Wednesday May 1st we attended Kincardines council meeting. They passed the resolution to make their community not a willing host for IWT.

Kincardine area is inundated with IWT already. It is good that their council is taking a stand now even though it is a little late. We would like to see our municipality act now to make it quite clear we do not want wind turbine projects coming here and that we tell Premier Wynne that "Northern Bruce Peninsula is not a willing host."

If all municipalities act together to send the same message, a united voice will be heard by the new Ontario government, just as it was heard by the McGuinty government.

We would like to have our council follow the other 18 communities sending a clear message to the new Premier that Northern Bruce Peninsula is not a willing host for Industrial Wind Turbines.

The residence, cottagers and visitors sent a clear message with a petition with 5,400 signatures and a resolution to Dalton McGuinty that Industrial Wind Turbines are not welcomed on the Peninsula now let the new premier know as well.

Following please find the communities that have sent their message and a sample resolution. Thank you for your consideration.

NOT a Willing host

The eighteen (18) townships and counties in Ontario below have already passed specific resolutions saying they are NOT "willing host community to Industrial Wind Turbines.

1. Arran-Elderslie, Township
2. Cavan Monaghan, Township
3. Chatsworth, Township
4. East Zorra-Tavistock, Township
5. Enniskillen, Township
6. Georgian Bluffs, Township
7. Grey Highlands, Township
8. Huron East, Township
9. Kawartha Lakes, City of
10. Kincardine, Township
11. Meaford, Township
Dear Premier,

Please be advised that Council for the Township of **Northern Bruce Peninsula**, at its meeting held on XXXX, 2013, passed the following resolution:

**WHEREAS** the Premier of Ontario has recently conveyed the Government’s desire to limit Industrial Wind Turbine (IWT) Projects to communities that are willing hosts;

**AND WHEREAS** Council for the Township of **Northern Bruce Peninsula** has received a clear message from its residents that they are not willing to host to IWTs

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Council for the Township of **Northern Bruce Peninsula** applauds the position taken by the Premier and the Government;

**AND THAT** based on the position of Council for the Township of **Northern Bruce Peninsula** and the input received from the community regarding IWTs, the Province of Ontario and specifically the Ministry of Environment be now advised that the Township of **Northern Bruce Peninsula** is not a “willing host” for IWTs;

**AND THAT** this resolution be circulated to Premier Kathleen Wynne, as well as to the Minister of Environment, Minister of Energy, Minister of Rural Affairs and to all Ontario municipalities for their support and endorsement.

A copy of the signed Resolution is enclosed for your records. Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

XXXX

CC: Honourable, Jim Bradley, MPP, Minister of the Environment
Honourable Bob Chiarelli, MPP, Minister of Energy
Honourable Jeff Leal, MPP, Minister of Rural Affairs
All Ontario Municipalities (via email)

Thank you
Lynn Szymezko
Linda Weatherhead
Moved by T. Boyle
Seconded by R. Burns

Resolution # 25-03-2012

WHEREAS Council has received a petition signed by over 5,500 residents, cottagers, and visitors alike opposing industrial wind turbines on the Bruce Peninsula. As well, a significant amount of correspondence against the construction of industrial wind turbines anywhere in Northern Bruce Peninsula;

WHEREAS the Bruce Peninsula consists of a World Biosphere, two (2) Federal National Parks, the Bruce Trail, Earth ANSI's, Provincially Significant Wetlands, Provincial Parks, Nature Reserves and Conservancy Lands, the Bruce County Forest Tract, Niagara Escarpment, and countless Environmental Sensitive Areas;

WHEREAS the Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula was proclaimed a “Dark Sky Community” in 2004, in the hope of protecting the night time environment;

WHEREAS the Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula’s strategic priorities include the conservation and protection of the unique and natural environment and enhanced citizen involvement;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula does not support the building of industrial wind turbines on the Bruce Peninsula;

AND FURTHERMORE THAT this resolution be circulated to Premier Dalton McGuinty, Minister of Energy Chris Bentley, Minister of the Environment Jim Bradley, Minister of Natural Resources Michael Gravelle, M.P. Larry Miller, M.P.P. Bill Walker, All Bruce County Municipalities, and the County of Bruce.

The Clerk read the motion on the floor and proceeded to call and record the votes of Council:

Councillor Stewart: Yes
Councillor Burns: Yes
Councillor Boyle: Yes
Deputy Mayor Bainbridge: Yes
Mayor McIver: Yes

The Clerk announced that the motion was carried.

Carried
May 2, 2013

Mayor and Members of Council
Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula
56 Lindsay Road S., R.R. #2
Lion’s Head, ON N0H 1W0

To the Mayor and Members of Council:

RE: CAA’s Annual Worst Roads Campaign

I am pleased to report that on May 1, 2013, CAA launched its annual Worst Roads campaign. At Queen’s Park, CAA called on the province to make Ontario’s annual deferred municipal road repair bill - the $2.8 billion funding gap identified in the Municipal-Provincial Fiscal and Service Delivery Review (2008) - a priority issue. Additionally, CAA reinforced its call for sharing gas tax profits with municipalities by establishing a dedicated fund for municipal road, bridge and highway improvements.

The provincial excise tax, which currently stands at 14.7 cents on every litre of gas and diesel sold in Ontario, generates about $2.3 billion a year. To see the greatest improvement, CAA believes that dedicating some gas tax profits to fixing our municipal roads, bridges and highways is long overdue.

As in past years, we are seeking feedback at www.worstroads.ca from your constituents on roads and highways that are in desperate need of improvement. Not only are we interested in roads suffering from potholes and crumbling pavement, we are also seeking feedback on roads with pedestrian and cycling safety issues, congestion, poorly timed traffic lights and confusing road signs and road markings. Voting is open until May 31, 2013. After verification and assessment of the nominated roads by the Ontario Road Builders Association, CAA will unveil this year’s Ontario Top 10 Worst Roads List.

Recognizing that roads and bridges make up the largest piece of the municipal infrastructure portfolio at about 45 percent, municipalities play a critical role in ensuring our roads, bridges and highways are well maintained. We ask that you continue to make maintenance and rehabilitation of road infrastructure a top priority to ensure safety and to support mobility for all road users. Additionally, we encourage you to visit our website to see what your constituents are saying about roads in your community.

For more than 100 years, CAA has advocated to improve traffic safety, mobility, transportation infrastructure and consumer protection. As one of Ontario’s largest
membership organizations, we continue to ensure our members' voices are heard at both Queen's Park and across Ontario's 444 municipalities. With over 2.2 million members in Ontario and 5.8 million members across Canada, there is no other organization more in touch with Ontario motorists than CAA.

We look forward to reporting back on the results of the 2013 Worst Roads campaign. Should you have any questions or concerns regarding Worst Roads or any of CAA's advocacy initiatives, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Yours truly,

John Ennis
Government Relations
CAA
905-771-3457
jenn@caasco.ca

Attachments: (1) Fact Sheet
CAA Worst Roads

✓ Annual grassroots infrastructure advocacy campaign
✓ Seeks public input on the condition of Ontario roads, bridges and highways
✓ Highlights the need for:
  1. Dedicated provincial funding for municipal road and highway improvements; and,
  2. Prioritization of road repairs at the municipal level

Why is this so important?

- Ontario's provincial government has charged a gas tax since 1925 and there is a need for a dedicated fund to help pay for municipal road, highway and bridge repair

- Ontario's deferred municipal road and bridge repair bill is estimated at $2.8 billion a year*

- Municipalities are responsible for maintaining over 140,000 kilometers of road and more than 15,000 bridges and large culverts

- The Government of Ontario is responsible for 16,600 kilometers of road and 4,750 bridges and large culverts

- Roads and bridges make up the largest sector of municipal infrastructure – 45 percent of the total municipal infrastructure portfolio

- Ontario roads, highways and bridges serve over 9 million licensed drivers in Ontario, facilitate millions of transit trips each year and support the movement of billions of dollars of goods

- Ontario motorists continue to pay twice: once at the pump and again at the garage

- Ontario motorists deserve gas tax fairness through dedicated funding – all motorists contribute and all motorists should benefit

---

Gas Tax – The Original Funding Tool: An Overview

**Ontario Provincial Gas Tax**

- Levied by the Government of Ontario
- $0.147 per litre
- Generated over $2.3 billion in 2011-2012 **

**Federal Gas Tax**

- Levied by the Government of Canada
- $0.10 per litre
- Generated over $1.6 billion in 2011-2012 (in Ontario)

**Dedicated for municipal roads, highways and bridges:**

- Provincial: 0%
- Federal: 50%

---

**Public Accounts of Ontario 2011-2012
April, 2013

Re: Ontario Medal For Good Citizenship

Dear Friends:

I am pleased to invite you to participate in the 2013 Ontario Medal for Good Citizenship by nominating a deserving citizen.

Established in 1973, the Ontario Medal for Good Citizenship honours Ontarians who, through exceptional, long-term efforts, have made outstanding contributions to community life.

Recipients will be presented with their medal by the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario at a special ceremony at Queen’s Park in the Fall of 2013.

Nomination can be made by visiting the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration’s website at: www.ontario.ca/honoursandawards. You may submit your nomination on-line by choosing the “Nominate Online” option, or download the PDF format on the website to submit by mail. For any further information, please contact the Ontario Honours and Awards Secretariat at 416 314-7526, 1 877 832-8622 or (TTY) 416 327-2391. Nominations must be received by July 17, 2013.

I encourage you to take the time to nominate a deserving citizen in your community for an Ontario Medal for Good Citizenship. The men and women we honour stand as shining examples to us all.

Sincerely,

Michael Coteau
Minister
MEDIA RELEASE:

$1 Million Funding Announced for BruceGreySimcoe Tourism Projects

BRUCEGREYSIMCOE, May 3, 2013: Regional Tourism Organization 7 (RTO7) announced the intention to work with Bruce, Grey, and Simcoe municipalities, tourism organizations and operators through its new partnership funding program that will see $1 million in jointly funded initiatives at work to develop tourism across the region.

The new projects include improvements in tourism signage, support for development of experiences, festivals and events, and projects to expand marketing efforts to draw more visitors to the region. The funding comes from existing and new money made available from the Province of Ontario, explained Executive Director Jeffrey Schmidt.

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport has provided the organization with $300,000 in new funding, provided matching dollars could be raised from tourism partners. Last November RTO7 – which promotes the region under the BruceGreySimcoe banner – announced plans to bolster this with an additional $200,000 from its base funding.

“The tourism industry responded enthusiastically to this opportunity,” said Schmidt. “In fact, we received 80 applications for funding that far exceeded our capacity. But the terrific news is that based on over $500,000 in matching contributions from our partners, we have achieved our goal of putting $1 million to work in the coming year to grow the region’s tourism economy.”

The program is a new venture for the tourism organization, and represents a departure from grants awarded by the Province, said Alexandra Hogan, Manager of Partnerships. “We’ll be working in close partnerships with organizations to help manage and execute these initiatives. This is a win-win opportunity that will strengthen collaboration and the competitiveness of the region.”

The selection of projects is only the first step in the program, noted Hogan. Funding is still subject to approval based on agreements that will be vetted by RTO7 and the Ministry, a process that she says will take a few weeks to finalize.

Approved Initiatives

The list of 32 approved projects range from support to promote established experiences including Saugeen Shores’ successful Pumpkinfoest, Jazz on the Mountain at Blue Mountain, and the Apple Pie and Ice Cream Trails. RTO7 looks forward to giving these and other events a boost, says Executive Director Schmidt, “But what has us really excited are ideas that came forward to develop new experiences, and those that reflected broad-based cooperation and support. These include a unique cultural tourism offering proposed by Simcoe and Grey museums, development of international tourism around Georgian Bay, and support for cooperative marketing of this summer’s Tall Ships Tour, an initiative supported by all five involved municipalities and Huronia Historical Parks.”

Particular projects that Schmidt said were “no brainers” when it came to approval were compelling applications by Grey County and the Township of Oro-Medonte to develop the growing cycling tourism market in the region. He went on to say that following consultation both partners readily agreed to join forces and consolidate their efforts.

“We couldn’t be more thrilled to work with Grey County and RTO7 to develop cycling in the region,” said Donna Hewitt, Director Corporate & Strategic Initiatives with Oro-Medonte. She added: “With the support that we have received from Tourism Simcoe County, and the combination of ideas and resources from our cycling partners this project is a golden opportunity to truly advance cycling tourism as a growing attractor of new visitation to the region.”

