

3.4.2 Expected Scenario Overview:

Assumptions used in the creation of the expected scenario include:

- Steady political support for continued procurement of wind energy generation capacity.
- Several transmission additions and upgrades that will facilitate the growth of the market in line with the LTEP.
- Potential interruptions to original project schedules:
 - Permitting – some;
 - Construction – few (chiefly due to winter weather);
 - OPA's 1 year extension on COD – some; and
 - Project cancellations – some.

3.4.2.1 Installation Rate in Ontario




Figure 3.5: Annual Wind Energy Installations in Ontario (in MW), Expected Scenario (2011-2018)

- Total 2011-2018 installations: 5,673 MW - total cumulative installations by 2018: 7,101 MW.
- Average annual installations: 709 MW - ranging from 438 MW (2012) to 985 MW (2014).

3.4.2.2 Trends

- Annual market volume will peak in 2014 and maintain a high volume until 2018 due to:
 1. The Bruce to Milton transmission expansion project
 2. East-West tie transmission upgrades
 3. Substantial transmission upgrades in south-western Ontario
- Market supply capacity for wind turbine installations of 900 - 1,000 MW per year:
 - The market may potentially experience domestic content supply constraints in 2014-2016 as there will be 3 years in a row of installation volume at nearly market capacity.
 - Most parts of the value and supply chains can stretch beyond 1,000 MW per year, but depending on future market conditions, the supply of domestic-content compliant towers could be constraining factors that could cause delays and/or price increases.

3.4.3 Low Scenario Overview:

Assumptions used in the creation of the low scenario include:

- Low political support for continued procurement of wind energy generation capacity:
 - Potential changes to the domestic content rules.
- Minor transmission additions to facilitate additional project awards and installations (by 2018).
- Potential interruptions to original project schedules:
 - Permitting – significant;
 - Construction – few (chiefly due to winter weather);
 - OPA's 1 year extension on COD – significant; and
 - Project cancellations – significant.

3.4.3.1 Installation Rate in Ontario




Figure 3.6: Annual Wind Energy Installations in Ontario (in MW), Low Scenario (2011-2018)

- Total 2011-2018 installations: 2,280 MW - total cumulative installations by 2018: 3,708 MW.
- Average annual installations: 285 MW - ranging from 0 MW (2018) to 516 MW (2014).

3.4.3.2 Trends

- Annual installations will peak in 2014 due to:
 1. The Bruce to Milton transmission expansion project
- Market supply capacity for wind turbine installations of 600 - 700 MW per year:
 - It is unlikely that the market will experience any domestic content supply constraints from 2011-2018.
 - Most parts of the value and supply chains have significant flexibility in terms of scaling production and service up and down. Further, additional supply in the Ontario marketplace could be used to serve other North American markets fairly easily due to the strong transportation infrastructure in Ontario. As such, though the market capacity will be far greater than demand in most years, it is unlikely that there will be a surplus of equipment and/or production capacity that could cause decreases in price.

4 Economic Impacts

4.1 Overview of Economic Impacts

Investment in the wind energy sector impacts a number of stakeholder groups within the province of Ontario in a variety of ways, including stimulation of local spending, generation of tax revenue, lease payments, job creation, and the development of local expertise and innovation⁷. Based on market activities corresponding with the “expected” scenario laid out in the previous section, the key economic indicators are:

- The wind energy sector will result in 80,328 person years of employment (PYE) from 2011-2018.
- Total private sector investment for wind turbine installations will be more than \$16.4billion, of which greater than \$8.5billion will be spent locally in Ontario from 2011-2018, shown in Figure 4.1.
- Total private sector benefits paid in Ontario, demonstrated in Table 4.7, as a result of installations in 2011-2018 will surpass \$1.1billion (based on and paid over 20-year contracts from the installation date), including:
 - \$1.03billion in lease payments to landowners; and
 - \$147million in taxation payments to municipalities.




Figure 4.1: Cumulative Private Sector Investment for Wind Turbine Installations in Ontario, Expected Scenario 2011-2018

⁷ The analysis in this report does not include the economic or labour impacts associated with the decommissioning, re-powering, and/or refurbishment of wind turbines at the end of their service life. It is likely that a combination of all three options will be employed for wind turbines in Ontario, but at this point in time it is unclear what percentage of turbines will be subjected to each end of service life option.




Figure 4.2: Annual Private Sector Investment for Wind Turbine Installations in Ontario, Expected Scenario 2011-2018

4.2 Job Creation

When compared to existing traditional energy sources in Ontario, the wind energy sector creates more employment opportunities per unit of energy produced and does so at a lower cost per job. This fact, as demonstrated in the following figures, helps to explain why the province of Ontario and other governments from around the world are including wind energy as a growing part of their energy mix.

In general, when considering jobs created by the wind energy sector, it is useful to make a distinction between pre-connection and post-connection jobs. Post-connection jobs are typically ongoing and include operation and maintenance (O&M) while pre-connection jobs are more variable in nature and include project development, onsite labour, manufacturing, wholesale, and distribution. For the purposes of our study, we have termed pre-connection jobs as “Construction Phase” and have assumed that the pre-connection jobs would be one-time⁸. In order to be sustained on an ongoing basis, these jobs would need to be maintained with export projects and/or additional local market awards.

