us from testing by the roadway. In order to secure a measurement, we measure the total sound, followed by a measurement of background sound. We deduct the background sound from the total sound to determine the contribution of a turbine. Testing by a roadway impacts the amount of work that is needed to understand the turbine noise levels. When interference noise, such as traffic, is present we must discard those data points in order to secure a pure measurement. Due to constraints there are several locations that we cannot use or that would be more problematic/less desirable. The sound levels predicted at your property may not be the worst case scenario. The MOECC regulations want us to monitor the worst case scenario.

**BC continued to discuss the Turbine Immission Audit process**

- Typically conducted in spring (March) and fall (October) over 2-3 months
- Measure sound, wind speed and direction, temperature, humidity, precipitation
- “Total sound” while turbines on
- “Ambient sound” while turbines parked (off)
- Compliance determined based on meeting MOECC criteria at different wind speeds
- Subtract average ambient sound from average total sound for each wind speed
- Difficult to obtain required number of data points at each wind speed
- Higher wind speeds (7 m/s) may not occur over many weeks, or may only occur with precipitation (i.e., storms) which in the end excludes a lot of data points
- Need to forecast required winds for ambient and then park turbines

**You were saying that you can take a measurement against the house, with the turbine parked can't you see what the absence of noise is compared?**

BC – The house is a reflecting plane that stops us from knowing what the true sound is (i.e., it invalidates the measurement). If you ever get a node (where sound reverberates and concentrates in one area) than it is not a true measurement of the sound.

**When I'm working on my car and the radio is on I turn it off so I can hear the engine better. Doesn't this same principle apply here?**

BC – I understand what you're saying but the MOECC requires that we have a "free field" to measure. We try to avoid roadway locations as there is road noise that interferes with the measurements. When we do measure these areas and a car goes by we have to throw away that data point, so in essence we have to measure more and longer. The priority was to choose where the sound impact would be the highest; the roadway location was one of these points although it meant more work.

Chair clarified that although you do not prefer to measure by the road, there are scenarios where this cannot happen and you still need to measure in these areas.

**Why are you measuring the noisiest area rather than the quietest area? It seems like you chose the noisiest areas instead of going to an area with the average noise level.**

BC – We are measuring this area as it is expected to be the loudest compared to turbine noise not road noise. We only want to measure the sound of the turbine when the background is quietest.

**Do you measure the noise with the background noise as well as the turbine noise?**

BC – Yes we do, and I understand your concerns but we are obliged to meet the MOECC requirements.

**I have home where I offered to host acoustic audits, this is my retirement home and I offered for tests to occur but I never heard back from anyone. I had to follow up and Gary noted that my residence was not chosen. Can you explain why?**

BC – I can explain but maybe in the interest of time I can follow up afterwards as this is a specific scenario.

The Chair then invited Charlotte Teat (CT) to discuss monitoring and mitigation measures.

**Monitoring and Mitigation Measures**

- Monitoring will be conducted in accordance with requirements of the REA and MNRF Guidelines
- Monitoring will begin May 1, 2016.
- Turbine searches will occur twice weekly from May 1 through October 31, and raptor surveys will continue weekly from November 1st through November 30th.
- Correction factors are applied in order to calculate overall estimated mortality rates across the project.
- Annual report provided to MNRF by March 31 following each year of monitoring.
- A minimum of three years of monitoring are required.

**What is a correction factor?**

CM – There are 3 factors;

- 1) **Proportion of area searched:** around each turbine there is a 50m radius to search and it is the proportion of that area that is able to be searched. If there is tall vegetation/crops or other obstacles then that particular area cannot be searched and we must account for carcasses that

could be present in that area but not found by the searcher.

- 2) **Scavenger removal rate:** we put out test carcasses at least once a month and determine the rate of scavenging activity. If there is scavenging activity, then the mortality estimator increases.
- 3) **Searcher efficiency rate:** we also put out test carcasses to determine how many carcasses a searcher is finding. The less test carcasses the searcher finds, the more the mortality estimator increases.

**So if scavengers took all the carcasses, would that mean there are zero mortalities?**

CM – No, this would be taken into account with the correction factor, which is the purpose of the correction factor.

