

APPENDIX B: PUBLIC ISSUES

Glen Dhu Power – Wind Project

Addendum to Glen Dhu Environmental Assessment and Registration Document

Summary of Issues Raised in Public Comments on the EA Registration Document

Respondent	Issue	Theme #
1	640m setback is too close to houses	8
2	Original proposal was to be built much further back	7
	Detrimental effect on property values	13
	Project will take tradition and serenity of generations past, present & future	9
	SWI has pitted neighbour against neighbour	9
	Increased noise pollution on family homesteads	1
3	Noise testing not conducted over long enough period of time	1
	No public notice regarding site change	7
	Noise an issue because one turbine blade weighs <10,000 kg	1
4	SWI exploited community because they know it doesn't have financial means to fight it	9
	EMP & EPP include no accountability	6
	Bird kills (specifically eagles)	4
	No bond for decommissioning	10
	Leaving turbines to rust once finished	10
	Locations of refuelling stations	10
	Industrial storage sites location adjacent to her house	10
	Vibroacoustic disease	3
	Wind turbine syndrome	3
	Migraines	3
	Compensation for damaged health	3
	Property value decrease	13
	Areas closed to residents with authorized access only	9
	Gravity wells located too close to turbine #34	11
	Drilling & blasting damage to watercourses	11
	Erosion & destruction to wildlife habitat	4
	Bears forced closer to homes during construction	10
	Herbicide usage	12
	Bat fatalities	4
	Eagles becoming extinct	4
	EA conclusions not scientifically based	6
	70% of costs to go overseas (NS taxpayers' money)	14
	Jobs given to imported labour	14
	Jobs not considered contribution to employment	14
	Abandoned homes leading to less tax revenue in community	14
	Elimination of tourism revenue	14
	No reduction in GHGs or coal dependency	15
Project will not benefit environmentally	15	
Inefficient generation of electricity	15	
Raising overall electricity prices in NS	14	

Glen Dhu Power – Wind Project

Addendum to Glen Dhu Environmental Assessment and Registration Document

Respondent	Issue	Theme #
	EA is inaccurate and incomplete	6
	Residents were left out of EA & consultation process	5
	Aug 31, 07 Mike Magnus stated 2 km min distance to houses while #34 was in place in June of that year	7
	SWI aided Pictou County to craft bylaw	8
	Unable to work due to stress from proposal	9
5	Residents have been deceived by SWI	9
	Detrimental impact to the environment & the community	9
	Keeping the masses ignorant is the thrust of SWI'	9
	Access road unknown	10
	View plane	2
	Noisy	1
	Flashing navigation lights	2
	Community not consulted about Project	5
	Church property leased without input from congregation	5
	Leases in place prior to community being notified of Project	5
	Tower base requires 43 loads of cement	10
	Tower base requires land mass equivalent to 2 city blocks	10
	Government does not care	9
	Government just wants to look green	9
	Turbines are noisy	1
Wildlife will not return to area	4	
Locals will have restricted access to roads they live on during construction	10	
Roads destroyed by Project	10	
6	Moose have already left the area therefore EA lacks credibility	6
	Fishers will be permanently displaced	4
	Bat survey was not done properly	6
	Turbine decibel levels being same as background noise not relevant as one is beautiful and one is not	1
	Low-frequency sound not considered in noise model	1
	Chemical treatments to remove vegetation will harm watershed	12
	SWI assisted Pictou County in developing bylaw	8
	SWI could face legal action due to lying about damage to quality of life and property values	9
	Profits will be miniscule	14
	Environmental benefit of wind energy is absent	15
	Setback should be 1000m	8
7	Human health concerns from strobe lights	3
	Human health concerns from noise	3
8	Maps in EA are not of good quality	6
	Charts were printed too small to read	6
	Language used in EA is confusing	6