In order to compare ongoing jobs with one-time jobs, we use a measure called person-years of employment (PYE). As the name suggests, PYE represent one year of employment for one individual (i.e. 40 hours per week for 52 weeks). To illustrate, since Ontario FIT contracts last for 20 years, we equate one O&M job associated with a FIT contract to 20 PYE.




Figure 4.3: Person Years of Employment per GWh of Generated Energy by Various Technologies Employed in Ontario.

To compare job creation (in terms of PYE) by various generation technologies, it is most useful to measure the number of PYE created per unit of energy produced (GWh in this case). Figure 4.3 demonstrates PYE per GWh by different technologies used in Ontario for energy generation. Results from a 2010 study published in Energy Policy by Wei et al. that synthesized data across 15 job studies

⁸ Re-powering construction phase employment was not taken into consideration as it will appear much later than the scope covered in this report. A continuous wind market will create these jobs and allow for a number of construction phase jobs to be self-sustaining.

were coupled with Ontario-specific conditions (such as wind regime, solar insolation, and FIT contract data) to inform the model used in Figure 4.3⁹.




Figure 4.4: Cost per Person Year of Employment by Various Energy Generating Technologies Used in Ontario

The cost of job creation can be calculated by comparing PYE per unit of energy with the cost per unit of energy. Our cost calculations have come from current Feed-In Tariff rates, Moody's Investment Service (for nuclear data)¹⁰, and the OPA's integrated power system plan (IPSP) evidence¹¹. In order to reflect a more complete and accurate cost to Ontarians, our assumptions for the cost of fossil fuels incorporates conservative estimates (2¢/kWh for natural gas and 12.7¢/kWh for coal)¹² published by the Ontario Ministry of Energy of the cost of health and environmental externalities caused by these types of power generation¹³.

⁹ Wei, M., Patadia, S., Kammen, D. 2010. Putting renewables and energy efficiency to work: How many jobs can the clean energy industry generate in the US? Energy Policy. 38: 919-931.

¹⁰ Weis, T., Stensil, S.-P., & Stewart, K. (August, 2010). Renewable is Doable. <http://pubs.pembina.org/reports/ontario-green-energy-report-august-web.pdf>

¹¹ Ontario Power Authority. (2007). Methodology and Assumptions for the Cost to Consumer Model. http://www.powerauthority.on.ca/ipsp/Storage/53/4886_G-2-1_Att_1_corrected_071019.pdf; and Ontario Power Authority. (2008). Integrated Power System Plan for the Period 2008-2027. <http://www.powerauthority.on.ca/integrated-power-system-plan/g-plan-outcomes>

For natural gas pricing the OPA considered several scenarios that fall within a spot-price range from \$4.00 to \$12.00; as present day prices are close to the low end of that range, we used the OPA's low price case in our cost calculations. Ontario Power Authority. (2008). Integrated Power System Plan for the Period 2008-2027. <http://www.powerauthority.on.ca/integrated-power-system-plan/g-plan-outcomes>.

¹² DSS Management Consultants Inc., RWDI Air Inc. (2005). Cost Benefit Analysis: Replacing Ontario's Coal Fired Electricity Generation. Toronto, ON: Ontario Ministry of Energy.

¹³ Externalities of 18¢/kWh due to coal were reported in a Harvard study. (Reuters. (2011). Coal's hidden costs top \$345 billion in U.S.-study.)

4.2.1.1 Total Jobs Created Annually and Total for 2011-2018

Figure 4.5 demonstrates annual job creation in Ontario by the wind energy industry. The number of PYE presented includes both one-time and ongoing jobs. All PYE from permanent jobs are attributed to the year in which the project was installed¹⁴.

The cumulative expected PYE created by the wind energy sector in Ontario from 2011-2018 is shown in Table 4.1. It should be noted that the jobs reported here are solely a result of the LTEP.

- From 2011-2018, 80,328 PYE will be created in Ontario due to the wind energy sector.
- On an annual basis, the number of jobs created varies from a low of 5,708 PYE in 2011 to 14,249 in 2014.

Note: The O&M job numbers listed for each year in Figure 4.5, are created as a result of the projects built that year, but are actually carried out over the 20 year period a project is expected to be in operation. Figure 4.8 illustrates that fact in more detail.




Figure 4.5: Person Years of Employment Created by the Wind Energy Sector in Ontario, Expected Scenario 2011-2018

4.2.1.2 Jobs Creation by Type in Ontario for 2011-2018

Figure 4.6 demonstrates the relative proportion of employment by different types of jobs in Ontario from 2011-2018, due to the wind energy sector.

- 54% of PYE created in Ontario due to the wind energy sector will occur in the construction phase due to labour and manufacturing employment.

¹⁴Developmental PYE are included in the construction phase as service jobs. As the employment calculations are for only connected projects, any development work in the prospecting phase, as well as any other development, manufacturing, and/or construction work for incomplete projects are not accounted for in our scenarios.

Ontario Wind Energy Sector Job Creation by Type of Job, 2011-2018




Figure 4.6: Total Ontario Wind Energy Sector Job Creation by Type of Job, Expected Scenario 2011-2018

PYE can be classified into three categories: direct, indirect, and induced.