The list of approved RTO7 Partnership Funding Initiatives for 2013 is as follows (figures represent RTO7 funding allocations only and do not include matching funds from partner organizations):
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Lead Partner</th>
<th>RTO7 Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apple Pie Trail Promotion</td>
<td>Municipality of Meaford</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGS Golf Product/Experience Development</td>
<td>Resorts of Ontario</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Route Signage</td>
<td>Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Development/Research &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>Grey County &amp; Township of Oro-Medonte</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Music Festival Promotion</td>
<td>Meaford Hall &amp; Culture Foundation</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glampalooza Thornbury</td>
<td>The Cheese Gallery</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey County Paddling Signage</td>
<td>County of Grey</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey-Bruce Campground Advertising</td>
<td>Summer House Park Ltd.</td>
<td>$14,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Cream Trail Promotion</td>
<td>Township of Huron-Kinloss</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz on the Mountain at Blue Online Contest</td>
<td>Jazz on the Mountain Festivals Inc.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse Blues Festival Promotion</td>
<td>Lighthouse Blues Festival Inc.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion’s Head Signage</td>
<td>Lion’s Head Promotincs Group</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Campaign for Campgrounds</td>
<td>Barrie KOA Campground</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Campaign for Orillia F&amp;E Co-op</td>
<td>City of Orillia Tourism Co-op</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Cottage? No Problem! Campaign</td>
<td>Fern Resort</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Marketing</td>
<td>Mt. St. Louis Moonstone</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Sound Salmon Tour Development</td>
<td>City of Owen Sound</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo &amp; Video Database Development</td>
<td>Ontario’s Lake Country</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumpkinfest Promotion</td>
<td>Saugeen Shores Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-branding/Website Development</td>
<td>Tom Thomson Art Gallery</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saints &amp; Sinners Trail Development</td>
<td>SUMAC</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauble Beach Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>Town of South Bruce Peninsula</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saugeen River Kiosk Signage</td>
<td>Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Georgian Bay International Travel Trade</td>
<td>Georgian Bay Destination Dev. Partnership</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfing Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Municipality of Kincardine</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall Ships Tour 2013 Marketing</td>
<td>So. Georgian Bay War of 1812 Committee</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Art Map Marketing</td>
<td>ColourPix</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Branding</td>
<td>Clearview Township</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Workforce Training</td>
<td>RTO7 / County of Bruce</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>Municipality of Brockton</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding/Signage Implementation</td>
<td>Township of Huron-Kinloss</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding/Signage Plan &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Town of Midland</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About Regional Tourism Organization 7: RTO7 provides strategic and collaborative leadership to build, sustain and grow tourism in Bruce, Grey and Simcoe counties. It is one of 13 independent not-for-profit corporations to which the Ontario government provides some $40 million in annual funding to lead tourism planning, marketing and development. Quick facts about BruceGreySimcoe tourism:

- Each year the three counties that comprise the region attract an estimated 9.5 million visitors, who spend an estimated $1.2 billion on everything from food & beverage to accommodation to transportation.
- Tourism across the region accounts for almost 7% of over $17 billion in total Ontario tourism spending and employs some 27,000 people.
- BruceGreySimcoe has in excess of 25,000 accommodation rooms, including hotels, motels, camping and RV sites, commercial resorts, cabins and B&Bs.
- There are over 400 attractions across the region, and over 600 festival and event days each year.

For more information:
Contact: Alexandra Hogan, Manager of Partnerships: ahogan@rto7.ca | (705) 441-2831
Or visit: The partnership funding resource page at www.rto7.ca
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Dear Council Members:

My name is Stephanie Warkentin, and I am President of the small nonprofit group that is currently undertaking the restoration of Knife Island Lighthouse in Stokes Bay. We are called Bruce Peninsula Lightkeepers Association, and I have spoken with some of you on various occasions or by email about our project. We are in a lease agreement right now with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans that allows us to do this work if we can find the funds.

We have never requested money before from the municipality, but right now is a particularly good time for the municipal council to show its support. We are being considered for grant money from the Ontario Trillium Foundation right now, and we would like to be able to tell them we have received some contribution from our community toward the project in order to increase our chances of being accepted this year. The project is estimated to cost $50,000 without consideration of weather delays and transportation costs involved getting crew and materials to the island. So while we have asked for this main cost from the Trillium Fund, we are hoping to raise enough on our own and to get enough volunteers to alleviate the transportation costs and any extra unforeseen costs that can happen during a restoration project of this nature. They have said that our project is “fundable”, and even seem favorably inclined towards it, but they need to see that we have support behind us already in order that we will be able to keep up the structure and never allow it to end up in the state that it is currently. Coastguard has not done any maintenance to the building that we know of for almost two decades, and it shows. We will need to do yearly weatherproofing and paint maintenance to ensure that once restoration is complete we can keep her looking good. Our small group has a lot of friends nearby in Stokes Bay that don’t necessarily have money to contribute but are almost always willing to lend a hand or any materials they might have to donate in kind. We have raised almost $1000.00 on our own, but I don’t think this is enough to convince the Trillium fund to give us what we need.

We have also applied for some small grant money that could be available to our group from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, but this is a long drawn out process and there are approximately 800 other lighthouse groups asking for the same thing across the country. We can’t expect them to decide in time to help our cause with the Trillium Fund.

If however, we had a contribution from the municipality, or at least a pledge of a contribution, we know it would go a very long way to helping them to decide in our favor. They would not be as concerned about our not being able to cover the cost of restoration should it go over the estimated cost. We are shooting for a $10,000 cushion amount, for a total of 60,000, including the grant money from the Trillium Foundation. Thus far we have only 1,000.00, though we are hopeful of raising more in the coming summer, as more cottagers arrive. We know that restorations often encounter delays, unknown problems as a structure this old (built 1904) is taken apart, and the island location will absolutely complicate matters for delays when the crew will not be able to go out to work due to wind and waves. So we believe this “cushion” fund will be necessary to make sure we can cover the end cost. Any funds left over will be allocated for the coming years’ annual maintenance, as we will have to do in future, to prevent the structure ever deteriorating again.
Especially in light of the many, many tourism/economic benefits we all know our historic lighthouses bring to the municipality in general, I am hoping you will give BPLA some monetary support. I don’t think I need to explain those benefits, but I will emphasize that Knife Island Lighthouse is part of the “self guided lighthouse tour” that is promoted by our tourism groups online and in their tour maps. This restoration project will definitely have a ripple effect over the whole municipality, and has the added benefit of a lot of youth interest in the community. We have a steady stream of visitors kayaking, sailing and motorboating out to the island in summer. Many of those visitors are dismayed to find that the Irish Harbor rear range lighthouse is now gone, and we are simply not willing to let them find an empty place on Knife Island too. Please see this link to our facebook page https://www.facebook.com/pages/Knife-Island-Lighthouse-Restoration-Project/400477716679110 and the featured video from the Bruce coast Lighthouse tour, also on their page. http://www.brucecoastlighthouses.com/

I know we have missed the community nonprofit grant deadline, but we are hoping that some similar allocation will be made to us in this special circumstance. Any extra funds left over from the restoration project (if any) will be used only for maintenance of the building in future. Upkeep of the structure and insurance costs are our only expenditures, as we are all volunteers. There are no paid positions in BPLA, and everyone donates any administrative materials or promotional costs as we need them. So our budget is quite simple, and we have no day to day transactions. Except for the insurance payment (already donated for this year), our funds will stay in the bank until the lighthouse needs them. Funds can only be spent if two authorized board members sign the check.

We just need to be able to assure the Trillium grant reviewers that we do indeed have our community and our municipality behind us in this really much needed effort to preserve our last remaining lighthouse in Stokes Bay. The loss of the Irish Harbor light a few years ago has left many community members upset and even more determined not to let Knife Island Lighthouse slip through our fingers as well. Our municipality was singularly unhelpful at that time, and we hope you’ll decide to make up for it now. It’s our marine heritage, and it is the last of three beautiful lightstations that once graced Stokes Bay shores. We absolutely must not let the last one remaining deteriorate further! Now that the Big Tub Lighthouse has been fixed up, Knife Island Lighthouse is the last of our local historical lighthouse sites to be properly looked after. It’s time!

Let’s do it now! This summer! We have almost convinced the Trillium Grant reviewers, and jumped through all the correct paper hoops with Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and all we need is a little boost from you! Please feel free to call me or request any information you need to make a decision on this. I’m happy to deliver it to the township before the next council meeting, or to appear at the meeting if required.

Thanks for your consideration and your time.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Warkentin
President of Bruce Peninsula Lightkeepers Association
Northern Bruce Peninsula

From: Walker, Bill <bill.walker@pc.ola.org>
Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 4:23 PM
To: Walker, Bill
Subject: RW: Statement from Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound MPP Bill Walker on the Chi-Cheemaun Ferry

The following statement was issued earlier today by MPP Walker:

Statement from Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound MPP Bill Walker

“I was very pleased to receive a call from the minister’s office this morning with the news he was stepping in with the necessary funds for the repair of the fender units. This repair work will ensure that the Chi-Cheemaun is safe for passengers and crew alike to dock at both Tobermory and South Baymouth.

I sincerely thank Minister Gravelle for listening to my concerns and working closely and collaboratively on this critical file, and for his leadership in getting the Chi-Cheemaun to sail again. This ferry service is a lifeline for our communities.

As a vital service to residents and businesses, I know MP Larry Miller is pushing for the work on the Chi-Cheemaun to commence immediately so we can have minimal impact on our region’s economy.

Both Larry and I have worked hard behind the scenes to push for the work to be completed because we understand the impact to our small business owners.”

CONTACT:
Ana Sajfert
Office of Bill Walker, MPP
Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound

O: 416-325-6242
BB: 416-768-1534
ana.sajfert@pc.ola.org
Helping People...
Social networking for Social Services

An opportunity for busy Social Service professionals to meet front line staff from other agencies, hear about the programs they offer and discuss how you can work together

**Speed Networking** Based on the concept of speed dating, you will connect with other service providers in 5-minute intervals.

**Labour Market Information** What careers are in-demand and where? Discuss barriers to employment and available supports.
- Four County Labour Market Planning Board
- Canadian Mental Health Association—Crisis Intervention
- Bruce Grey United Way—211

**It Takes a Community...** Working in teams, participants will brainstorm how the respective agency can contribute to possible pathways for sample client scenarios.

**Thursday June 6, 2013 9:00-3:00**

Elmwood Community Centre
38 Queen Street, Elmwood, ON

Lunch provided - Including dessert buffet!

Spots are limited, RSVP by May 15th
or 519-881-4655

Your registration will be confirmed after May 22nd
May 3, 2013

Dear Stakeholders,

As the new Assistant Deputy Minister of the Accessibility Directorate of Ontario, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce myself and let you know how much I look forward to working with you on this very important portfolio.

The Accessibility Directorate recently moved to the Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Employment. This will reinforce the government’s message to the private sector to help promote the employment potential of those living with a disability, and further advance economic benefits for our businesses and communities.

Over the last few years, strong leadership at the Accessibility Directorate has leveraged your work, making great strides to increase accessibility for everyone in Ontario, and reducing the barriers that people with disabilities face every day. We now have standards in key areas, and with your support, have created real momentum towards meaningful change in the province. Now we must build on that momentum and continue our work implementing the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005. Your valuable insight and support is instrumental in our continued success as we increase accessibility and reduce barriers facing all Ontarians.

Sincerely,

Ann Hoy
2013 Budget Provincial Budget Released

The Honourable Charles Sousa, Minister of Finance has released the 2013 provincial budget and includes a number of highlights which affect municipalities:

- The budget continues to honour the existing upload agreement. In 2014, the upload benefit value to municipalities totals almost $1.4 billion. This reconfirms earlier commitments to continue the uploading schedule as agreed to in 2008.

- The Minister’s speech acknowledges the need to, “prevent further pressure on our property taxes” to fund infrastructure investments. This message is reinforced on four key points:
  
  o As announced last week, the government will create a $100 million infrastructure fund for roads, bridges and other critical infrastructure to help small, rural and northern municipalities. The government will consult with municipalities on an allocation methodology soon. These funds will be available as of October 2013;

  o Consultations will start on the development of a permanent infrastructure funding program for rural and northern municipalities in 2014;

  o Existing provincial government support for public transit systems across the province will be made permanent and enshrined in the budget bill. Currently 2 cents per litre of the provincial gas tax provides over 90 municipalities with about $321 million annually. This permanency offers municipalities a predictable and stable source of revenue that grows with the economy. It meets a key ask of the municipal sector; and

  o The government will consider new revenue tools to support transportation and public transit in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area.

- Regarding the property assessment system, the government has announced a review of some key elements. This review will be led by the Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Finance, Steven Del Duca, MPP and consultations will be completed by the fall. It will review assessment appeal timelines and assessment methodologies applied to the evaluation of special-purpose business properties such as mills, industrial lands, landfills, and billboards. It will also consider how to strengthen the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) and its governance. This review will not be looking at issues affecting residential property assessment.

- The budget reaffirms a decrease to the Ontario Municipal Partnership Fund (OMPF) by $25 million in 2014. The Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) remains extremely concerned with this decrease. It is occurring at the same time as the government is consulting separately on the Ontario
 Provincial Police (OPP) costing formula and key property assessment issues during the OMPF transitional year. These are two very significant municipal cost and revenue issues currently in flux which the OMPF is supposed to help address. The sequencing of these three reviews could cause unintended consequences for municipalities in 2014. AMO again urges the government to reconsider the order of these reviews and in the meantime, restore $25 million to the OMPF envelope in 2014.

- The budget contains changes to the social assistance system which will have municipal cost implications starting in 2014. These include costs related to raising the earnings exemption and the rate increase for Ontario Works (OW). Government officials could not provide a figure on how much these changes, among others, will affect municipalities. AMO awaits these numbers. In 2014, municipalities remain responsible for funding 14.2% of OW benefit costs. This reinforces the need for caution when considering the OMPF for qualifying municipalities.

- Also included is $13.5 million over three years for drinking water source protection. This will assist small and rural communities. Additional details are pending.

AMO will continue its review of the budget and keep the membership informed.

AMO Contact: Matthew Wilson, Senior Advisor, mwilson@amo.on.ca, 416.971.9856 ext. 323.

PLEASE NOTE AMO Breaking News will be broadcast to the member municipality’s council, administrator and clerk. Recipients of the AMO broadcasts are free to redistribute the AMO broadcasts to other municipal staff as required. We have decided to not add other staff to these broadcast lists in order to ensure accuracy and efficiency in the management of our various broadcast lists.

DISCLAIMER These are final versions of AMO documents. AMO assumes no responsibility for any discrepancies that may have been transmitted with the electronic version. The printed versions of the documents stand as the official record.
RTO7 is pleased to advise that your Partnership Funding application for Northern Bruce Peninsula Cycling Signage has been conditionally approved.

Based on a financial contribution of $30,000.00, you applied for funding of $15,000.00 and we have approved funding of $15,000.00.

Please note that RTO7 access to funds from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture & Sport is contingent on there being a signed agreement in place. You are therefore strongly cautioned against initiating work before a signed agreement is in place.

Within the coming days we will contact you to arrange a meeting to discuss project scope, roles and responsibilities, and other contractual details. In the interim please review the draft sample agreement (also available on the Partnership Funding resource page). We appreciate your patience and understanding in this regard, as there are over 30 approved projects requiring our immediate attention.
We will be announcing successful partnership projects at our May 3rd information session in Meaford and hope you are able to join us (RSVP). A list of approved projects (including yours) will be distributed in the form of a media release, which will also be posted to the Partnership Funding resource page at that time.