Julie Rice (JR) - The idea of having correction factors, is a way to address the coyotes who are scavenging, it is designed to correct the number of found to expected number of carcasses. This correction factor counts against the project, not for it.

**Is this process the same for all birds?**

DD – Yes it is.

CM – To clarify, during the monthly raptor search if we were to find birds or bats we would also include these in our findings.

**What happens if too many raptors are being killed?**

CM – We submit our findings to the MNR which has limits for number of raptors being killed.

**Your annual report is to be submitted to the MNR by March 31, 2016?**

CM – The first report will be due March 31, 2017 as monitoring is occurring in 2016.

**Can this information be given to council or the public to see how the reports are submitted?**

DD – Yes this can happen as has occurred in the past at other projects. We would provide a summary similar to the one found here for our Conestogo project:

[http://www.nexteraenergycanada.com/pdf/conestogo/BirdBatMonitoring/Conestogo\\_BirdBatMonitoring2014\\_FactSheet.pdf](http://www.nexteraenergycanada.com/pdf/conestogo/BirdBatMonitoring/Conestogo_BirdBatMonitoring2014_FactSheet.pdf)

JR – We do not normally get our results until after the monitoring season is complete and there are multiple calculations that have to occur which unfortunately slows down the process.

**For the next meeting can you have the timing details of the report and also provide additional information to assist in the public being able to understand the reports.**

Charlotte then continued discussing monitoring and mitigation measures.

**Natural Heritage Monitoring**

- Post construction monitoring of certain natural features and wildlife habitats are required by the REA, including:

- Woodland and edge restoration monitoring (3 years)
- Amphibian woodland breeding habitat surveys (1 year)
- Habitat monitoring will begin in 2016, in accordance with the requirements of the REA
- Annual reports will be submitted to MNRF by December 31 of each year of monitoring

**Are these reports available to the public to read? Why or why not?**

DD – I believe they are not. I would have to confirm if this is possible but I can take a look and see if this is possible. **Update:** Reports are not made available. However public summaries will be prepared for the website similar to above for bird and bat monitoring.

Charlotte then discussed species-at-risk monitoring.

**Species-At-Risk (SAR) Monitoring**

- Species at Risk mortality monitoring began in the summer of 2015
- Monitoring is being conducted in accordance with MNRF requirements
- Annual report are prepared and submitted to MNRF in accordance with reporting requirements
- Species at Risk Monitoring continues for the life of the project

**Is the SAR report able to be posted online?**

CM – No we cannot provide this information to the public.

Chair asks for CM to detail why this information is sensitive?

The MNRF tracks SAR information to understand more, the reason this is not released to the public is that there may be poaching issues as well potential for sensitive habitat destruction from people who want to find or watch these species.

**How many SAR are you monitoring for this project?**

CM – For the April to November studies there are 4 birds and 2 bats (see below for list). We are not covering the Redside Dace as we don't expect there to be impacts to watercourses from the project.

SAR being studied:

- Eastern Meadowlark
- Bobolink
- Barn Swallow
- Bank Swallow
- Little Brown Myotis
- Brown Myotis

## 6. Depositions

**Procedural Question – I am wondering why you limit the depositions submitted and that you can hand pick the ones that are acceptable. This process seems un-democratic to me.**

Chair – This process has been used for all CLC meetings and is a similar process used in local municipal

council meetings. We use this approach to ensure deposition is related to the topics being discussed at the upcoming meeting.

Marian Ratcliffe – refer to Appendix A

Maria de Melo – refer to Appendix A

Martina Hayward – deposition not provided.

**Comment: This is not a “company issue”; rather this is a matter that needs to be addressed by the government. This is not the company’s technical fault but rather the people who make the rules.**

DD – I think the take away from Ms. De Melo is that we need to review the Acoustic report and see where there may be issues.

**Comment: (Maria De Melo) – I understand that you have a job to do but what you need to do is being a good corporate citizen, please consider the impact to the eight to nine families, we are in the position now to have to move and abandon our homes. The takeaway here is that you are impacting people and animals and you need to be accountable for this.**

**How many abandoned homes are there in Ontario due to Industrial Wind Turbines (IWTs)?**

Bev C. – This is a very tough question as you would have to obtain information from all the different projects and there would be various gaps in information.