- Direct PYE are jobs that are created to immediately serve the actual supply chain, such as wind turbine manufacturing and construction.
- Indirect¹⁵ PYE are jobs that have been created to facilitate the creation and maintenance of the supply chain, such as the construction and manufacture of facilities and equipment used in the wind energy generation supply chain.
- Finally, induced PYE are jobs that are created elsewhere in the economy as a result of spending from both direct and indirect workers and firms¹⁶. Induced PYE were not included in this study so as to be conservative with PYE estimates as well as due to their ambiguous nature. Induced jobs are real, but quantifying them is difficult, so we have focused our analysis on direct and indirect jobs.

Expected PYE creation due to Ontario's Wind Energy Sector from 2011-2018, demonstrated in Table 4.1, will be almost equally split between direct and indirect employment:

- 38,135 direct PYE; and
- 42,193 indirect PYE will be generated in Ontario due to the wind energy sector.

¹⁵ Note: The model assumes (based on inputs and multipliers from Statistics Canada) that a certain percentage of indirect jobs would need to exist in the province to serve the wind energy sector. These jobs are counted in the year in which the installations are complete and not necessarily in the year that they occur.

¹⁶ Estimates of Job Creation from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.
http://www.whitehouse.gov/assets/documents/Job-Years_Revised5-8.pdf

Table 4.1: Job Creation (PYE) in the Ontario Wind Energy Sector, 2011-2018

Wind Energy Sector Job Creation (PYE) in Ontario, 2011-2018										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Expected Scenario	Direct	2,651	3,013	3,246	6,776	5,523	6,349	5,308	5,269	38,135
	Indirect	3,057	3,323	3,579	7,473	6,091	7,003	5,855	5,811	42,193
	Total	5,708	6,336	6,825	14,249	11,614	13,353	11,163	11,080	80,328
High Scenario	Direct	3,349	3,138	4,540	7,643	6,714	6,985	7,285	6,947	46,602
	Indirect	3,863	3,461	5,007	8,430	7,405	7,704	8,035	7,663	51,567
	Total	7,212	6,598	9,548	16,073	14,120	14,689	15,319	14,610	98,169
Low Scenario	Direct	1,979	2,642	1,950	3,549	1,710	2,138	1,069	-	15,037
	Indirect	2,282	2,914	2,150	3,914	1,885	2,359	1,155	-	16,658
	Total	4,262	5,557	4,100	7,462	3,595	4,497	2,223	-	31,695

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011

Note: In Table 4.1 all jobs created by an installation in a given year are tied back to that year regardless of when the job actually occurs. See Figure 4.7 for an alternative view of the same data.

Table 4.2: Net Job Creation (PYE) Difference Between Market Scenarios (Relative to the Expected Scenario), 2011-2018

Net Difference in Job Creation (PYE) in Ontario Relative to the Expected Scenario, 2011-2018										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Expected Scenario		5,708	6,336	6,825	14,249	11,614	13,353	11,163	11,080	80,328
High Scenario		1,504	262	2,723	1,824	2,506	1,336	4,156	3,530	17,841
Low Scenario		(1,446)	(780)	(2,725)	(6,787)	(8,020)	(8,856)	(8,940)	(11,080)	(48,633)

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011




Figure 4.7: Ontario Wind Energy Sector Cumulative Job Creation (in PYE), 2011-2018

Alternatively expected job creation by year and by job type from 2009 to 2038¹⁷ as a result of the wind energy sector in Ontario is shown in Figure 4.8, assuming that:

- Each project is awarded at the beginning of the 1st year;
- Services (developmental and other) take place in years 1 and 2;
- Sufficient lead-time is provided to allow for manufacturing to mainly take place in the 1st and 2nd years;
- Construction is not performed over the winter and is a 2 year process;
 - Foundation and infrastructure work is completed in year 2
 - Turbine erection is completed in year 3
- Each project will be connected and generating at the end of year 3;
- O&M work will begin at the beginning of the 4th year and last for 20 years; and
- Tax payments and lease payments to landowners will begin in year 4 and last for 20 years.

Note: These figures are ONLY for the projects forecast for installation in 2011 through 2018. The actual number of jobs is likely to be higher because no jobs are included for export, pre-contract development, or any ongoing installations after 2018. Furthermore, we have only considered direct and indirect jobs and not induced jobs. Therefore, these numbers are conservative for all years. The drop-off in employment after 2017 would only occur if exports and continued project awards beyond 2018 did not materialize.

¹⁷ For the purposes of this model direct and indirect employment were assumed to occur at the same time. As such, there is no differentiation between these two employment categories in this measure of employment.

- During the forecast window, the number of jobs created varies from a low of 4,761 in 2011 to 9,951 in 2014; and
- 1,031 O&M jobs, ongoing after the end of the forecast window, are expected to be maintained until 2031 when they will slowly decline until a low of 141 in 2038 as wind energy generation projects reach decommissioning and the end of their generation contracts.