Again, we will be in touch soon and we look forward to working together on this exciting initiative. Should you have any immediate questions, please forward by reply email and we will endeavour to respond as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

Alexandra Hogan
Manager of Partnerships / Regional Tourism Organization 7

ahogan@rto7.ca / www.rto7.ca
705.441.2931 Please note new direct line

Always in Season: BruceGreySimcoe.com
Visit us: facebook.com/BruceGreySimcoe
Please see our attached invitation to BPTA's May Meet & Greet, as well as our AGM, with featured speakers.

DATE: Monday, May 13th
TIME: 6pm - refreshments and Meet & Greet / 7pm - Speakers and AGM Meeting
PLACE: Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula Municipal Hall, Lindsay Rd. 5

Please RSVP, so we can plan snacks and drinks. We look forward to seeing you there!!

Warm regards,
Kathi Anderson
BPTA

"Catch Your Breath" on the Beautiful Bruce Peninsula

Bruce Peninsula Tourist Association
PO Box 150
Lions Head, ON NOH 1W0
519-793-4734
bruce.bpta@gmail.com
www.brucepeninsula.org

....... Also operating the Ferndale Park Information Centre
Bruce Peninsula Tourist Association

May 2013 - Meet & Greet, Speaker & AGM

Bruce Peninsula Tourist Association (BPTA) cordially invites you to attend our Annual General Meeting to be held on Monday, May 13th.

This year’s event introduces Ginny Henry, RTO7’s new Communications Coordinator, speaking to us about a new mobile app, developed for our tech-savvy visitors, as well as information on how business operators can link into RTO7’s website to further their marketing reach. You may want to take advantage of the opportunity to speak with Ginny, one-on-one, about RTO7-related topics.

We have also arranged to have Sean Liipere, recently hired as Conservation and Stewardship Manager, speak about his new role and what the vision for this community-based program includes, in a presentation entitled: “Towards a Community Conservation and Stewardship Plan”.

The evening starts at 6pm with light refreshments and a meet-and-greet in the main Information Centre area, followed by our Speakers and business meeting at 7pm. We are always looking for people who are interested in participating on the Board, or on Committees, so please ask any current Board member for more information!

We welcome BPTA members, all Peninsula business owners, our Tourism partners, and the public to attend as well. This will give us all a chance to get out and renew acquaintances, check out what’s new and what’s ‘new again’ in tourism in our neighbourhood!

Please RSVP by May 9th if you plan on attending, so we can plan for refreshments and snacks. For more information or to reserve your spot, please contact us through the BPTA office at 519-793-4734 or email us at info@brucepeninsula.org.

Bruce Peninsula Tourist Association (BPTA) is a not-for-profit association of mainly commercial enterprises, dedicated to promoting, developing and supporting tourism for businesses, organizations and governments in the entire Bruce Peninsula area.
April 30, 2013

Dear Friends,

THEO FLEURY: “Playing With Fire”

Theo Fleury…one of the NHL’s most exciting players, a former Olympic and Stanley Cup champion, brings his compelling and inspiring story to our area on Friday June 7th, 2013 at the CAW Family Education Centre in Port Elgin at 7pm. In addition to his storied hockey career, Theo is proud of his Metis Heritage and is also a member of the Siksika Nation in the Calgary area. A man who has triumphed over evil, Theo considers himself a victor and is a leader in pursuing justice for the most vulnerable in our community…children of sexual abuse.

This event is in support of the Bruce Grey Child & Family Services Foundation, which helps children throughout Bruce & Grey counties. The Mission of Bruce Grey Child and Family Services Foundation, with the support of our donors, is to raise funds to strengthen our community by enhancing the well being of vulnerable children, youth, and families through education, prevention, enrichment, and development.

Please don’t miss the opportunity to hear Theo Fleury on June 7th at CAW Family Education Centre at 7pm. Tickets are $40.00 each and can be purchased by calling Cindy at 519-371-4453 x 4133.

Your contribution can and will make a difference in the lives of the children of Grey & Bruce County. We hope we can count on your support. Thank you for opening your heart to our most disadvantaged.

Sincerely

Cindy

Cindy Wheeler (Ms.)
Senior Fund Development Officer
“Lucky. Everyone but me thought I was lucky.”

Former Canadian Professional Hockey Player and Author of “Playing With Fire”

THEO FLEURY

Visit Theo Fleury’s website www.victorwalk.com

FRIDAY, JUNE 7, 2013
7 PM · $40/person

CAW Family Education Centre
115 Shipley Avenue · Port Elgin, ON

For tickets please call
Cindy Wheeler 519-371-4453 x 4133

Sponsored in part by

Bruce Power  Rogers

Proceeds to support
BRUCE GREY CHILD & FAMILY SERVICES FOUNDATION
bgcfsfoundation.ca
April 9, 2013

Mayor Milt McIver and Members of Northern Bruce Peninsula Council

It is with much dismay that I have witnessed the lack of care taken in regards to the Tobermory Cenotaph, when clearing the roads during the winter months. At times it was completely buried in snow and now that the snow has gone, the newly-seeded grass is covered in copious amounts of sand. It is quite unfathomable to me and to others that after the municipality and federal governments spent taxpayer’s money to refurbish the area, that this has been allowed to happen.

My late husband was a proud member of Branch 290 Legion and a former service member, and he would be very upset to see this has been allowed to happen. By letting the contractor blow all the snow on to the monument and the surrounding area, it shows disrespect to all veterans. But in addition it shows a general disrespect to Tobermory Legion and all the people in the community who support the Legion and the many who gather from time to time to honour our veterans at the beautifully restored cenotaph.

I am respectfully requesting that the Municipality provide the monies and resources to clean up the sand and re-plant the grass seed if needed. Also to request that before the snow clearing season begins next year to have a discussion with Branch 290 as to how this situation will not occur again.

Yours truly,

Linda Godhue

Tobermory ON
The Hon. Denis Lebel  
Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities  
Transport Canada  
330 Sparks Street  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0N5

May 1, 2013

Dear Minister Lebel,

As the Member of Provincial Parliament for Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound, which is home of the Chi-Cheemaun ferry, I am writing today to advise of my concern over the delayed start of ferry season.

As you’re aware, the Owen Sound Transportation Company (OSTC), which operates the ferry, was forced to ground the ferry service due to serious concerns over public safety, spurred by low water levels and a lack of fender work that is needed to ensure safe passenger docking.

I recently had the opportunity to speak with OSTC CEO Susan Schrempf to be appraised of her plans to keep operating the ferry service between Tobermory and South Baymouth on Lake Huron and to offer support in getting government action. I have also been in constant communication with your colleague, Larry Miller, MP for Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound, and know that he is working hard to find a resolve to this very serious matter.

Right now, local businesses in my riding are very concerned about the impact the delayed start of the Chi-Cheemaun ferry will have on our region’s economy. These are the same businesses that are right now also bracing for losses due to declining water levels, estimated to have a social and economic impact between $50 and $100 million per year.

With that in mind, I am writing today to urge you to ramp up discussions with your provincial counterparts and fix this problem as expeditiously as possible. Every day the ferry does not operate is a significant negative impact to the businesses in our area and also on Manitoulin Island.
I understand that different levels of government have been engaged in talks; however, due to the severity of this situation to our economy, and considering the talks are at a stalemate, I am respectfully asking you - as the Federal Minister responsible for this Port - take immediate action to resolve this issue and get the Chi-Cheemaun sailing again.

Thank you.

Bill Walker, MPP
Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound

Cc: Susan Schrempf and OSTC Board
    Larry Miller, MP (Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound)
    Milt Mclver, Mayor, Northern Bruce Peninsula
    John Close, Mayor, South Bruce Peninsula
    Al Barfoot, Mayor, Georgian Bluffs
    Deb Haswell, Mayor, City of Owen Sound
    Ron Lane, Mayor, Gore Bay, Manitoulin Island
    Chamber of Commerce Presidents (NBP, SBP, OS, MI)
    The Hon. Michael Gravelle, Minister of Northern Development and Mines
    The Hon. Michael Chan, Minister of Tourism
    Michael Mantha, MP, Algoma-Manitoulin
Northern Bruce Peninsula

From: John Dowding
Sent: Wednesday, May 01, 2013 9:09 AM
To: northernbrucepen@amtelecom.net
Subject: low water levels - Georgian Bay and Lake Huron

Attention- Milton McIver- Mayor North Bruce Peninsula

Dear Milton

HELP!

We need you and your mayor counter parts in the cities and towns that line the shores of Georgian Bay, Lake Huron and Lake Michigan in both Ontario and the affected States in the United States to act immediately to push the federal governments to act NOW to implement the recommendations of the IJC- International Joint Commission to raise water levels in the Lakes Michigan, Georgian Bay and Lake Huron. If all of the mayors act as a united team that will be a very powerful force representing a very large percentage of the population of both countries. The IJC has said we have to act immediately. We need the leaders of Canada and the United States to listen to the mayors and their concommunities to say YES to moving this action ahead to address the problems we have today due to the record low water levels and to stop the bigger problems in the future.

I recently visited Tobermory and could not believe how low the water level is at the town boat launch and docks. It will not be long before boating and recreation as we know it today will not be feasible on this vital waterway. This could mean the financial collapse of the already weak economy of the north Bruce!!!!!!! I was surprised today to here on the radio news report that you were not aware of this very serious situation.

The economic impact to the provinces and states affected will be significant. As well, this action will conserve more of the world's supply of fresh drinking water which is critical for the future- act now to save the future. As you now know the IJC recommended putting blocks in the St Clair river and other rivers to act as a dam to reduce the outflow of water. Currently the outflow of water is diverting an unnatural supply of the water from lake Huron and Lakes Michigan. The water levels are so low that most people's wells are drained and they have to truck in water to their houses. We also see that wetlands have dried up in the last few years affecting animal habitat. We have also heard that the great lakes freighters are having to reduce their loads making them less efficient. This makes no sense when their is a solution. All of the above is affecting Owen Sound.

I believe that we have taken the time to have a study undertaken to prove that their is a BIG problem. We DO NOT need another study, we need to implement the steps recomended by the professionals who said ACT IMMEDIATELY.

I am a concerned and alarmed Ontartio citizen who has lived around Georgian Bay and Lake Huron for the last 20 years ( Meaford and Owen Sound and Lindsay Road 20, Larsen Cove Road North). The situation is serious and we need you to meet with your counterparts to push the federtal governments to implement the recomendations NOW. We hope you have heard this message and will react.

Thank you for listening and hopefully reacting.

John Dowding
April 27, 2013

Mayor Milt McIver
Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula
56 Lindsay Road 5,
RR#2 Lion’s Head On.,

Mayor McIver and Council:

Peninsula Bruce Trail Club volunteers are planning to install the new sign kiosks you approved in April this year. As you can see on the attached example these signs are non-commercial local information wayfinder signs for both visitors and local residents providing information about not only the Peninsula Bruce Trails but also services within the local communities. They are a cooperative venture between Peninsula Bruce Trail and County of Bruce Planning /Tourism.

In view of the above we request that the council please consider waiving the signage fees for these sign kiosks.

Thank you.

Don McIlraith, Past President, Peninsula Bruce Trail Club.
Welcome to the Bruce Trail

The Bruce Trail is Canada's longest and oldest marked footpath and the best way to explore vistas, caves, cobbled beaches, soaring cliffs, and unique flora and fauna of the Bruce Peninsula.

The 885 km Bruce Trail opened in 1967 and runs the length of the Niagara Escarpment from Queenston to Tobermory.

The Bruce Trail Conservancy is a charitable organization committed to establishing a conservation corridor and public footpath along the Niagara Escarpment, to protect its natural ecosystems and to promote environmentally responsible public access to this UNESCO World Biosphere Reserve.

Following the Bruce Trail

The trail is marked with "blazes." These blazes are painted on trees, fence posts, gate posts, stiles, bridges, rocks, and hydro poles. The main Bruce Trail is blazed in white; side trails are marked in blue (see graphic below).

Through the generosity of landowners, the Bruce Trail is routed through both private land and protected land. Please respect this privilege and stay on the blazed trail.

The Bruce Trail Users' Code

- Hike only along marked routes. Do not take short cuts.
- Do not climb fences – use the stiles.
- Respect the privacy of people living along the trail.
- Leave the Trail cleaner than you found it. Carry out all litter.
- No open fires are allowed on the Trail. Use a portable stove.
- Camp only at designated camp sites.
- Leave flowers and plants for others to enjoy.
- Do not damage live trees or strip off bark.
- Keep dogs on a leash and under control at all times.
- Do not disturb wildlife.
- Leave only your thanks and take nothing but photographs.
- Obey all signs.

"Leaves of three, let it be" Stay alert for poison ivy!

Explore The Bruce
www.exploretthebruce.com

You are on Park Road
Chippewas of Nawash

911

While you are in the area, run with the angels. Keep your dog and never leave your pet unattended.

Bruce Trail
CONSERVANCY
www.brucetrail.org
Good day,

You are receiving this email because you are a member of the Multi-Municipal Wind Turbine Working Group (MMWTWG). The MMWTWG recently made a submission to the Ontario Legislative Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs.

The Ontario Highlands Friends of Wind (OHFOWP) have a view that differs from the MMWTWG and we also made a submission to the Committee.

Our request today is that this covering email and the attachments be included as Correspondence for your next Council meeting and accordingly posted for the public to read. Council, of course, can act on the Correspondence in any way they see fit.

The attachments are:

1. Our submission "Committee Submission OHFOWP FINAL",
2. Our previous submission to the Feed In Tariff Review dated December 13, 2011. This document is an appendix to our submission to the Committee and provides a description of OHFOWP,
3. The submission by the MMWTWG "prebudget2013submissionmmwtwg" as downloaded from the Wind Concerns Ontario website on April 13, 2013. This document is also an appendix to our submission.

We do not require a presentation to Council.

Please confirm receipt of this email package.