**James C. - I emailed NextEra awhile back asking to number the turbines, do you have an update on this?**

DD – Yes, all of the turbines have had numbers placed on them.

**Are there GPS coordinates of the Turbines?**

DD – Yes they are in the REA reports.

**Is NextEra considering adding additional CLC meetings?**

**Bev C. – I would like this to be addressed tonight.**

AR – First we would need to address this with all CLC members and give them a chance to provide input. I think in the CLC meeting summary we need to set a time limit to make this decision.

**This is the committee and these are the members who should decide another meeting, this is the way council works.**

AR – The resolution is a request to host additional meetings after which we go back to the MOECC to determine if additional meetings are required.

**The community wants this; that alone should be reason enough. I think at the very least is that we have one additional meeting in September / October. I am not prepared to let it go, I want a decision tonight.**

Chair – To clarify, the CLC does not include NextEra reps, it only includes the members who have volunteered their time. This decision cannot be made just by two CLC members; we need to speak with



AECOM  
 215 – 55 Wyndham Street North  
 Guelph, ON, Canada N1H 7T8  
 Tel: 519 763 7783 Fax: 519 763 1668



all CLC members, the MOECC and the municipality of West Grey.

After a discussion with CLC members, members of the public and NextEra it was confirmed that an additional meeting will occur. Details regarding this meeting will be communicated to the CLC once a date is set. At this point we are aiming for Fall 2016.

### 7. Public Question and Answer / Meeting Adjournment

The Chair noted that as members of the public were able to ask questions throughout the meeting and as we are at the end of the allotted timeframe that the meeting will be adjourned. This being said the Chair noted that members of the public are encouraged to follow up with individual NextEra team members to address their questions.

### PARKING LOT

Parking Lot Topic	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Natural Heritage Assessment reports are posted online prior to being submitted to the MNRF.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NHA reports are not made available. However public summaries will be prepared for the website similar to the bird and bat monitoring reports.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CLC provided the results of the acoustic study for their review by next CLC meeting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NextEra to confirm by next CLC meeting.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Date for additional CLC meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NextEra will confirm timing for additional CLC meeting and contact CLC members. Aiming for Fall 2016.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CLC to be provided more information regarding mortality monitoring and natural heritage once available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NextEra and NRSI to provide more information at the next CLC meeting.</li> </ul>



AECOM  
215 – 55 Wyndham Street North  
Guelph, ON, Canada N1H 7T8  
Tel: 519 763 7783 Fax: 519 763 1668



## **Appendix A**

### Depositions from Members of the Public



AECOM  
215 – 55 Wyndham Street North  
Guelph, ON, Canada N1H 7T8  
Tel: 519 763 7783 Fax: 519 763 1668



## **Marian Ratcliffe**

Good evening Ladies and Gentlemen

My name is Marian Ratcliffe and I am a non-participating resident within the East Durham Wind Turbine Project. I have asked to speak to you today about the manner in which NextEra is handling our complaints regarding their project.

My husband and I have been lodging noise complaints (48 or more) against the these turbines, T2 especially, since they started up in August 2015 and are still suffering loss of sleep (over 100 nights) and loss of enjoyment of home and property due to noise pollution generated by the turbines. We can hear them not just outside, but inside our home. Our neighbours share similar complaints.

First up, the Call Centre in Florida to report our complaints, too often we sit on hold and really they are a bit far away to be of any use. Wouldn't it be better if we called someone local and were able to have them out right away to hear the noise?

At the CLC meeting, August 27, 2015, Keith Oswald spoke to you about the noise issues and that night T2 was shut down and stayed down for about 2 weeks. On Sept. 2nd I received a letter from NextEra (Catherine A. Mitchell, Senior Business Manager) dated August 25th responding to complaints lodged that month. In it I was informed that the turbines had been evaluated and found to be operating normally and in compliance with all limits mandated by the REA. I also have an email from Derek Dudek dated Sept. 1, 2015, forwarded to me by Susan Tweney letting her know that T2 was down for repairs.