Figure 4.8: Expected Ontario Employment due to Wind Construction 2011-2018: Job Years as They Occur, 2009-2038

4.2.2 Jobs Multipliers for Construction & Operation Phases of Wind Energy in Ontario

Based on ClearSky Advisor’s Forecast of the Wind Energy Sector in Ontario 2011-2018 (Chapter 3.4) we expect wind energy to have an impact on employment in Ontario in the next several years.

- On average, expected wind energy installations will create 14.1 person-years of employment in Ontario per MW of nameplate capacity:
 - Per average installed wind turbine in Ontario, 30.2 PYE are created in Ontario;
 - During the construction phase, on average, 10.5 PYE per MW of installed wind capacity will be created;
 - During the O&M phase of wind energy, on average over the 20 year contract, 3.6 PYE per MW will be generated in Ontario.

Table 4.3: Summary of Wind Energy Sector Job Creation Studies, in PYE/MW

Wind Energy Sector Job Creation (PYE) Comparison		
Location	PYE/MW	Original Source
Ontario	14.1 PYE/MW	ClearSky Advisors
European Union	21.7 PYE/MW	EWEA
California	12.3 PYE/MW*	CALPIRG
Colorado	5.4 PYE/MW	Colorado State University and The WSARE Program
Nevada	7.7 PYE/MW*	REPP
The United States of America	15.3 PYE/MW*	McKinsey
The United States of America	10.0 PYE/MW*	EPRI
Global Average	13.0 PYE/MW	Wei et al., 2010

* Calculated from Wei et al., 2010.

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011; Wei et al. 2010; EWEA, *Wind at Work 2009*; Colorado State University Cooperative Extension and the Western Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (WSARE) Program, *Wind Energy in Colorado*

As a comparison, the 14.1 PYE per MW forecasted for Ontario falls within the reported range of 5.4 PYE per MW to 21.7 PYE per MW reported for wind energy generation and is slightly higher than the peer-reviewed global average of 13.0 PYE per MW reported by Wei et al. (2010) and shown in Table 4.3¹⁸. This slightly higher number for Ontario could be explained by the domestic content requirements of the FIT program, which were reflected in our calculations.

¹⁸ Wei, M., Patadia, S., Kammen, D. 2010. Putting renewables and energy efficiency to work: How many jobs can the clean energy industry generate in the US? *Energy Policy*. 38: 919-931; The European Wind Energy Association (EWEA). (2009). *Wind at Work, Wind energy and job creation in the UE*; Colorado State University Cooperative Extension and the Western Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (WSARE) Program, *Wind Energy in Colorado*.

4.3 Economic Benefits & Market Value

4.3.1 Market Size & Value for Ontario

4.3.1.1 Size of Market Opportunity for Wind Energy Sector Supply Chain in Ontario

A significant amount of all goods and services purchased by the Ontario wind energy sector will be produced in Ontario. In general, the wind energy sector tends to spend locally on construction, manufacturing, development, operation, and maintenance. Domestic content requirements in the FIT program in Ontario are reinforcing this approach and will drive further local spending on manufacturing and professional services. From 2011-2018, it is anticipated that over \$8.5 billion will have been captured by the Ontario-based wind energy sector supply chain, as demonstrated in Table 4.4. The investment into the wind energy generation sector is different from many other investments made in public infrastructure in Ontario as it is entirely from the private sector, to be paid back by the rate-payer if, and only if, the wind turbine installations produce power.

Table 4.4: Economic Value of the Ontario-Based Wind Energy Sector Supply and Value Chain (\$Millions)

Economic Value of the Ontario-Based Wind Energy Sector Supply and Value Chain, 2011-2018 (\$Millions)										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Expected Scenario	Ontario-Based	\$528	\$662	\$729	\$1,494	\$1,237	\$1,425	\$1,213	\$1,215	\$8,503
	Industry-Wide	\$1,433	\$1,260	\$1,367	\$2,781	\$2,318	\$2,673	\$2,293	\$2,303	\$16,427
High Scenario	Ontario-Based	\$665	\$689	\$1,009	\$1,685	\$1,500	\$1,570	\$1,648	\$1,589	\$10,355
	Industry-Wide	\$1,797	\$1,314	\$1,885	\$3,136	\$2,806	\$2,947	\$3,100	\$3,003	\$19,988
Low Scenario	Ontario-Based	\$397	\$581	\$448	\$795	\$406	\$502	\$272	\$49	\$3,451
	Industry-Wide	\$1,082	\$1,108	\$847	\$1,490	\$779	\$958	\$536	\$127	\$6,928

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011

4.3.1.1.1 Market Size for Service & Supply Chain During Construction

The market size of the supply chain serving the construction phase of Ontario's wind energy generation sector, demonstrated in Table 4.5, makes up the vast majority of spending in the industry:


- Most of this spending will be on the wind turbine nacelle (described in Chapter 3.2).
- By 2018, it is expected that almost \$8.1 billion will be spent on the construction phase Ontario-based service and supply chain, as shown in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Economic Value of the Ontario Based Wind Energy Sector Construction Phase Supply Chain (\$Millions)