Thank you for your consideration,

Malcolm Hamilton
Ontario Highlands Friends of Wind Power
http://ohfowp.blogspot.com/
Pre-Budget Consultations 2013

Submission to
Ontario Legislative Committee on
Finance and Economic Affairs

Ontario Highlands Friends of Wind Power

Filed by

Malcolm W. Hamilton, P.Eng.
267277 South Line B, Grey Highlands
RR 2 Proton Station, ON
N0C 1L0

April 16, 2013
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I Summary

The purpose of this submission is to correct some assertions made in the submission by the Multi-Municipal Wind Turbine Working Group (MMWTWG) and to provide some recommendations to the Committee regarding wind energy in Ontario.

The MMWTWG is totally committed to destroying wind power in Ontario in order to protect their vested interests. Their recommendations are a good example of this intent but they are flawed. Their recommendations are internally conflicted and poorly supported.

Ontario Highlands Friends of Wind Power (OHFOWP), representing a group of host landowners, industry employees, suppliers and environmentalists, has a more effective set of recommendations:

- Create or increase incentives for municipalities and neighbouring landowners
  - Increase revenue sharing for municipalities
  - Provide royalties for neighbours near wind projects
  - Require property value indemnification for neighbours near wind projects
- Eliminate expensive barriers to development
  - Recognize the cost of delay as the final barrier to grid parity for wind
  - Require full medical disclosure for health claims
  - Establish real consequences for frivolous delays
  - Accelerate health studies
II. Critique of the Multi-Municipal Wind Turbine Working Group submission to this Committee dated March 22, 2013

A. MMWTWG’s Background section

In their opening section, labeled “Background”, the Group asserts that their member municipalities are unwilling to be hosts of wind turbines. While this may be true of the dozen or so elected officials who show up for the monthly meetings, it is not necessarily true for their constituents.

1. Constituents not represented

Surveys have demonstrated that the public in rural areas is strongly supportive of windmills, even when those windmills are placed in their community. (Oraclepoll Research)

Host landowners are definitely in favour of using their own land in order to keep their farms alive. A steady cash flow from a credit-worthy source can easily be leveraged into loans from financial institutions. Those loans are being put to good use in the rural economy, e.g.:

- Upgraded farming equipment
- Land improvements such as drainage
- Secondary education for families

The elected officials who attend the MMWTWG meetings seem to represent only weekend residents and retirees, i.e. those with small lots who are urbanizing the rural municipalities, e.g.:

- Mark Davis: realtor in Arran-Elderslie
- Steve Hammel: representative for Arran Lake
- Paul McQueen: Brewster’s Lake constituents
- Don Murray: Bruce Beach Cottagers Association constituents
- Dwight Burley: Dwight Burley Construction
- Stewart Halliday: Lake Eugenia constituents

The elected officials also tend to come in pairs (e.g. Arran-Elderslie, Chatsworth, Georgian Bluffs, Grey Highlands typically send two representatives each) so, while there are about 10 municipalities who are involved in the Group, there are always more than 10 elected officials travelling to the meetings. They are joined by an almost equal number of citizen representatives who, in general, are active wind opponents plus
observers. On at least one occasion, they were joined by Opposition MPP’s (e.g. Lisa Thompson, the Energy critic, Steve Clark, MPP Leeds-Grenville)

2. MMWTWG doesn’t represent their Counties

The Group claims to represent 15 municipalities from six counties. However, these six counties have 50 municipalities amongst themselves, so this group represents less than a third of the counties.

According to the Group’s minutes, 11 (not 15) municipalities are active members although a maximum of only 8 municipalities show up at any time.

The Group also claims to be the unwilling hosts of one-third of all wind turbines installed in Ontario. In fact, the Group’s municipalities represent less than 10% of the turbines in Ontario (Enbridge in Kincardine, Ripley in Huron-Kinloss and Plateau in Grey Highlands).

There are other wind farms in those six counties, of course (e.g. Melancthon in Dufferin and Kingsbridge in Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh). However, those counties have chosen not to be active members of the Group.

3. Politics prevail

While municipalities exist at the pleasure of the provincial government, a broad division of authority was laid out in the Municipalities Act. That act included such things as resources, highways, taxation, energy, etc. It did not contemplate the governance over renewable energy and so the Green Energy Act (GEA) was devised to provide clarity and uniform standards across the Province.

Many municipalities felt that the GEA abrogated their rights to zone land use in their areas. While many municipalities embraced wind energy and found a way to co-operate with the provincial government (e.g. Chatham Kent, Frontenac Island) others fought it from the beginning (e.g. Arran-Elderslie). Others (e.g. Melancthon) were early supporters and then changed tone as wind proposals piled up on them.

Wind Concerns Ontario claims that over ninety municipalities are unwilling hosts. However, the vast majority of those ninety municipalities has never hosted a wind turbine and has no relevant experience. In contrast, over 60% of the major operating wind projects in Ontario have willing hosts.
There is a real question as to how unwilling these municipalities really are. Most of them have simply stated that they want a moratorium on wind projects until health studies have been performed. This is a convenient political ploy since 17 health studies have already been performed around the world. In the last few months, a study in New Zealand has shown that health effects can be induced into subjects by viewing media reports and then listening to low frequency sound (Crichton, 2013). Another study in Australia has shown a total absence of health complaints for over a decade until anti-wind activists attacked certain areas (Chapman, 2013). An Ontario study has shown the biased reporting of the Press in Ontario with clear fear factors emerging in their reporting of wind issues (Deignan, 2013).

Further, the politics surrounding wind has risen to the Provincial and Federal level.

The Opposition MPP for Huron-Bruce, Lisa Thompson, is now a single-issue candidate – a moratorium on wind energy. She and Vic Fidelli (who share the Energy Critic role) have called for a moratorium on all future wind development. She has attended at least one meeting of the MMWTWG. Their leader, Tim Hudak, is not only calling for a moratorium, he is stating that he would actually unravel existing contracts with wind developers, at a cost that would be ten times as large as the cancelled gas plants in Mississauga and Oakville. Ironically, his party had also promised to close this plant in his pre-election promises in 2011. (Hamilton, 2013)

The Federal Conservatives, likely responding to their provincial counterparts, decided to conduct their own health study. Provincial PC’s were quick to leverage the announcement of the Federal study by claiming that a Federal study must be evidence that the ongoing provincial study was inadequate. In the meantime, Wind Concerns Ontario called for a boycott of both studies while still proclaiming “No wind turbines without health studies”. Clearly, any health study result will be refuted by the WCO.

Members of WCO campaigned for the PC’s. John Laforet, a professional media activist, appears to have been retained to act for the WCO and/or the PC party during the campaign. He quit (or was released) a day or so after the PC’s were defeated.

The fossil fuel and nuclear industries in Ontario have also weighed in. The Power Workers Union was caught using a PR firm to post anti-wind comments by non-existent email accounts. Mr. Palmer, the author of the submission to the Committee is a retired nuclear industry employee. MPP
Bill Walker left his job at Bruce Power to be parachuted into Bill Murdoch's old riding of Owen Sound.

This sounds similar to the nuclear industry in the UK, which was embarrassed when it was proven that they had funded a vicious attack against wind, coordinated by Sir Bernard Ingham – Maggie Thatcher's inventor of the concept of "spin". Here's a quotation from PR Watch:

*Both the NIA [Nuclear Industry Association] and the BNES [British Nuclear Energy Society] are in touch with the group Supporters of Nuclear Energy (SONE), of which Sir Bernard Ingham is the secretary. Ingham is well known not only for his staunch support of nuclear power but also for his implacable opposition to wind power. Both he and SONE are involved in the anti-wind power campaign group Country Guardian and has boasted of personally halting two thirds of proposed wind farms in the UK.*

(PR Watch, 2005)

B. MMWTWG Recommendation 1

After a long dissertation on Civics 101, Mr. Palmer asserts in his submission that wind turbines are a fraud, a dishonest scheme and a scam. He then tries to promote the nuclear industry by again asserting that refurbished nuclear is less expensive than wind energy. This flies in the face of estimates outside of the nuclear industry that the Darlington refurbishment would cost 10 to 14 £/kWh. (Pollution Probe, 2010)

Most wind projects currently online receive about 10 £/kWh with a recent tranche at 13.5 £/kWh and future projects at 11.5 £/kWh – well within the range of a refurbished Darlington. The province of Quebec chose not to refurbish their nuclear reactor based on the huge delays and over-runs at Pt Lepreau in New Brunswick.

Mr. Palmer then proceeds to claim that windmills do not currently generate an economic benefit for a municipality. However, municipalities like Chatham Kent, Frontenac Island, Elgin, Algoma and Thunder Bay would seem to disagree. They are welcoming wind projects under current fiscal arrangements.

However, we do agree that an increase in revenue to the municipalities would be useful in increasing acceptance. Any increase should totally accrue to the benefit of the municipality, not the associated counties and school boards that provide little or no services to a specific wind project. To accomplish this, the FIT price should be increased to reflect what would essentially be a transfer of wealth from the ratepayers in Ontario to the
host municipalities. Just to be clear, this increased payment would not accrue to the developers.

C. MMWTWG Recommendation 2

Extrapolating from a water rental charge to a wind rental charge is laughable. The logical extension from this is to charge farmers for rain on their fields, the sunshine warming their crops and for all of us an oxygen rental charge for the air we breathe.

Or, on a more rational note, maybe nuclear and fossil fuel plants should be charged for their water usage, their air pollution and the risk of a nuclear accident.

D. MMWTWG Recommendation 3

Accelerated capital cost allowance (CCA) is a tool used by all governments to encourage capital investment. The specifics of the allowance are built into every developer’s financial model. The OPA does the same in their modeling. When setting a FIT price, OPA adjusts the price in order to generate a reasonable rate of return for the best cost-competitive projects. Consequently, any change in CCA policy would just be reflected in an increase in FIT price or a lack of willing investors. Of course, this is what the MMWTWG is trying to create.

Again, in the spirit of fairness, if wind energy CCA is changed, then the same should occur for all other sources of energy, including nuclear and gas generation; tar sands extraction, etc.

E. MMWTWG Recommendation 4

Mr. Palmer seeks to confuse with false comparisons

He starts by asserting that each and every component of an electricity system needs to be able to switch itself off and on in accordance with the demands of the consumer. In fact, all that matters is that the system meets the demands of the consumer or that the consumer modifies his demand on the system. Modern systems do this all the time.

Here’s the experience of Richard Smith, the head of energy strategy at the UK National Grid:

Not wound up about wind
Of course, that's not the only issue exercising the press, which has also focused on the problems associated with integrating large amounts of intermittent wind power into the grid over the next few years. Some have even argued that turning fossil fuel power stations on and off to back up wind power could result in higher emissions than if the government invested solely in gas power.

Dismissing this as one of the "flakier arguments" in the renewables debate, Smith points to a recent analysis National Grid undertook for the Scottish Parliament. It concluded that over an 18 month period, the expected emissions benefit of using wind power - that is the amount of carbon dioxide saved by using wind to produce power - was reduced by just 0.1 per cent as a result of the need to use fossil fuel power stations as backup.

The National Grid's ability to predict where the wind is going to blow in a week, a day or an hour is crucial to this argument. A couple of years ago, the company launched a new wind forecasting system designed to help it plan for wind intermittency. On a day-to-day basis, says Smith, its accuracy is "phenomenally good" - getting it right 95 per cent of the time when it looks ahead 24 hours. He says:

"Over the last few years we've gone from no wind on the system to seven gigawatts of wind on the system. If you'd asked a control room system operator 15 years ago what he could do with seven gigawatts of variable generation, he'd have said, 'I'm off, can I go and do something simpler'. But now they're managing it."

In fact, Smith argues, wind is more predictable in some senses than conventional power sources like coal or gas. A traditional power station like a nuclear plant could "trip and fall off in a matter of milliseconds", he says. Wind turbines may have to be shut off to protect them in high wind conditions, but these are easier to predict than a nuclear power station suddenly cutting out. (Webster, 2013)

When comparing costs, Mr. Palmer compares spot prices with long-term average costs in the industry (typically called LCOE – levelized costs of energy). The LCOE includes energy (essentially the spot price) plus operating and capital costs. That's why a refurbished Darlington comes in at 100 to 140 $/MWh and a new nuclear plant comes in at 250 $/MWh, compared to the EIA number of 24.7 $/MWh (2.47 ¢/kWh). This is not surprising given the capital intensity of nuclear plants and wind relative to their fuel costs.

I doubt if Mr. Palmer would agree to a FIT price of 2.47 ¢/kWh for the Darlington refurbishment.
At 135 $/MWh (13.5 ¢/kWh), wind is definitely competitive. At the current FIT price of 115 $/MWh (11.5¢/kWh) it’s a bargain. And windmill capital costs per MWh have been trending down through the last decade while nuclear costs have been trending up.

F. MMWTWG Recommendation 5

It’s not clear how Mr. Palmer’s rant about coal has anything to do with the price of wind energy.

He first says that the reduction of coal use was primarily a result of demand reduction, conversion to gas and a return of some laid-up nuclear capacity. And furthermore, that wind energy is currently a small component of the energy mix. That’s all true. However, wind has come from zero to 5% of energy production in about seven years. It could easily provide 20% within the next decade, eclipsing gas and nuclear as they become more expensive.

Mr. Palmer then seems to be making an argument for increasing coal capacity. I hope that’s not the case. He claims that the major reason for initially paying a premium for renewable energy was asthma reduction. He ignores the other factors including:

1. Carbon dioxide – carbon dioxide is a major greenhouse gas. In areas where there is a carbon trading mechanism, carbon dioxide prices would add 0.7 to 1.2 ¢/kWh to natural gas and coal power prices.
2. Mercury contamination
3. Particulate matter
4. NOx and SO2

However, that doesn’t stop Mr. Palmer from becoming an epidemiologist (remember that he’s a P.Eng.) and creating a graph depicting coal energy production and asthma rates. Unfortunately, or maybe intentionally, his graph of asthma rates has two fatal flaws:

1. The asthma rates start in 1996 but stop in 2009. Wind energy production started in early 2006 but didn’t show up on the IESO radar until 2008.
2. The coal generation data in his figures 1 and 2 track each other vertically, but the data in figure 2 is misplaced by six years. In other words, coal production actually peaks in 2000 and then declines. The decline in asthma (age 5 to 9) starts in 2000 as
well. Again, maybe gas or resuscitated nuclear capacity should get the credit but, based on Mr. Palmer’s corrected data, asthma rates appear to have fallen with reduced coal use.