Mid September T2 started up again and the noise from it was as bad or worse than before. Keith and I and our neighbours were all complaining about the noise. We were subjected to the hum, the jet screams and the loud whooshes and whompfs of T2 and we lost sleep, we couldn't stand to have windows open or be outside much and so we complained. We were told NextEra was investigating our complaints and sound studies would soon start.

Of letters, we only received two others, both generic, one in October was only a response to the CLC in August and requested our patience as NextEra carried out maintenance and calibration checks and performed sound studies. And another in November informing Sir/Madam that the sound audit studies had begun and that any mitigation measures would be determined from the results. NextEra would of course continue to investigate our complaints.

Between the restart of T2 mid September and the end of November I lost over 55 nights of sleep and lodged 20 complaints with NextEra and the MOECC regarding the serious noise issues with T2, as well as direct conversations with Derek Dudek on the issue. I was repeatedly told, "we are investigating". I asked many questions relating to the investigation of this noise problem, but wasn't given very informative answers. I was told the turbines were operating normally and that NextEra would ensure compliance with the MOECC sound limits, but would do no more than that. I asked to speak to





AECOM  
215 – 55 Wyndham Street North  
Guelph, ON, Canada N1H 7T8  
Tel: 519 763 7783 Fax: 519 763 1668



someone with more authority than Mr. Dudek and was refused. I even requested NextEra send their Acoustic Engineer out to investigate the problem at my home, turns out NextEra doesn't have one, I was told that if I wanted that I would have to hire my own.

In an email dated Nov. 6th Derek Dudek again stated that T2 was operating normally. In a phone call Nov. 24th, Derek admitted that another had reported similar noise concerns with T2, turns out it was Representatives from the MOECC Owen Sound corroborating my complaints. Still it was about Nov. 27th (Derek wasn't sure) that Techs were out to the turbines, they went up to the hub and found "something" loose that was responsible for the intense noise issue. What "investigations" were your people doing prior to that? And why do we have to have the MOECC backing up our complaints to get you to take action?

Sadly, the noise problems continued and so did our complaints.

Accepting the fact that NextEra wasn't really investigating our complaints I asked more questions and Dec. 4th I requested that they review my complaints against turbine operations, wind speed, direction and anything else available and let me know the results. Derek told me this would take some time. I waited patiently, but heard nothing. Then, in January, I read the minutes for CLC 3 and saw that NextEra is required to provide the MOECC with wind speed and direction as well as "A description of the measures taken to address the cause of the incident and to prevent a similar occurrence in the future". Perfect, send me that please. And I waited. After repeating the request I was told no, the "Team" doesn't feel that it is proper, turns out NextEra may not have an Acoustic Engineer on staff, but they definitely have a Lawyer.

In the mean time we continue to have our sleep disturbed and suffer with the noise, we lodge our complaints and NextEra does their investigations which are limited to checking the maintenance of the turbines and waiting for sound studies. I would have it noted at this point that NextEra personnel have only visited my property once, back in August, and my property is not a subject of any sound studies.

With all I have stated above how can anyone expect me to believe that NextEra has done any proper investigation into our complaints? My goal is to have NextEra honour their assurances that they would not have a negative effect on our health or enjoyment of property; as far as I can tell NextEra does not share this goal.

I support the Municipality of West Grey's request that the CLC meetings continue beyond the 4 required by the REA. We need this venue to make public the ongoing frustrations we have with NextEra and their inaction with respect to our complaints.

Thank you for letting me speak tonight.



AECOM  
215 – 55 Wyndham Street North  
Guelph, ON, Canada N1H 7T8  
Tel: 519 763 7783 Fax: 519 763 1668



## **Maria De Melo**

My name is Maria De Melo. I have happily lived and worked from home in West Grey for almost 15 years. Over 2 years ago I became aware of NextEra's plan to erect 14 Industrial wind turbines in my immediate environment.

At first, I had no preconceived notion about IWTs; perhaps I could even say that I was under the impression that this was a good idea in fighting climate change and transitioning to clean energy. As I began to research this technology I quickly became aware of information and research that painted a negative picture of IWTs. World-wide some people and animals that lived in close proximity to IWTs were experiencing negative health effects.