Economic Value of the Construction Phase Supply Chain, 2011-2018 (Millions)										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Expected Scenario	Ontario-Based	\$513	\$642	\$692	\$1,444	\$1,177	\$1,354	\$1,132	\$1,123	\$8,077
	Industry-Wide	\$1,366	\$1,178	\$1,269	\$2,649	\$2,159	\$2,483	\$2,076	\$2,060	\$15,240
High Scenario	Ontario-Based	\$648	\$669	\$968	\$1,629	\$1,431	\$1,489	\$1,553	\$1,481	\$9,868
	Industry-Wide	\$1,726	\$1,227	\$1,775	\$2,988	\$2,625	\$2,731	\$2,848	\$2,716	\$18,637
Low Scenario	Ontario-Based	\$383	\$563	\$416	\$756	\$364	\$456	\$223	\$-	\$3,161
	Industry-Wide	\$1,020	\$1,033	\$762	\$1,387	\$668	\$836	\$409	\$-	\$6,116

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011

Annual Ontario Wind Energy Sector Construction Phase Spending



Source: ClearSky Advisors Inc. 2011

Figure 4.9: Expected Annual Ontario Wind Energy Sector Construction Phase Spending, 2011-2018

4.3.1.1.2 Market Size for Operation & Maintenance in Ontario

The market size of the supply chain serving the O&M phase of Ontario’s wind energy sector, shown in Table 4.6, makes up a smaller component of spending in the industry (relative to construction):

- O&M materials spending will far outweigh labour costs;
- By 2018 it is expected that over \$1.1 billion will be cumulatively spent on O&M services for wind turbine installations in Ontario; and
- It is expected that by 2018 \$91.6 million will be spent annually in Ontario due to O&M services.

Table 4.6: O&M Phase Spending due to the Ontario Wind Energy Sector by Segment, 2011-2018

Economic Value of the O&M Phase Supply Chain, 2011-2018 (Millions)										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Expected Scenario	Labour	\$6.5	\$7.9	\$9.5	\$12.8	\$15.4	\$18.5	\$21.1	\$23.6	\$115.2
	Materials	\$60.1	\$73.7	\$88.3	\$118.7	\$143.5	\$172.1	\$195.9	\$219.6	\$1,071.9
	Total	\$66.6	\$81.6	\$97.7	\$131.5	\$159.0	\$190.6	\$217.0	\$243.2	\$1,187.2
High Scenario	Labour	\$6.9	\$8.4	\$10.6	\$14.3	\$17.6	\$20.9	\$24.5	\$27.8	\$131.1
	Materials	\$64.3	\$78.4	\$98.8	\$133.2	\$163.4	\$194.8	\$227.5	\$258.7	\$1,219.2
	Total	\$71.3	\$86.9	\$109.5	\$147.5	\$180.9	\$215.7	\$252.0	\$286.6	\$1,350.3
Low Scenario	Labour	\$6.0	\$7.3	\$8.2	\$10.0	\$10.8	\$11.8	\$14.7	\$14.7	\$79.9
	Materials	\$56.1	\$68.0	\$76.7	\$92.7	\$100.3	\$110.0	\$112.2	\$112.2	\$732.0
	Total	\$62.1	\$75.3	\$85.0	\$102.6	\$111.1	\$121.8	\$127.0	\$127.0	\$811.9

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011




Figure 4.10: Expected Ontario Wind Energy Sector Cumulative O&M Phase Spending, 2011-2018

4.3.2 Economic Benefits for Landowners

Landowners with wind turbines on their property will also receive an economic benefit as a result of the wind energy sector in Ontario. Due to the dispersed nature of turbines for wind energy generation projects across many properties, income is distributed to landowners more widely relative to other, non-renewable sources of electricity and therefore a larger number of individuals in the community benefit. On average an annual lease payment of \$19,334 is received by landowners for every MW of installed wind energy capacity on their property. Our research indicated that lease payments can range

from under \$10,000 to nearly \$30,000 per MW. The value of agreed upon lease payments typically is project specific and greatly depends upon:

- Market conditions (i.e. demand for quality sites has increased over time as supply has decreased);
- Wind energy procurement program (i.e. RES, RESOP, FIT, etc.);
- Quality of wind resource;
- Ease of access to the land; and
- Other project specific location characteristics.

From 2011-2018, it is expected that over \$313million will be paid to landowners in lease payments due to the wind energy sector in Ontario, as demonstrated in Table 4.7. For wind energy generation capacity installations from 2011-2018, it is expected that over \$1billion will be paid in land leases to landowners in Ontario by the end of the 20-year generation contracts¹⁹.

- Total private sector investment, demonstrated in Table 4.7, as a result of installations in 2011-2018, will reach over \$1.1billion (based on 20 year contracts):
 - Over \$1billion of this total will be through lease payments to landowners

Table 4.7: Economic Benefits to Landowners and Municipalities

Economic Benefits to Landowners and Municipalities from New Wind Turbine Installations (2011-2018)				
		Lease Payments	Municipal Taxation **	Total
Average Annual Payment	Per MW	\$19,334 *	\$1,302	\$20,636
	Per Turbine	\$41,271	\$2,779	\$44,050
Expected Scenario	Total Payments from 2011-2018	\$313,936,159	\$44,792,293	\$358,728,452
	20-Year Payments (from 2011-2018 installations)	\$1,027,745,099	\$147,710,917	\$1,175,456,017
High Scenario	Total Payments from 2011-2018	\$357,080,534	\$50,969,381	\$408,049,915
	20-Year Payments (from 2011-2018 installations)	\$1,256,927,721	\$180,693,145	\$1,437,620,866
Low Scenario	Total Payments from 2011-2018	\$214,691,479	\$30,540,836	\$245,232,314
	20-Year Payments (from 2011-2018 installations)	\$412,990,330	\$59,071,665	\$472,061,995

* This is an average lease payment value. Our research indicated that lease payments for wind turbine installations can range from under \$10,000 to nearly \$30,000 per MW.