Importantly, though, these errors call into question all of Mr. Palmer’s arguments. In my consulting career, we had a phrase, “If one of the numbers is wrong, then all of the numbers are wrong.” Either Figure 1 or Figure 2 is clearly wrong (his Figure 1 appears to line up with IESO data). This is from a P.Eng. who conducted risk analyses for nuclear plants.

In terms of jobs created per kWh of generated energy, wind and solar are likely at the bottom of that list. The highest is treadmills. In other words, job creation per KWh is not a very useful measure unless you’re a politician. Frankly, you could take the dollar savings produced by wind compared to nuclear energy and keep nuclear plant employees on the payroll writing their memoirs and still be better off.

On the other hand, putting those people to work building, installing and operating wind plant – all without a monopoly union position – would be good for the Province. I suspect that most municipal officials, reflecting on their historical relations with Hydro One and OPG would probably agree.

Finally, we need to challenge the findings of the 2011 Auditor General’s report on renewable energy. The Auditor General was careful to always include wind and solar together when making his pronouncements. Obviously, it was because solar was very expensive relative to other energy sources. It may also have been because he has a family cottage near a proposed wind project. He certainly broke from his earlier policy of not speaking with media about his reports – granting an on-air interview with Dale Goldhawk followed by a presentation at the Council for Clean & Reliable Electricity where he thanked Jan Carr, a champion of nuclear power in Ontario, for all his help.

It has now been proven that wind energy will add very little to future electricity price increases. In fact, wind energy would reduce electricity prices relative to nuclear power. Future increases will be dominated by the cost premiums related to nuclear energy. Solar may have the highest cost/kWh in the short term but it is rapidly trending downward to the point where it will be lower than a nuclear plant when that nuclear plant could eventually be commissioned.

G. MMWTWG Recommendation 6
Having demonstrating that wind energy is currently a small part of the energy mix, Mr. Palmer then tries to suggest that wind is chasing jobs out of Ontario. He quotes a number of people saying that electricity price increases are causing them hardship. Do the math. Wind, at 4% of energy production would have to be 10 times as expensive as nuclear power in order to produce such an effect.

Mr. Palmer then tries to suggest that high power prices are driving jobs out of Ontario. If that were true, it would lie totally at the feet of nuclear and gas investment, not wind. That's been proven earlier in this paper.

However, high power prices have not been driving jobs out of Ontario.

Figure 1 shows that there is absolutely no correlation between provincial power prices for large users and the province's employment rate.

**Figure 1 Provincial Unemployment vs. Power Price**

![Unemployment vs 50MW Power Price graph](image)
In stark contrast, Figure 2 shows that Ontario’s unemployment rate is highly – almost totally – correlated with the US/Canada exchange rate.

**Figure 2 Ontario Unemployment Rate vs. US/Canada Exchange Rates**

Electricity rates are not a big deal for most manufacturing operations, other than smelters. If electricity rates were such a big deal for auto manufacturers, for example, then we’d see car plants in Quebec, Manitoba or British Columbia.

**H. MMWTWG Conclusions**

In Mr. Palmer’s conclusion, he claims that wind developers will be requesting a handout from the Province. In fact, wind developers receive only what an independent, government agency posts as a reasonable tariff. The developers can choose to submit proposals, or not, based on their energy resource and capital requirements. They are then paid for what
they produce. All production risk (technology choices, resource assessment, etc.) is assumed by their shareholders – i.e. no scam.

He further claims that “small people” have been hurt but doesn’t account for the host landowners who possess at least 100 times of the land held by the wind opponents. Furthermore, these host landowners have lived on the lands for generations and are the ones that feed our province. They need these royalties in order to keep these farms productive.

The real “small people” that Mr. Palmer refers to are those that live on two or three acres of land (or less if they’re on a lake front), who moved there recently from a large urban centre and who show up on weekends. They paid a premium for their property and now they’re upset.

Mr. Palmer lives near one or two proposed wind projects and is clearly against wind. I live amongst half a dozen windmills, sleep very well at night, and support windmills.
III OHFOWP Recommendations

As stated earlier, Ontario Highlands Friends of Wind Power (OHFOWP) has its own set of recommendations for the Committee with regards to electricity policy. Broadly, they are:

- Create or increase incentives for municipalities and neighbouring landowners
  - Increase revenue sharing for municipalities
  - Provide royalties for neighbours near wind projects
  - Require property value indemnification for neighbours near wind projects
- Eliminate expensive barriers to development
  - Recognize the cost of delay as the final barrier to grid parity for wind
  - Require full medical disclosure for health claims
  - Establish real consequences for frivolous delays
  - Accelerate health studies

These recommendations are very close to our submission to the Feed In Tariff review a little over a year ago. That submission is part of the Appendix and expands on our rationale and our specific recommendations.

Since then, we’ve had a year to observe the consequences of delays in the development of renewable energy caused by litigation and appeals. In the last year, there have been well over ten appeals, lawsuits and threats of lawsuits. The stated objective, in many cases, was to delay the project in order to frustrate the developer and/or delay the project until a change of government occurred.

Until recently, claims of adverse health effects didn’t require proof of a lack of pre-existing conditions or even proof of causality. Fortunately, in Chatham-Kent Wind Action Inc. v. Director, MOE, the ERT rejected the argument that the mere anticipation of a wind project could cause adverse health effects. This precedent and principle needs to be maintained.

While none of these legal actions have been successful in the Courts, they are achieving the effect of delay. A delay of a year in a wind project can add 5 to 10% in costs (e.g. financing, idling of employees, contract
penalties). Even a delay of 3 to 6 months can cost a modest sized (e.g. 20 MW) project upwards of $2 million. To date, a few judgments have led to payments of legal costs but not the real underlying economic costs.

While the Environmental Review Tribunal goes out of its way to offer appellants wide latitude in their arguments, they now need to consider the consequences of these appeals on both the Province (in defending these appeals) and the proponents of the projects.

We’re seeing increasing evidence that wind energy does not cause adverse health effects when the Ontario regulations are met. We’re seeing evidence from outside Canada that it is the fear of wind projects, brought about by organized wind opponents, that is causing stress. The appellant in the Chatham-Kent Wind Action appeal noted above made that very argument.

Recently, potential participants told Professor Bigelow (University of Waterloo) who is conducting a health study in Ontario, that it was too late for them to participate because they were already stressed by the potential of a wind project near them. In that same health study, early results of an Ontario media survey were published in a peer-reviewed journal showing that Press coverage was pervasively using fear phrases in their coverage. No wonder there is widespread panic. As Professor Chapman, University of Sydney, has stated, “wind turbine syndrome is a communicated disease”.

All of this argues for an acceleration of these health studies. To not do so will just needlessly increase the level of panic in the Province as wind opponents artificially ramp up the population’s fears. Since that panic appears to be causing stress in people long before they see a project in their midst, this is now a public health issue.
Appendices
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2. Copy of OHFOWP submission to the 2011 FIT Review (attached)
3. Citations (below)
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SUBMISSION

to the

FEED-IN TARIFF PROGRAM TWO-YEAR REVIEW

by

ONTARIO HIGHLANDS FRIENDS OF WIND POWER

ENGAGING ONTARIO COMMUNITIES IN WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION:

This submission addresses two specific issues:

1. The need to increase the engagement of local communities in wind projects; and
2. Limiting the ability of opponents to interfere with the legitimate involvement of developers and communities in the planning, approval and development of wind projects.

It is our belief that the success of renewable energy development in Ontario, and the social and civil commitment to it, will hinge on adapting the Feed-in Tariff (FIT) framework to incorporate these principles. While these principles are directed mostly towards wind projects, they could be adapted for other renewable ventures, such as solar, biomass.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

We have four recommendations. Three of them are concessions by the industry and one is a request to the Province.

1. Royalty sharing with neighbouring landowners:

   This recommendation requires developers to share a portion of the project's revenues as a royalty with all of the landowners surrounding a wind turbine. The host landowner would be given a greater share since the land lease for the turbine is an encumbrance on their land. This would add only a fraction of a cent per kWh to generation costs.

2. Property indemnification:

   Royalty sharing creates a buffer against property devaluation. Potential buyers of a property would place real value on a future stream of royalty payments. Nevertheless, some landowners may want to leave for their own reasons. The wind industry should create a mechanism to buy out houses of those whose lives, in the
judgment of an independent group, are upset by turbines. The purchase price for those properties would be the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) assessment value.

3. **Community Benefits:**

   The current turbine tax levied by the municipalities should be augmented and used directly in the community, not just merged with the existing mill rate.

4. **Reducing Intimidation, interference with consultations and abuse of process:**

   There are three parts to this recommendation:

   (1) The government should amend the appropriate legislation to accelerate the process for challenges to renewable energy projects. Additional resources should be allocated to the Environmental Review Tribunal (ERT). Submissions to the ERT should be filed and heard in 60 days and the tribunal's decision rendered 30 days after the hearing. Also, there should be financial penalties for frivolous appeals.

   (2) The government should introduce and/or amend measures to protect those who participate lawfully in supporting or opposing renewable energy projects from legal action intended to suppress legitimate dialogue and discourage local participation in renewable projects.

   (3) The government should review the requirements for public consultations concerning renewable projects to encourage more effective community engagement, eliminate disruptions and intimidation and encourage more effective distribution of information concerning projects.

**OUR OBJECTIVES:**

It is our belief that owners and developers need to set up their projects and consultations so that they are part of, and committed to, the communities where they are located for the long term.

By the same token, sceptics, opponents or other interested parties should not be allowed to stonewall, and spread disproportionate propaganda with total disregard for facts and benefits.

The government needs to strike a balance by strong and fair leadership. Governments should avoid last minute changes for political expediency.

The following four sections provide more details behind each recommendation.

1. **Royalty sharing:**

   As wind turbines become larger, the number of host landowners relative to all landowners declines. This creates a "lottery" where one landowner hosts a turbine while no one else does.

   Royalty payments are actually a small percentage of the economics of a wind project, typically 2% of revenues rising over time to 4% as project debt is paid off.

   However, royalty payments are subtracted from revenue and so they're "heavy money". They go straight to the project's bottom line.
So, while royalty payments are a small component of what a consumer pays (power price), they can have a major impact on a developer’s return on investment. In other words, don’t take this payment out of the developer’s pocket.

Based on an analysis of environmental assessment data, a 1 km radius around turbines would typically include 2.5 non-participants. If each non-participant were allocated 40% of the royalty paid to the host landowner, then the per-turbine royalty would rise from 2% to 4%. Overall, this scheme would cost ratepayers much less than 1¢/kWh.

There are details of this scheme that need to be worked out, such as:

- how to define the inclusion zone
- distance from turbine
- property line or receptor
- the length of the contract period,
- compensation for owners of vacant land

We have assumed that there would be no retroactive consideration, but that could be changed to provide fairness to those involved earlier.

2. **Property indemnification:**

The royalty scheme detailed above would build an inherent property value buffer equal to the net present value (NPV) of the cash flow of the royalty payments.

For example, a typical royalty for a 1.5 MW wind turbine is $10,000 per year. A non-host landowner would therefore receive $4000 per year under the royalty sharing assumptions. The Net Present Value (NPV) of that cash flow with a 5% discount rate is approximately $50,000. For a $200,000 rural property, that is more than a buffer, it’s almost a windfall.

However, there may be a few individuals who are so annoyed by the presence of turbines that they wish to leave the area. If so, the developer would be required to purchase the property at the MPAC valuation that existed just prior to the approval of the project. The landowner obviously has the right to sell the property to anyone else, along with the rights to the royalty sharing.

Since most developers lack much capability in real estate, the wind industry may wish to form a co-operative that would purchase properties acquired as part of an indemnification program and manage them as a portfolio. Based on historical purchases of properties by developers, this portfolio would probably be less than $5 million at any point in time.

3. **Community Benefits:**

At present, municipalities receive a turbine tax based on a rate set by the province. This tax is then shared with school boards and counties and so the impact on the municipality is diluted. Since the school boards and the counties incur minimal incremental costs associated with turbines, this tax scheme should be replaced with one that uses the turbine tax to the benefit of host municipalities.
Many developers have recognized the value of sharing turbine earnings with the municipalities and have offered amenity payments of about $4000 per annum for a 1.5MW turbine.

This should mandatory. Community renewable energy revenues should be placed in a Community Fund, separate from general revenue, so that people can see how the community benefits directly from renewable energy projects.

4. **Intimidation, interference with consultations and abuse of process:**

In the last three years, Ontario has seen a significant increase in anti-wind activism. This activism has ranged from reasoned debate (e.g. Letters to the Editor, community information sessions, representation to municipal Councils, etc.) to the extreme (e.g. intimidating tactics at public meetings, vendettas against professionals and members of the press and threatening neighbours and participants in projects with strategic lawsuits aimed against public participation (SLAPP's) among other things.

Anti-wind activists have also recognized that time is the enemy of any capital intensive project. They have adopted tactics to delay any progress with projects as an essential part of their strategy. To that end, they have launched legal challenges with the OMB, the OEB, the Environmental Review Tribunal, the MPAC Assessment Review Board and the Ontario Courts as well as engaging Municipal Councils to oppose wind projects whenever, wherever and however possible.

While all parties should have redress to the Courts, there is a growing concern in the legal community that changes are required. We concur with the Ontario Anti-SLAPP Advisory Panel that recommended the following:

> **On consideration, the Panel has concluded that it is desirable for Ontario to enact legislation against the use of legal processes that affect people's ability or willingness to express views or take action on matters of public interest. While the value of freedom of expression is the principal one at stake, it is also important that the public resources of the court system not be expended on litigation that is not of substantial merit and is contrary to the public interest.**

(http://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/english/anti_slapp/anti_slapp_final_report_en.pdf)

**WHY LISTEN TO US?**

We have over ten years experience in the wind industry and engagement in wind projects in our communities. We have seen and experienced first hand the evolution of strident and committed local opposition.