Closer to home, the first red flag was starting to be apparent. It seemed that our government had decided to force IWTs on poor communities by removing citizens and their municipality's democratic rights.

The second red flag for me was the day, as a concerned citizen, I walked into our community's ERT. What I saw that day was shocking and foreign, I felt like I was no longer in Canada. In a large room 2 tables faced each other: one full with NextEra's lawyers sitting together with our government's lawyers. Across from them was a courageous citizen taking them on, sitting at his table alone. It quickly became apparent that our government was not there to protect us. Before my eyes and ears the MOE became the ANTI-MOE, completely biased and prejudiced against the citizens they are mandated and paid to protect.

With this new realization, I got up from my citizen's seat and joined the lone appellant citizen at his table.

For over 2 years now our community has rallied together determined to gain back our democracy and rights. But alas, a company with so much financial gain at stake together with the Anti-MOE was too much to overcome. Together, they had ensured all avenues for citizens were blocked and futile. About 6 months ago the 14 IWTs started operating and shortly thereafter the citizen's worst nightmare became apparent. At first, the closest citizens started feeling the effects. Although I could not see or physically hear the IWTs I did not stop advocating for our hurting citizens. The stories were heartbreaking, citizens like Susan Tweney, Martina Hayward, Marian Ratcliff, Lynn Andrews, Peter Turner, Gary Hooper to name a few were now daily being highly impacted and were having difficulty living in their homes.

As the cold weather hit, I closed my windows and my nightmare also began. Like another citizen, Jackie Vainik, who also cannot see or physically hear them our symptoms are similar. Suddenly after living here in peace for 15 years, I am having trouble sleeping. When I finally do fall asleep I wake up in the morning, exhausted and disoriented. No matter where I go in my house this high pitch, buzzing noise follows me. I find it difficult to concentrate and think, my brain feels fried and scrambled. Because I live and work here, there is no escape.

Our stories are no longer based on research and hearsay; this is our new reality, stuck in our dream



AECOM  
215 – 55 Wyndham Street North  
Guelph, ON, Canada N1H 7T8  
Tel: 519 763 7783 Fax: 519 763 1668



homes, unable to live in peace.

At the last CLC meeting I stood up and told you- some of us were being highly impacted and requested you test our homes as part of your sound study. You decided to ignore this information, us and this request. Instead, you have chosen to go about doing our anti-MOE's work, ensuring you protect NextEra's bottom line.

As a result, we have done our own sound study, which I will provide you with copies. Our results show your IWTs are not in compliance.

Our results show that prior to the IWTs, between 1am – 5 am, most points were in the low 20 dBA range. Now, between 1am – 5 am, when people are trying to sleep, these highly impacted properties experience averages of low-mid-high 40 dBA range.

Throughout history, corrupt governments and big business have needed their employees to carry out their dirty work. You are these employees. Though I and my impacted neighbours have to live with the IWTs, you must live with yourselves.

The health study conducted by our government acknowledges that as much as 15%+ are impacted, well here we are. Edmund Burke said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men (and I add good women) to do nothing." With this in mind, I ask you to meet with us and try and help our community find solutions that can help those impacted. We will pursue this meeting through our municipal representatives Bev and Carol. Expect to hear from us because we expect you to do the right thing.

Thank you.



AECOM  
215 – 55 Wyndham Street North  
Guelph, ON, Canada N1H 7T8  
Tel: 519 763 7783 Fax: 519 763 1668



## **Appendix B**

### Financial Donations



AECOM  
215 – 55 Wyndham Street North  
Guelph, ON, Canada N1H 7T8  
Tel: 519 763 7783 Fax: 519 763 1668



## Financial Donations

- **Diamond Project** – Ballpark and Playground Improvement Project - \$2500
- **Durham Community Health Care Foundation** - \$5000
- **Durham Youth Fishing Derby** - \$1000
- Approached by **The Friends of Vickers Park** for a mobile music stage, NextEra was pursuing a donation but unfortunately the proposed project did not go forward.