** Minimum municipal taxation payments as calculated based upon the property assessment of wind turbines according to the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation and multiple 2010 municipal tax rates across Ontario.

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011; Statistics Canada 2010

¹⁹ The economic benefit calculated for landowners does not include any effects on property values.

4.3.3 Economic Benefits for Communities

In addition to supporting spending and employment in the province, the wind energy sector will affect municipal tax bases. Minimally, the economic benefit to communities from taxation on expected wind turbine installations will generate over \$44million of tax revenue for Ontario municipalities from 2011-2018, as demonstrated in Table 4.7. For expected wind energy generation capacity installations from 2011-2018, nearly \$148million of taxation payments will be made to Ontario municipalities by the end of the 20 year generation contracts²⁰.

The property assessment, for taxation purposes, of wind turbine installations in Ontario is determined by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation. In Ontario, only the wind turbine tower is subjected to property taxation; meaning that the blades, nacelle, and foundation are exempt. Additionally, the taxable value for a wind turbine tower is fixed at \$40,000 per MW of generation capacity. Moreover, it is assumed that each installed turbine requires one acre of land and the land upon which the turbine sits is assessed in the same manner as the immediately surrounding land. Thus, property assessment of wind turbine installations in Ontario is calculated according to:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Assessment} &= (\$40,000 \times \text{MW of Installed Capacity}) \\ &+ (\# \text{ of Turbines} \times \text{Cost of Land per Turbine}) \end{aligned}$$

Payable municipal property taxes are calculated using the property assessment of the wind turbine installation and the industrial property tax rate in the municipality.

In addition to taxation other municipal benefits have been observed in the province. In some instances the necessary privately funded infrastructure investments (such as roadway improvements) required for wind turbine installations provide opportunities at the community level. These investments are regularly maintained throughout the project lifetime. Additionally, some developers and municipalities agree upon amenity fees to be paid by the developer, which may take a variety of forms, ranging from a percentage of gross revenue to the construction of community centres and arenas. These provide additional benefits, beyond lease payments and municipal taxation, to the entire community as a whole but are difficult to quantify as part of this report.

In many cases the non-taxation benefits to communities can often meet or exceed the taxation benefits to municipalities.

²⁰ Anticipated Taxation was calculated based upon multiple 2010 municipal tax rates across the province as well as the value of farm land from Statistics Canada (Statistics Canada. (2010). Value of Farm Capital.)

4.4 100 MW Project Sample

To illustrate the findings in this report we have created an example of what could be expected for a typical 100 MW nameplate capacity wind energy generation project to be installed in Ontario. For this example we assume:

- The project is awarded at the beginning of year 1;
- Services (developmental and other) take place in years 1 and 2;
- Sufficient lead-time is provided to allow for manufacturing to mainly take place in years 1 and 2;
- Construction is not performed over the winter and is a 2 year process;
 - Foundation and infrastructure work is completed in year 2
 - Turbine erection is completed in year 3
- The project will be connected and generating at the end of year 3;
- O&M work will begin at the beginning of year 4 and last for 20 years; and
- Tax payments and lease payments to landowners will begin in year 4 and last for 20 years.

Table 4.8: Summary of 100 MW Project Sample Costs, Benefits, and Employment

100 MW Project Sample Costs, Benefits, and Employment		
Expected Cost	<i>Total Lifetime Cost (in 2011 \$)</i>	\$337,530,679
	<i>Total 20 Year O&M Cost</i>	\$68,501,669
	<i>Total Expected Installation Cost</i>	\$269,029,010
20 Year Economic Benefits to Landowners and Municipalities	<i>Total 20 Year Economic Benefits</i>	\$41,271,945
	<i>20 Year Lease Payments</i>	\$38,668,407
	<i>20 Year Tax Payments</i>	\$2,603,538
Expected PYE	<i>Total</i>	1,416
	<i>Construction Phase</i>	1,052
	<i>O&M Phase</i>	363

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011

- The total lifetime costs to the developer (including all-in installed costs and a 20-year O&M service agreement) would be nearly \$338million;
- Over \$41million in economic benefits to landowners and municipalities will be realized by the end of the contract; and
- 1,416 PYE will be created over the entire 23 year project timespan.




Figure 4.11: Expected Employment by Sector and Time for a Typical 100 MW Wind Farm in Ontario²¹

²¹ For the purposes of this model direct and indirect employment were assumed to occur at the same time. As such, there is no differentiation between these two employment categories in this measure of employment.