This opposition is based on personal preferences without any consideration for the interests of others in the community or the broader policy issues involved.

Opposition tactics now involve intimidation, misinformation and the active disruption of the community consultation processes so that others in the community (e.g. landowners, contractors and green energy supporters) cannot participate effectively in projects.

For information, over the last ten years we initiated the development of the following projects and were active participants in their implementation:

Melancthon I 68MW
Melancthon II 132 MW
Plateau I, II and III 27 MW

In this process we were involved with landowners, municipal officials, anti-wind groups, First Nations, Hydro One, the OPA and the IESO across RES, RESOP and FIT programs.

We also established a local group, the Ontario Highlands Friends of Wind Power (OHFWP) to represent those living and working in communities in Ontario’s Highlands south of Georgian Bay interested in the generation of renewable energy from local wind resources.

Respectfully submitted on behalf Ontario Highlands Friends of Wind Power:

Malcolm W. Hamilton
267277 South Line B RR #2
Proton Station ON
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Robert Knox
123 Cedar Street,
Collingwood, ON L9Y 3A7

Roger J. Short
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RR #1 Kimberly ON
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We are strongly committed to using technology and business skills to reduce our community’s carbon footprint by producing electrical energy using renewables, wind, solar and biomass
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Background:

The Multi Municipal Wind Turbine Working Group (MMWWG) is comprised of elected officials and citizens from some 15 Municipalities in the Counties of Bruce, Dufferin, Grey, Huron, Perth, and Wellington Counties. The Working Group meets monthly, or on the call of the Chair, to address issues arising from the installation of wind turbines in the represented municipalities. The Municipalities the Working Group represent have identified themselves as unwilling hosts for wind turbines, based on actual experience, since about one-third of the wind turbines installed in Ontario are in place in our municipalities, and more are planned based on Ontario Power Authority information.

On March 8, the MMWTWG formally requested to make an oral presentation to the Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs Pre-Budget Consultations based on our experience. When advice was received on March 14 that this request was denied, at the regular meeting of the MMWTWG on March 14, the Working Group directed that a written submission be prepared by the (staff) Technical Advisor of the Working Group on behalf of the Multi Municipal Wind Turbine Working Group. This was the basis for this submission.

In your Pre-Budget Consultations, the Standing Committee will receive many requests from groups for additional spending of money the Province does not have, at a time of record debt. This submission, in contrast, requests you to selectively spend less money on a government initiative that is not achieving its stated goals, and in fact is causing harm. The rampant proliferation of wind turbines in our communities called for and encouraged by the Green Energy and Green Economy Act (2009) are imposing a huge cost on Ontario in general, and especially on the unwilling host communities, where community spirit has been severely damaged, and well being of citizens has been harmed. Putting in place the 2013 Budget is an opportunity to address these issues, and we respectfully submit this briefing paper with the expectation that you will give it careful consideration.

The Concept of One Ratepayer and Recognition of a Scam:

Local Municipal Councils are well aware of the concept of “there is only one ratepayer” who pays taxes (federal, provincial, county, and municipal) as well as utility rates for energy, and public services. We are well aware that while there are many “wants” for support, it is critical that we identify the essential “needs” to be addressed. If we err, we will meet our “ratepayers” on the street, or in the local market, and our citizens will be vocal to identify our errors. While deep down, most understand that not all of their “wants” can be met all the time, the biggest concern is where citizens see that “serious needs” are unmet, while programs that benefit only a few, or which do not achieve stated goals are pushed forward. Those are recognized clearly as what they are, a fraud, a dishonest scheme, or simply, a scam. Members of the Multi Municipality Wind Turbine Working Group, respected members of their communities, are not above recognizing wind turbines as what they are – a scam.
The example can be given in some of our smaller municipalities where the funds are not available to repair necessary infrastructure of roads and bridges, yet, in the same municipality the Ontario Power Authority shows a pending application for a 40 x 2.5 MW wind turbine array in the municipality, which based on rates in effect at the time of application would have been paid about $800,000 per year per turbine for power produced, a premium of over $500,000 per turbine per year above the cost of power derived from refurbished nuclear power, for a 20 year contract. That is a bonus of over $20,000,000 per year for this one small project, in this one municipality, money paid by Ontario ratepayers for a product produced in the municipality, but with the money sent out, when the local municipality cannot even afford to repair the bridges that citizens use.

For the same project, due to the special arrangement of the Minister of Finance to limit the assessment for wind turbines to $40,000 per MW, the municipality would receive taxes of $13,341.88 per year per turbine. Assessment by Municipal staff indicates we might well lose an equivalent amount due to reduced municipal taxes of homeowners adversely impacted by the same turbines. Spending in the municipality by the very limited number of long-term staff operating and maintaining the turbines would be about the same as the taxes. Thus, the wind turbine operator would be paid some $800,000 per year per turbine, and the municipality would receive less than $30,000 per year. You can see why we identify this as a scam. They make the “gain” and our citizens get the “pain.”

**Bonusing for Wind Turbines:**

The Municipal Act [Subsection 111 (1)] is quite explicit to prohibit a Municipal Council from directly or indirectly assisting any manufacturing business or other industrial or commercial enterprise through the granting of bonuses, such as giving total or partial exemption of any fee, charge, or levy, yet this is exactly what the Minister of Finance did for wind turbines by putting in place an assessment cap to limit the assessment of a wind turbine that may be a $5,000,000 investment to $100,000.

**Recommendation #1:** The Minister of Finance revoke the special “bonus” of an assessment cap for wind turbines, and require a wind turbine assessment to be based on the installed value, much as the value of a home is based on the installed fair market value as determined by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation. There is no way that a $5,000,000 wind turbine would change hands for $100,000.

**Gross Revenue Charge:**

Ontario has a long established principle for hydraulic generating stations that the operator of a hydraulic generating station benefits from an asset that belongs to all the citizens of the province. Section 92.1 of the Electricity Act identifies taxes and charges paid by operators of hydraulic generating stations, as the Gross Revenue Charge (GRC) based on the gross revenue of the plant. This includes a “Water Rental Charge” payable to the
Minister of Finance. On a similar basis, an operator of a wind turbine generating station should pay a comparable “Wind Rental Charge” as the source of the energy that generation is derived from was neither purchased by the operator (as one buys coal or natural gas, or uranium fuel bundles) and in fact the wind is a provincial asset that belongs to everyone, not just the landowner over which the wind blows.

**Recommendation # 2: The Minister of Finance should institute a “Wind Rental Charge” to be paid annually by operators of wind turbines based on the gross revenue of the wind generating station, in a parallel manner as the “Water Rental Charge” paid by operators of hydraulic generating stations, in recognition of the fact that the wind is a provincial asset, and not owned by anyone.**

**Income Tax Accelerated Capital Cost Write Off:**

In addition to the revenues that they generate, wind systems are eligible for an accelerated capital cost allowance of 30% per year under Canada’s income tax act. This means that the owner will be able to write off the capital cost of the equipment quickly, and within four years up to 90% of the total installed costs may have been depreciated, creating substantial tax savings and increasing after-tax income for the wind turbine operator. Further, examination of the longevity of wind turbine operators in Ontario shows that although some large wind turbine arrays have existed since 2006, in every case, the ownership has flipped to new owners.

The depreciation of a wind turbine claimed to have a lifetime of 20 years, by up to 90% of its value in only 4 years is again an example of a scam, as it ensures that taxes are not paid. Further, it appears very likely that under the current climate, when wind turbines then flip in ownership, the capital cost writeoff restarts, and the wind turbines may never pay income tax.

**Recommendation # 3: The Minister of Finance of Ontario, jointly with the Minister of Finance of Canada need to re-assess the accelerated capital write off for wind turbines, and ensure that the write off matches the life expectancy of the technology. Further, there needs to be very clear expectations set that the original capital cost of a wind turbine can only be written off once – to repeatedly write off the capital after each flip of ownership is fraudulent.**

**Pay Appropriate Price for Quality of Service Received:**

Inherently, consumers understand the concept of paying “top dollar” for value, and quality. It is understandable to pay more for a quality service, that delivers the product needed, on-time. An inferior service, that delivers sporadically, and not when needed, would not survive long in the marketplace of the real world. In the electricity supply world, consumers expect that the lights will come on when the switch is flipped, the car block-heater will work during the crisp -40 degree winter northern nights, and the air
conditioner will work on hot sticky days. If these expectations are not met, it does not matter that the service is called “premium” the consumer will balk. Wind turbines have somehow gained the expectation of being a premium priced product, even though the wind is poorly matched to the periods of electrical system demand. The wind turbine industry itself describes them as being cost competitive with other generators. On 15 Nov. 2011, Renewable Energy World news stated, “The best wind farms in the world are already competitive with coal, gas and nuclear plants. But over the next five years, continued performance improvements and cost reductions will bring the average onshore wind plant in line with cheap natural gas, even without a price on carbon, according analysis from Bloomberg New Energy Finance.” The United States Energy Information Agency (EIA) a non-partisan information service, identifies [http://www.eia.gov/electricity/annual/html/epa_08_04.html](http://www.eia.gov/electricity/annual/html/epa_08_04.html) the following total costs for electricity generation in the USA in 2011:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Source</th>
<th>2011 Cost per kWh</th>
<th>2011 Cost per MWh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>(24.7 $ per MWh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossil Steam</td>
<td>35.09</td>
<td>(35.09 $ per MWh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro electric</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>(8.88 $ per MWh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Turbine and Small</td>
<td>44.54</td>
<td>(44.54 $ per MWh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider though that each of Nuclear, Fossil steam, hydro electric, or gas turbines can produce power when needed, 24 hours a day. On that basis, the $135 per MWh contract price signed by the Ontario Power Authority for wind generated electricity, which produce when the wind blows – if the industry itself identifies that in the US wind is already cost competitive with coal, gas and nuclear plants might seem just a little excessive, unless the word used so often already in this discourse, of scam is restated. As citizens, we have no difficulty in agreeing to pay a reduced price for an inferior product, so comparably, we should pay a reduced price for wind, which is not available when needed.

**Recommendation # 4:** The Minister of Finance should ensure that there is an appropriate price paid for the value of generation delivered in the terms of comparable prices identified by industry. When the wind industry identifies that wind is competitive with other prices, it should not be paid excessively. Wind, which is only available sporadically should be costed including the cost of storage, and only if both wind and storage costs together are competitive, should they be paid the price given to other 24/7 producers.

**Pay a Premium Price Only Based on Fulfilment of Expectations:**

The claim was often made that implementing renewables in Ontario will result in the shut down of coal fired generators. Figure 1, on the next page shows that the implementation of 4 TWh of wind (and negligible generation from solar) certainly were NOT responsible for the 40 TWh reduction in coal output from 2003 and 2012. The figure, derived from IESO, and predecessor Ontario Power Generation and Ontario Hydro reports shows that the 40 TWh reduction in coal output was made possible by the 20 TWh increase in
nuclear output from 2003 to 2012, the 10 TWh increase in natural gas fired output, and the 15 TWh decrease in Ontario load due to the effects of the recessionary pressures.

![Ontario Electricity Generation](image)

**Figure 1** – The 40 TWh reduction in Coal Output was NOT caused by Wind or Solar

Further, the justification of shutting down coal fired generation was often stated as to improve the health of citizens. The main indicator discussed is the reduction in the rate of asthma, particularly in children. The rates of asthma in children is available from databases available from the Hospital For Sick Children in Toronto, which are based on the Ontario Asthma Database maintained by the Institute for Clinical Evaluative Services (ICES).

The data in Figure 2, on the next page show that from the years 1996 through 2000, while the Ontario generation from coal was falling, the asthma rate was falling. From the years 2000 through 2006, while the Ontario generation from coal was increasing, the asthma rate was falling. From 2006 through 2009, while coal generation was falling, the asthma rates were falling. It is very difficult to correlate an improvement in health to coal fired generation when the asthma incidence rate continues to fall, even though coal generation goes down, up, and down. An observer might be inclined to observe that some other factor must be in play as the predominant factor, such as reduction in smoking habits near children.

For each of the age groups shown on the chart, the increase and then decrease in prevalence rates which are staggered over the years suggests that the asthma incidence
peaked in children aged 0 to 4 years in the early 1990's but has been falling since, and the prevalence rate increase is just indicative of the movement of this "peak" though the age band. This is not to minimize the importance of childhood asthma, but only to observe that the data is not well correlated to changes in coal fired generation in Ontario.

Figure 2: Asthma Rates in Ontario seem insensitive to Coal Generated Electricity

Finally, although encouraged by a very favourable government from the years 2009 to 2012, the number of jobs created by the installation of wind turbines in Ontario has come no where near the 50,000 jobs predicted to be created within 3 years by passage of the Green Energy and Green Economy Act. Once the initial concrete truck drivers have moved off, the number of sustainable jobs for a 200 MW wind array is typically fewer than 10.

Recommendation # 5: The Minister of Finance should consider the recommendations of the 2011 Auditor General that "Wind and solar will add significant costs to ratepayer's electricity bills. It was felt that the higher costs associated with renewable energy were an acceptable trade-off given the environmental, health, and anticipated job-creation benefits." If, as this briefing paper notes, the environmental, health, and anticipated job-creation benefits have not materialized, then the prices need to be renegotiated.
Consider the Impact on the Economy of the Ongoing Prices Paid for Wind Power:

Not only is it important to consider the lack of job creation by wind turbines, one also has to realistically consider the very real risk to the economy caused by the increasing price paid for green electricity. In 2009, when the Minister of Energy rolled out the Green Energy and Green Economy Act, he predicted that the cost impact to Ontario Consumers would be less than 1% per year. (George Smitherman quoted in the Globe and Mail, February 24, 2009)

Figure 3 shows the actual price increase in electricity supply in rural Ontario has been over 15% per year for peak generated electricity and mot much less for off peak power.