Glen Dhu Power – Wind Project

Addendum to Glen Dhu Environmental Assessment and Registration Document

Respondent	Issue	Theme #
	Public meetings were totally secretive	9
	Sites were changed	7
	Turbine model changed to a bigger and noisier model	7
	Residents were not informed	5
	Health officials not informed	3
	Human consequences not addressed	6
	Wildlife consequences not addressed	6
	Epilepsy and Migraines as a result of strobe lights	3
	Residents with ADD affected	3
	Residents with ADHD affected	3
	Residents with Autism affected	3
	Residents with mental illness affected	3
	Sound emissions create impossible living environment	9
	Residents will have to abandon their home	9
	Black bears will relocate closer to homes creating danger	10
	Bears not mentioned in EA	6
	Eagles not mentioned in EA	6
	Beaver not mentioned in EA	6
	Property value will decrease by 80%	13
	SWI has pitted parents against children	9
	SWI has pitted siblings against siblings	9
	SWI has pitted neighbour against neighbour	9
	No smoking by workers in forested area should be permitted	10
	Fire fighting - training and responsibility	10
	Distrust the company	9
	Open house format used to divide and conquer residents	9
	Blasting and effects on water supply	11
	No bond for decommissioning	10
	Health effects on domestic animals	4
9	Timely written notice of Project was not made	5
	Project was kept secret	9
	Disruptive impact on environment	15
10	Setback for Pictou County should be at least 2.4 km	8
	Headaches as result of wind farms	3
	Migraines as results of wind farms	3
	Nausea as result of wind farms	3
	Dizziness as result of wind farms	3
	Palpitations as result of wind farms	3
	Tinnitus as result of wind farms	3
	Sleep disturbance as result of wind farms	3

Glen Dhu Power – Wind Project

Addendum to Glen Dhu Environmental Assessment and Registration Document

Respondent	Issue	Theme #
	Stress as result of wind farms	3
	Anxiety as result of wind farms	3
	Depression as result of wind farms	3
	Those who live 2.4 to 4.8 km from turbines will suffer	3
	EA down plays effects on wildlife	6
	Approving this EA is breaking the law	9
	Will not be able to use her property	13
	Children's inheritance is spoiled	9
	SWI has taken over her land	9
	Will not be able to live in her home	9
	Pays mortgage and cannot leave	9
	Cannot sell property due to decreased property values	13
	600m starts at her house	8
11	All issues relate to the Project not being approved until MEKS has been completed	6
12	SWI has taken no remedial action with existing turbines & residents who want to be relieved of noise	9
	Author lacks credentials to report on any noise issues	6
	Humans rarely experience wind turbine noise while sitting in trees	1
	Background noise study not representative of human receptor points	1
	Wind noise is louder at night	1
	Residents within 1900m may express annoyance to noise	1
	Background noise study doesn't address	1
	Reliance on Pictou County bylaw to protect is misguided	8
	Noise mitigation is incomplete and lacks accountability	1
	SWI placed WTGs close to residents with no notification	8
	Fails to show fair and open public consultation	5
	Missing data for noise model	1
	Sound data is incomplete and no conclusions can be drawn	1
	SWI led residents to believe turbines would be far back in highlands	9
	Turbines were placed on ridgeline, in full view, over looking homes	9
	SWI says it didn't have time to have public meetings	9
	General public not well represented as few showed for meeting in March, 2007	5
	Respondent states in initial layout the closest turbine was 3 km from his house	7
	Vascular study site map (June 2007) had different locations than those on March 2007 map	7
	No public notice of relocation of turbines	7
	SWI representatives heard information at meeting held by Respondent in August 2007	5
	SWI representatives heard information at bylaw hearing in Sept 2007	5
	Mike Magnus' statements at April 2008 meeting contradict EA turbine locations	7
	SWI did not hold a public meeting to discuss changes made to layouts	7
	SWI ignored their own bird study's advice	6
	SWI put turbines closer to scarp face after advice of bird study to set back	6

Glen Dhu Power – Wind Project

Addendum to Glen Dhu Environmental Assessment and Registration Document

Respondent	Issue	Theme #
	EA submission was first public disclosure to turbine layout	5
	SWI has certain and extensive knowledge of resident's concerns and ignored them	5
	General public was omitted from list of contacted stakeholders in EA document	5
	Document completed almost one month prior to open houses	5
	Nutty Mountain held public meeting 10 months prior to EA submission	5
Two Respondents provided copies of their presentations made to Pictou County during the public review of the by-law concerning wind turbine setback. These documents comment on issues 1, 8 and 15.		