Appendix

Table A.1: Ontario's Electricity Market Forecast by Generation Type, 2010-2018

Ontario's Electricity Market Forecast 2010-2018 (TWh)									
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total Demand	148.7	150.9	152.9	154.8	156.8	158.7	160.9	163.2	165.5
Conservation	6.7	8.0	9.2	10.5	11.7	13.0	14.6	16.2	17.8
Nuclear Generation	82.9	88.3	93.8	93.8	93.8	93.8	75.5	69.1	61.6
Coal Generation	12.6	7.5	7.5	6.1	2.6	-	-	-	-
Natural Gas Generation	20.5	22.6	22.9	23.2	23.5	23.8	24.1	24.5	24.8
Hydro Generation	30.7	30.9	30.9	31.0	31.4	33.1	33.1	33.1	33.1
Wind Generation	2.8	4.4	5.4	6.5	8.8	10.6	12.7	14.5	16.2
Other Types of Generation	1.3	1.9	2.7	4.2	4.7	5.1	5.4	5.7	5.9
Net Export	8.8	12.7	19.6	20.4	19.7	20.7	4.5	(0.2)	(6.1)

Sources: ClearSky Advisors 2011; OPA, IPSP Planning and Consultation Overview 2011; OPA, Ontario's Long Term Energy Plan 2010; IESO, 18 Month Outlook December 2010

Table A.2: The OPA's Domestic Content Grid as Classified by Ontario's Wind Energy Sector Supply Chain

The OPA's Domestic Content Grid ²²			
Designated Activity	Description	Domestic Content Qualifying Percentage	Supply Chain Classification
1	Wind turbine blades	16%	Blades
2	Pitch system	3%	Nacelle
3	Yaw system	7%	Nacelle
4	Hub and hub casing	2%	Nacelle
5	Gearbox	11%	Nacelle
6	Generator and brake	3%	Nacelle
7	Heat exchanger	1%	Nacelle
8	Drive shaft	1%	Nacelle
9	Power converter	5%	Nacelle
10	Towers	4%	Towers
11	All steel that was formed and shaped into the towers	9%	Towers
12	Control panel and electronics	2%	Electrical
13	Nacelle frame	2%	Nacelle
14	Nacelle shell	2%	Nacelle
15	Pad mount or equivalent transformers	2%	Transformer
16	Grid connection	10%	HV Systems
17	Construction and on-site labour	15%	Labour
18	Consulting services	5%	Developmental

Sources: ClearSky Advisors 2011; OPA, Feed-In Tariff Contract 2010

²² The official domestic content grid, as part of the Feed-In Tariff contract is available at: http://fit.powerauthority.on.ca/Storage/11202_FIT_Contract_Version_1.4.pdf

Table A.3: Job Creation (PYE) in the Ontario Wind Energy Sector by Employment Segment, Expected Scenario 2011-2018

Construction Phase										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Construction	Direct	478	409	441	920	750	862	721	715	5,295
	Indirect	1,448	1,241	1,337	2,791	2,275	2,616	2,187	2,170	16,066
Manufacturing	Direct	332	880	948	1,979	1,613	1,855	1,551	1,539	10,696
	Indirect	332	881	949	1,981	1,615	1,856	1,552	1,540	10,706
Professional Services	Direct	237	196	211	440	359	412	345	342	2,542
	Indirect	87	72	78	162	132	152	127	126	935
Other Services and Government	Direct	773	665	716	1,495	1,219	1,401	1,171	1,163	8,604
	Indirect	436	376	405	845	689	792	662	657	4,861
O&M Phase										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Direct		831	863	930	1,941	1,582	1,819	1,521	1,510	10,998
Indirect		753	753	811	1,694	1,381	1,588	1,328	1,318	9,625

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011

Table A.4: Job Creation (PYE) in the Ontario Wind Energy Sector by Employment Segment, High Scenario 2011-2018

Construction Phase										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Construction	Direct	604	426	616	1,038	911	948	989	943	6,476
	Indirect	1,830	1,293	1,870	3,149	2,766	2,877	3,001	2,862	19,648
Manufacturing	Direct	419	917	1,326	2,233	1,961	2,040	2,128	2,029	13,053
	Indirect	420	917	1,327	2,235	1,963	2,042	2,130	2,031	13,065
Professional Services	Direct	300	204	295	497	436	454	473	451	3,110
	Indirect	110	75	108	183	160	167	174	166	1,143
Other Services and Government	Direct	977	692	1,002	1,687	1,482	1,541	1,608	1,533	10,522
	Indirect	551	391	566	953	837	871	909	866	5,945
O&M Phase										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Direct		1,050	899	1,301	2,190	1,924	2,001	2,087	1,990	13,442
Indirect		952	784	1,135	1,911	1,679	1,747	1,822	1,738	11,766

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011

Table A.5: Job Creation (PYE) in the Ontario Wind Energy Sector by Employment Segment, Low Scenario 2011-2018

Construction Phase										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Construction	Direct	357	359	265	482	232	290	142	-	2,126
	Indirect	1,082	1,089	803	1,462	704	881	431	-	6,451
Manufacturing	Direct	248	772	569	1,036	499	625	305	-	4,055
	Indirect	248	773	570	1,037	500	625	306	-	4,058
Professional Services	Direct	177	172	127	231	111	139	68	-	1,024
	Indirect	65	63	47	85	41	51	25	-	376
Other Services and Government	Direct	525	530	391	712	343	429	210	-	3,141
	Indirect	266	269	198	361	174	218	106	-	1,593
O&M Phase										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Direct		620	757	559	1,017	491	613	323	-	4,379
Indirect		562	660	487	887	427	535	263	-	3,822