On January 24th, the Owen Sound Sun Times headlined “Families Struggling to Keep Heat On” noting, “Three weeks into 2013 and the United Way of Bruce Grey is already finding itself unable to help some families seeking assistance from the agency’s Winter Warmth program.” The article went on to note that Executive Director Francesca Dobbyn stated, “We have people without heat right now,” and continued, “People are making informed sad decisions. We’ve seen homeowners walk away from their houses because, while they can afford the mortgage, they cannot afford the increased utility costs.” Fuel poverty has reached Ontario, brought in part by initiatives of the Ontario government.

It is also important to consider the impact on the increasing electricity prices in Ontario on sustaining jobs. With price increases of this magnitude, Ontario is under high risk of
losing the remaining industries we have. In every community, small industries, and even commercial enterprises for which energy for refrigeration is a major cost, (such as grocery stores, apple orchards, ice cream factories, cheese factories, and farmers with dairy coolers) are suffering. We have already lost a number of industries and commercial enterprises for which energy is a major component because they have moved to locations with lower energy prices (for example Xstrada, Stoney Creek Dairy, and Ben and Jerry’s Ice Cream).

Consider the remaining large manufacturers in Ontario. Honda in Alliston, Toyota in Woodstock, GM in Oshawa, Ford in Oakville, and Chrysler in Windsor are major Ontario businesses operating in an environment where the Ontario base electrical prices are nearly double the prices in the United States where these firms already have other assembly plants.

The table below compares the price for electricity for a rural consumer in Ontario, as noted above, to the price for electricity for the consumer in various American states which are home to the US auto assembly plants. Even though there may be special arrangements to price electricity lower for industry, the comparison of price for consumers is indicative of the overall impact of electricity prices in Ontario and the competing USA markets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontario Auto Assembly Plant</th>
<th>Assembly Plant For Manufacturer Exists in this State</th>
<th>Ratio of Ontario Rural Price per kWh to US State Price per kWh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toyota - Woodstock</td>
<td>Kentucky (also Texas)</td>
<td>23.0/8.7 = 2.6 or 23.0/10.9 = 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honda - Alliston</td>
<td>Ohio (also Indiana)</td>
<td>23.0/10.5 = 2.2 or 23.0/9.5 = 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM Car - Oshawa</td>
<td>Kansas City, KA</td>
<td>23.0/10.2 = 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM Truck - Oshawa</td>
<td>Lansing, Mi</td>
<td>23.0/12.5 = 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford - Oakville</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>23.5/12.5 = 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysler - Windsor</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>23.0/12.5 = 1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Recommendation # 6:** The Minister of Finance must seriously consider that not only are Ontario consumers already suffering from reported “energy price poverty” but we are at an increasing risk of losing remaining automotive manufacturing plants as the Ontario electricity price rises well above the price in US States where each manufacturer already has an existing assembly plant.
Conclusions:

There are many who will appeal to the Finance Minister to send money their way at Budget time, so they can be winners. Up to now, the developers and operators of wind turbine generating developments in Ontario have been big winners. They have been given long term contracts at prices well above either what they need to make a profit, by their own admission, for what can only be stated to be an inferior quality product, that is not available when needed. There are many who will speak loudly and want to have their photograph taken with for those who win.

The Multi Municipality Wind Turbine Working Group submits this brief on behalf of the small people who have been hurt by the decisions taken by the Ontario Government. These little people do not have strong voices, nor lobby groups, nor can they afford to fight against the government. Few will stand beside the little people, but we do. These are the people we represent, our neighbours, and good citizens of our communities. It is unjust that they have been harmed. This must stop.

Because this is intended to be a brief that focuses on Finance and Economics, the issues of hurting people have been reduced to the economic harm being felt by consumers, municipalities, and the province. However, in reality, a very strong case must also be made for those who have had their lives significantly adversely impacted by the installation of wind turbines in Ontario. Since each of the developers who have installed and profited from wind turbine installations that were in each case approved by authorities of the Ontario Government, there is one real cost that the Government will need to prepare for, and that is the ultimate cost that will be the responsibility of the government to bear to address the hurt caused to these citizens. The truth will prevail, and justice will eventually come to bear. This submission has tried to bring the truth forward for your due consideration.

Submitted on behalf of the Multi Municipal Wind Turbine Working Group,

IJC Improves regulation plan for Lake Superior outflows and recommends action to Investigate restoration of Lake Michigan-Huron levels

2013/04/28

The International Joint Commission advised the governments of Canada and the United States, by letter dated April 15, 2013, that it will implement this year an improved plan for regulating Lake Superior outflows at Sault Ste. Marie. The new plan, Lake Superior Regulation Plan 2012, provides additional benefits compared to current regulation, especially during extreme water supply conditions.

In addition, the Commission recommends that the governments of Canada and the United States investigate structural options to restore water levels in Lake Michigan-Huron by 13 to 25 centimeters (about 5 to 10 inches), including a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis and a detailed environmental impact study. Specifically, the Commission encouraged governments to focus on options that would not exacerbate future high water levels but that would provide relief during periods of low water.

"Although future water levels are uncertain, we cannot ignore the damage from record low water levels," said Joe Comuzzi, Canadian chair of the Commission. "From Georgian Bay to Door County, from shoreline property owners to the shipping industry, we heard calls for action, and we urge governments to act in response to our recommendations."

"While the improvements are modest, the new regulation plan for Lake Superior outflows is better for the environment, better for navigation and better for hydropower production," said Rich Moy, U.S. Commissioner. "But all stakeholders need to be aware that changes in regulation are not the answer to the extremely low levels we are experiencing right now."

The Commission endorses the Study Board's modelling and monitoring recommendations recognizing that critical information and tools are needed to adaptively manage this dynamic system.

In order to better understand how future water supplies may affect water levels, the Commission calls upon governments to better coordinate the binational collection of climate-related data and strengthen climate change modelling capacity to help improve water management. This approach underpins the adaptive management framework recommended by the Study so that decision-makers at all levels of government have the tools and processes to make informed decisions. The Commission will issue specific recommendations regarding adaptive management for the Great Lakes system following its deliberation of the Great Lakes St. Lawrence River Adaptive Management Task Team final report. (more information available at ijc.org/boards/stlawrenceriver/taskteam).

"Meeting the ongoing challenges of extremo low and high levels on the Great Lakes should be guided by robust adaptive management to inform decisions, at all levels, with the best information and full community engagement," said Dereth Glance, U.S. Commissioner. "Our goal is for stakeholders throughout the Great Lakes to become engaged in the process and use the latest scientific information to prepare for extreme water levels and storms."

"We commend and thank the Study Board and the more than 200 experts who worked on this project," said Lyall Knott, Canadian Commissioner. "Their report advances scientific knowledge and provides governments with a solid basis for action."

Lana Pollack, U.S. chair of the Commission, chose not to sign the Commission report because, in her view, it places insufficient emphasis on climate change and the need for governments to pursue and fund adaptive management strategies in the basin. She also cautioned against raising "false hopes that structures in the St. Clair River, if built, would be sufficient to resolve the suffering from low water levels of Lake Michigan-Huron, while at the same time causing possible disruption downstream in Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie."

The International Joint Commission’s advice to governments is in response to the findings and recommendations of the International Upper Great Lakes Study. Originally focused on updating the regulation plan for Lake Superior outflows, the five-year study was expanded to include an examination of whether physical changes in the St. Clair River were affecting the level of Lake Michigan-Huron. At an exploratory level, the Study also looked at various engineering options for restoring Lake Michigan-Huron levels, including approximate construction costs and both positive and negative impacts.
Prior to making these recommendations to the governments, the Commission thoroughly reviewed more than 3,500 comments received from the public, including those provided at 13 public hearings held throughout the upper Great Lakes basin last summer (all comments available at jic.org/luglreport). Further information about the study, including technical documents, peer reviews and a "decision tree" tool describing how the Study Board reached its findings and recommendations are available at www.iugls.org.

For more information:

Bernard Beckhoff, Ottawa 613-947-1420 beckhoffb@ottawa.jic.org
John Nevin, Windsor 519-903-6001 nevinn@windsor.jic.org
Frank Bevacqua, Washington 202-736-9024 bevacqua@washington.jic.org

© International Joint Commission 2013
Subject: Final Date for Public Comments regarding the DGR Project.

Good Afternoon,

As part of our continued effort to keep you informed about the development of Ontario Power Generation (OPG)’s proposed Deep Geologic Repository (DGR) Project for low and intermediate level waste (L&ILW), I want to inform you that the Joint Review Panel (JRP) for the DGR Project has announced May 24, 2013 as the final date for public comments on OPG’s Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Preliminary Safety Report (PSR) and other documents in support of the licence application for the DGR Project.

The JRP announced a six-month public comment period in early February 2012 which was later extended. Members of the public, First Nations and Métis communities are encouraged to submit comments by mail, e-mail or fax by the deadline of May 24, 2013 to one of the addresses below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debra Myles, Panel Co-Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c/o Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 Elgin Street, 22nd Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, ON K1A 0H3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: 613-957-0626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll free: 1-866-582-1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:dgr.review@ceaa-acee.gc.ca">dgr.review@ceaa-acee.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kelly McGee, Panel Co-Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c/o Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Box 1046, Station B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280 Slater Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, ON K1P 5S9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: 613-947-3710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 613-995-5086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:OPG-DGR@cnscc-ccsn.gc.ca">OPG-DGR@cnscc-ccsn.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to the EIS and licence application documentation can be found at www.opg.com/dgr.

Following a determination by the Joint Review Panel that it has enough information to go to a hearing, the JRP will announce a public hearing date for the DGR Project 90 days prior, as well as instructions on how to participate in the hearing.

OPG submitted documentation for the DGR Project in April 2011 and represents more than four years of study, analyses and investigation, involving a broad range of consultation from experts and input through a robust public engagement process. The EIS concludes the DGR can safely manage and contain low and intermediate level waste in an environmentally responsible manner and is not likely to result in any significant adverse effects.

For more information about the DGR Project and the regulatory approvals process, please visit www.opg.com/dgr or the DGR Registry at www.ceaa.gc.ca reference #06-05-17520 or contact dgrinfo@opg.com

Thank you for your continued involvement and interest in this project. I will continue to keep you updated on the project and regulatory developments.

Sincerely,

Terry C. Doran P.Eng.
Vice President, Nuclear Waste Management Division

Ontario PowerGeneration
Ontario Announces Plan for New Infrastructure Fund

Small, Rural and North Municipalities to Benefit If 2013-2014 Budget Passes

Earlier today, the Government of Ontario announced its intention to create a $100 million fund to address the road, bridge and critical infrastructure needs of small, rural and Northern municipalities. The fund will be part of the 2013-2014 provincial budget.

The program, which recognizes the unique needs of small, rural and Northern communities, is the government's first step toward implementing a wide-ranging transportation plan for Northern and rural Ontario. The government also sees this program as the next step of its plan to "create jobs and build a prosperous and fair Ontario".

The new fund would be available by October 1, 2013. In announcing the program, the Premier of Ontario, Kathleen Wynne also committed to having the province consult on the components of a permanent program for roads, bridges and critical infrastructure investments in small, rural and Northern municipalities.

"This initiative recognizes the unique challenges that confront rural, small and Northern communities" said Joanne Vanderheyden, OGRA President. "Along with the decision to mandate asset management plans, this is an important next step in developing the modern infrastructure that Ontario needs to succeed in the 21st century."

The implementation of this program will be contingent on the passing of the 2013-2014 budget.
April 22, 2013

St. Edmunds Property Owners Incorporated
P. O. Box 152
Tobermory, Ontario N0H 2R0

ATTENTION: Mr. Udo Nixdorf, President

Dear Sir:

RE: Submission of Closed Session Investigation Fee
Complaint filed by Deputy Mayor John Bainbridge
Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula

Please be advised that your cheque in the amount of Fifty ($50.00) Dollars was received by regular first class mail this afternoon.

Please find enclosed a receipt acknowledging the payment of the Closed Session Investigation Fee.

I note that you have copied your April 18, 2013 letter to the Mayor and Members of Council. I will ensure that a copy of that correspondence will be placed on the May 13, 2013 Council agenda. Pursuant to your request, by way of this letter, Deputy Mayor Bainbridge will receive acknowledgement that the fee for the Closed Session Investigation has been paid by your organization on his behalf.

I trust that the foregoing is sufficient at this time.

Yours truly,

Mary Lynn Standen
Municipal Clerk

cc: Mayor and Members of Council
Deputy Mayor John Bainbridge
18 April 2013

Mary Lynn Standen
Municipal Clerk
Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula
56 Lindsey Road 5, R.R. #2,
Lion’s Head, ON., N0H 1W0

Dear Ms. Standen,

Re: Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula
Closed Meeting, March 11, 2013 – Complaint of Improperly Constituted Meeting
Filed by John Bainbridge, Deputy Mayor

Enclosed is a cheque in the amount of $50.00 as payment for the fee demanded by your Office in order for the investigation of the cited complaint to proceed.

While this complaint was initiated by Deputy Mayor Bainbridge, SEPO is in full support of pursuing this investigation. The details of the improprieties of the meeting in question serve to demonstrate that the majority members of Council care little for proper conduct in closed meetings, even after recommendations submitted by Amberley Gavel Ltd., resulting from a complaint filed by SEPO in November, 2011 on similar matters.

Further, we formally request that this letter serve to appeal to Council to discontinue the practice of paying LAS a stand by fee, given that the Ombudsman of Ontario provides Closed Meeting investigations free of charge. In fact, the Ombudsman strongly discourages municipalities from charging complainants a fee for filing complaints.

We ask that you kindly acknowledge to SEPO and Deputy Mayor Bainbridge the receipt of the enclosed cheque and that you will proceed with the complaint.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Udo Nixdorf, President
St. Edmunds Property Owners Inc

Cc Mayor McIvor & Councilors
John Bainbridge, Deputy Mayor
DATE

Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula
56 Lindsay Road 5
RR#2
Lions Head, Ontario  N0H 1W0

Att: The Mayor and Council

Dear Mr. Mayor and Councillors,

Re: Tobermory cenotaph and fisherman’s memorial

Many people have expressed their disappointment with the way that the Municipality piled snow, cleared from the roads, on the site of the cenotaph and the adjoining fisherman’s memorial. We wish to add the voice of SEPO to this expression of community dismay.

As you are aware the cenotaph was moved last year because of the damage caused to it by the municipality’s snow-clearing equipment. In addition, a considerable amount of money was spent by the Tobermory Legion to landscape the site. Since then volunteers have cared for the site until the snow came. Much of their work is now in vain as a result of the municipality’s lack of consideration.

A war memorial is focus for much of a community’s pride in its history and past citizens. It is little short of an insult to the community to use the war memorial as a dump for snow cleared from the roads, particularly given the sand and other debris mixed in with it. It astonished us that, given all the empty parking lots in the area, the municipality did not bother to use them as a place to dump the snow.

We would like to ask that in future Council ensures that its employees treat the memorial with respect and find somewhere else to dump the snow.

Yours truly,

For the Executive of St. Edmunds Property Owners

cc. The Bruce Peninsula Press
April 18, 2013

The Honourable Kathleen Wynne
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building
Queen’s Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Re: Motion to support the Township of Wainfleet Declaring they are Not a “Willing Host” for Wind Turbine Development

Dear Premier,

Please be advised that the Council of the Municipality of Bluewater passed the following resolution at their Council meeting held on April 15, 2013:

Moved by Councillor Irvin, seconded by Councillor Palmer that the Council of the Municipality of Bluewater supports the motion made by the Township of Wainfleet declaring that they are Not a “Willing Host” for Wind Turbine Development; and

That this resolution be circulated to Premier Kathleen Wynne, as well as to the Minister of Environment, Minister of Energy, Minister of Rural Affairs and all Ontario Municipalities. Carried.

Kind Regards,

Charlene Overholt
Deputy-Clerk

cc: Honourable Jim Bradley, MPP, Minister of the Environment
Honourable Bob Chiarelli, MPP, Minister of Energy
Honourable Jeff Leal, MPP, Minister of Rural Affairs
All Ontario Municipalities (via email)

Valuing our unique quality of life, recognizing our diversity, respecting our traditions.
SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MINUTES – MEETING #53

MEETING: SOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE

DATE: FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2012

TIME: 9:30 A.M.

LOCATION: GREY SAUBLE CONSERVATION, OWEN SOUND ON

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Mike Traynor called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

In Attendance: Chair, Mike Traynor
David Biesenthal, Bruce Davidson, Ken Furlong, Kathie Hughes, Mark
Kraemer, Brent Lanktree, Les MacKinnon, Les Nichols, Carolyn Parker,
Dale Thompson, Bill Twaddle, Mitch Twolan

Others Present: Robert Reid, Ex-officio member, Grey-Bruce Health Unit
Don Smith, Project Manager, Drinking Water Source Protection (DWSP)
Nancy Guest, Recording Secretary, DWSP

Also in Attendance: John Cottrill, CAO, Grey Sauble Conservation
Betsy Stewart, Councillor, Northern Bruce Peninsula
David Ellingwood, Program Supervisor, DWSP
Brian Luiinstra, Hydrogeologist, DWSP
Elly Ward, Communications Specialist, DWSP
Donna Clarkston, Outreach Specialist, DWSP

Regrets: Lou D’Alessandro, Carolyn Day, Robert Emerson

The Chair introduced and welcomed Mr. Dave Inglis, Warden of Bruce County and Mayor of the
Municipality of Brockton, Mr. John Peevers from Bruce Power and Mr. Pat Gillesen from Bruce
Federation of Agriculture.

1. Adoption of Agenda

Motion No. SPC-12-204
Moved by Ken Furlong
Seconded by Brent Lanktree

THAT the Agenda be adopted as distributed.

Carried
2. Declaration of Pecuniary or Conflict of Interest

Committee members were reminded to disclose any pecuniary interest that may arise during the course of the meeting. No disclosures of pecuniary interest were expressed at this time.

3. Adoption of Minutes

Motion No. SPC-12-205
Moved by Bruce Davidson
Seconded by Mitch Twolan

THAT the Minutes of the September 28, 2012 Source Protection Committee meeting be adopted as distributed.

Carried

4. Matters Arising from the Minutes

Nitrate Issues in the Walkerton Well Head Protection Area Report 4a

The Hydrogeologist reviewed Report 4a with a powerpoint presentation and advised that the this is a sensitive area due to the geology of the area and not because of poor agricultural practices. All standard sampling procedures were followed and excessive levels of nitrate were found relating to bedrock wells.

Kathie Hughes arrived at 9:45 a.m.

Discussions followed respecting the amount and availability of data, and the cost of additional research.

Motion No. SPC-12-206
Moved by Dave Biesenthal
Seconded by Les Nichols

THAT the issues related to nitrate in the Brockton well head protection area be removed from the Source Protection Plan.

Defeated

The Committee recessed from 10:45 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

5. Correspondence

Email from Ann Bacso dated October 5, 2012 including a letter to the Provincial Premier dated October 3, 2012 respecting wind turbines; and response from Drinking Water Source Protection dated October 10, 2012; and response from Ann Bacso dated October 11, 2012 was noted and filed.

Letter from Ling Mark, Director, Source Protection Programs branch, MOE, dated November 14, 2012 respecting program funding was noted and filed.

Email from Saira Bozin Ilisinovic, MOE, dated November 19, 2012 respecting Stewardship Program was noted and filed.

SPC Mtg #53 – November 30, 2012 – Adopted Minutes
6. Reports

Administration Report 6a

The Project Manager reviewed Report 6a and advised that the municipal implementation workshops were well-attended and discussions seem to be taking place amongst the municipalities.

Early Response Program Request for Extension Report 6b

The Project Manager reviewed Report 6b and advised that an extension has been requested to allow the availability of excess funds to be used up to the end of 2013. There are four outstanding projects awaiting paperwork; other projects were cancelled; and approximately $126,000 remains in excess.

Communications Report 6c

The Communications Specialist reviewed Report 6c and spoke of her attendance at the Walkerton Water Works and the Experience Green events. She advised that Module 1 of the Municipal Implementation Guide was complete and has been distributed to municipalities across Ontario. Binders containing Module 1 were distributed to the municipalities in this Region. Comments have been received respecting Module 2; Module 3 is currently in progress; this office is taking the lead on Module 4, which should be written by late December or early January; this office has also been asked to take the lead for Module 5; we are waiting to hear if we are the lead on Modules 6 (funding) and 7 (prohibition); and Module 8 has been removed.

Intake Protection Zone-3 and Tritium Report 6d

The Hydrogeologist reviewed Report 6d and advised that tritium has been identified at Bruce Nuclear Power Development (PNPD) as a possible threat. Whether tritium is a significant threat and if there is a hydrogeological connection still remains to be determined. The tritium level in the water near BNPD is 1000th of the provincial water quality standards; the highest level being approximately 20 Bq/l; the provincial standard being 7000 Bq/l. To declare this as a significant threat, there must be a substantial quantity of material plus a hydrogeological connection. Under those parameters, this could be a significant threat if there was a catastrophic failure at BNPD; and there is an opportunity to set policy.

The meeting recessed for lunch at 12:10 p.m. and reconvened at 1:05 p.m.

Mark Kraemer excused himself from the meeting

Delegation

The Chair introduced the delegation of Mr. Jim Henning and Mr. Pat Gibbons on behalf of the Southampton Residents' Association who gave a presentation about the deep geologic repository (DGR) and the role played by Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO). A discussion followed concerning the mandate of the Source Protection Committee with respect to the DGR.
7. New Business

Review of SPC Member Terms of Appointment Report 7a

The Project Manager reviewed Report 7a and advised that the fifth anniversary of the commencement of the Source Protection Committee was November 27, 2012. The Project Manager explained that one-third of the SPC appointments will expire when the Source Protection Plan approval notice has been published in the Environmental Registry. The Management Committee will make final appointments of members to replace departing members. Members were encouraged to make their wishes known before the Source Protection Plan is approved.

8. Other Business

The Hydrogeologist, Brian Luinstra, announced that he and his family are moving to Perth, Australia at the end of the year and thanked the Source Protection Committee for its work with him. He has enjoyed his time with Drinking Water Source Protection.

The Chair thanked the Hydrogeologist and the Project Manager, who is returning to Saugeen Conservation at the beginning of 2013, for all their work with the Committee and their dedication to clean water.

There was no other business.

9. Confirmation of Next Meeting and Adjournment

The Project Manager advised that the budget has not been set for the next fiscal year and it is unknown what funding will be available for SPC meetings. There may not be a meeting in January 2013 and the Committee will be advised as soon as possible.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Mike Traynor
Chair

Nancy Guest
Recording Secretary
124 Greenough Point Road  
Box 65  
Stokes Bay, ON N0H 2M0  
May 8, 2013

The Mayor and Councillors  
Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula  
Mayor Milt McIver  
Deputy Mayor John Bainbridge  
Councillor Betsy A. Stewart  
Councillor Tom Boyle  
Councillor Ray Burns

Re: Decks on the Beach at Greenough Harbour

Dear Mayor McIver, Deputy Mayor and Councillors,

The attached letter to Council was discussed by Council at its March 25 meeting.

To follow up, the CAO suggested a Temporary Zoning By-law on April 22 as a possible solution, but no questions were asked to clarify the advantages and estimate costs.

Would the benefits of giving the community time to develop a consensus and dispel possible long term divisions outweigh the possibility of an appeal and study costs?

Given a few months, I am confident that we could work out a solution that all residents could accept.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Jeremy Thorn
The Mayor and Councillors  
Municipality of Northern Bruce Peninsula  
Mayor Milt McIver  
Deputy Mayor John Bainbridge  
Councillor Betsy A. Stewart  
Councillor Tom Boyle  
Councillor Ray Burns  

Re: Decks on the Shore at Greenough Harbour  

Dear Mayor McIver, Deputy Mayor and Councillors,  

The members of Greenough Resident Committee have asked me to send this request to Council.  

In 2002, the MNBP Council passed the Greenough Harbour Zoning By-law 2002-43 which among other provisions prohibited buildings, structures (decks) and site alteration on Greenough’s rocky alvar-like beach. This by-law was subsequently approved by the OMB in 2003. Unfortunately, this same by law was not included in the MNBP Comprehensive By Law passed in September 2002 and any others to date. In 2006 the sub-division agreement for Greenough Harbour was approved with inclusion of 12 x 20 deck.  

There is a housekeeping amendment that council will be looking at this year to review and rectify this exclusion.  

The current residents incorrectly believed that decks were not allowed on the shoreline until a new owner erected one this past summer. This has caused concern among the majority of the original owners who, by informal survey, strongly agreed that decks spoil this wilderness shoreline as well as being an environmental concern and would therefore prefer the shore be kept in it’s natural condition. There are others who would agree to decks but would like to clarify the total footprint size of allowable decks in the sub division agreement and/or modify the size, location and build material of the decks. In addition, the developer understandably would like to be able to proceed with the building of decks.  

We request that Council allow Greenough Harbour residents time to develop a consensus around the building of decks on the shoreline either from the viewpoint of ‘prohibition’ or ‘size, location and build material’ before any more decks are built. We will be holding a General Meeting on June 1st to address the issue. The community needs time to work through the issues prior to the housekeeping update that deals with the by-law. There is confusion about whether the sub division agreement or the By-Law currently prevails and we have asked Bill Jones for further information on this. In addition, as the decks do not require a building permit we are concerned that decks may be erected before council and residents have time to work this out which could result in major inconsistencies.
We request that council advise the Resident’s Committee how they might temporarily delay the construction of decks until a full consultation with the community can be held in connection with the housekeeping update later this year.

One committee member has suggested that perhaps Council could give temporary effect to the single line in Zoning By-law 2002-43 regarding the prohibition of buildings, structures and alterations on the beach on Greenough Point by inserting a corresponding line at the end of section 13.3 of the MNBP Comprehensive Zoning By-law.

The proposed wording of the line to be inserted parallels precisely the one passed by Council in 2002:

**Buildings, structures and site alteration shall be prohibited in the area shown as R2-t in By-law 2002-43**

We trust that Council will have other suggestions as to how best temporarily prohibit decks and look forward to your response and assistance in this matter.

In addition, should our understanding of the situation (which is attached) not be correct we would appreciate clarification.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Houston
Chair, Greenough Residents Committee
Summary of the Situation

1. Greenough Harbour Zoning was passed by Council as By-law 2002-43. It pertains to the whole proposal for the Greenough Harbour development. Among other provisions, it prohibits all buildings, structures and alterations on Greenough’s alvar-like flat rock beach.

2. The Greenough Harbour Zoning By-law 2002-43 was appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) because third parties (Upton & Prior) thought its environmental provisions were not strong enough.

3. The MNBP Comprehensive Zoning By-law was passed in September 2002\(^1\) without reference to Greenough zoning because the Greenough Harbour Zoning By-law 2002-43 was under review by the OMB. This by-law was also excluded from subsequent Comprehensive Zoning By-laws and remains excluded to this date.

4. Greenough Harbour Zoning By-law 2002-43 which provided the legal authority to proceed with the Greenough Harbour development was approved by the OMB in 2003. The approved version included prohibition of structures (decks) on the beach.

5. The Subdivision Agreement was signed by the developer John Keeso and the Mayor in October 2006. Schedule "O", which was added as the 15th attachment to the Subdivision Agreement, included on page 18 one sentence that said a 12' by 20' deck could be built on the beach in front of every lot, in contravention of the Council’s (original) Greenough Harbour Zoning By-law 2002-43.

6. All of the amendments, consolidations and housekeeping updates since have missed giving effect to Greenough Harbour Zoning By-law 2002-43. Greenough is therefore protected only by the general MNBP R2 zoning and Subdivision Agreement (therefore allowing construction of the first 12’x20’ deck).

---

\(^1\) This comprehensive Zoning By-law is meant to consolidate all the newly created By-laws of the Municipality that have been implemented, to create an all-inclusive overall By-law.