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011

Table A.6: Supply Chain Value for the Ontario Wind Energy Sector, 2011-2018

Wind Energy Sector Supply Chain for Ontario, 2011-2018 (\$Millions)										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Expected Scenario	Construction Phase	\$1,366	\$1,178	\$1,269	\$2,649	\$2,159	\$2,483	\$2,076	\$2,060	\$15,240
	O&M Phase	\$67	\$82	\$98	\$131	\$159	\$191	\$217	\$243	\$1,187
	Ontario-Based Total Value	\$528	\$662	\$729	\$1,494	\$1,237	\$1,425	\$1,213	\$1,215	\$8,503
	Industry-Wide Total Value	\$1,433	\$1,260	\$1,367	\$2,781	\$2,318	\$2,673	\$2,293	\$2,303	\$16,427
High Scenario	Construction Phase	\$1,726	\$1,227	\$1,775	\$2,988	\$2,625	\$2,731	\$2,848	\$2,716	\$18,637
	O&M Phase	\$71	\$87	\$109	\$148	\$181	\$216	\$252	\$287	\$1,350
	Ontario-Based Total Value	\$665	\$689	\$1,009	\$1,685	\$1,500	\$1,570	\$1,648	\$1,589	\$10,355
	Industry-Wide Total Value	\$1,797	\$1,314	\$1,885	\$3,136	\$2,806	\$2,947	\$3,100	\$3,003	\$19,988
Low Scenario	Construction Phase	\$1,020	\$1,033	\$762	\$1,387	\$668	\$836	\$409	-	\$6,116
	O&M Phase	\$62	\$75	\$85	\$103	\$111	\$122	\$127	\$127	\$812
	Ontario-Based Total Value	\$397	\$581	\$448	\$795	\$406	\$502	\$272	\$49	\$3,451
	Industry-Wide Total Value	\$1,082	\$1,108	\$847	\$1,490	\$779	\$958	\$536	\$127	\$6,928

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011

Table A.7: Total Construction Phase Spending due to the Ontario Wind Energy Sector, Expected Scenario 2011-2018

Total Ontario Wind Energy Sector Construction Phase Spending, 2011-2018 (Millions)									
Equipment									
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Nacelle	\$549	\$476	\$513	\$1,070	\$872	\$1,003	\$839	\$832	\$6,154
Blades	\$121	\$105	\$113	\$236	\$192	\$221	\$185	\$183	\$1,356
Towers	\$167	\$144	\$155	\$325	\$265	\$304	\$254	\$252	\$1,866
Transportation	\$135	\$117	\$126	\$262	\$214	\$246	\$205	\$204	\$1,508
Balance of Plant									
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Materials	\$204	\$175	\$188	\$393	\$320	\$368	\$308	\$306	\$2,262
Labour	\$131	\$112	\$121	\$252	\$205	\$236	\$197	\$196	\$1,448
Developmental	\$60	\$50	\$54	\$112	\$91	\$105	\$88	\$87	\$646

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011

Note: This table represents construction phase spending for projects installed in each given year as indicated above. This spending may not all occur in that year, but would likely occur over the course of 2-3 years prior to commercial operation date (COD).

Table A.8 :Economic Value of the Ontario-Based Wind Energy Sector O&M Phase Supply Chain for 20-Year Generation Contracts (\$Millions)

20-Year Economic Value of the O&M Phase Supply Chain, 2011-2018 (Millions)										
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
Expected Scenario	Ontario-Based	\$84	\$71	\$122	\$254	\$207	\$238	\$199	\$197	\$1,371
	Industry-Wide	\$354	\$300	\$323	\$675	\$550	\$632	\$528	\$525	\$3,886
High Scenario	Ontario-Based	\$106	\$74	\$170	\$286	\$252	\$262	\$273	\$260	\$1,683
	Industry-Wide	\$447	\$312	\$452	\$761	\$668	\$695	\$725	\$692	\$4,753
Low Scenario	Ontario-Based	\$62	\$62	\$73	\$133	\$64	\$80	\$40	-	\$515
	Industry-Wide	\$264	\$263	\$194	\$353	\$170	\$213	\$104	-	\$1,562

Source: ClearSky Advisors 2011


Note: This table represents the total O&M phase spending for projects installed in each given year as indicated above. This spending will not all occur in that year, but will occur over the course of the 20 year generation contracts. For a more detailed breakdown of likely spending by year see Table A.6.

About ClearSky Advisors

ClearSky Advisors is an independent research and advisory firm focused on renewable energy markets. The firm was formed by experienced executives and consultants that have worked with many of the world's largest and most respected energy, technology, and manufacturing companies. The founders and principle consultants have been responsible for more than \$100M of research activities over the past two decades. Adding to that, our founders and analysts have expertise in strategy development, business planning, project management, quantitative and qualitative research, process design, and research methods.

Through a variety of research and consulting projects in the renewable energy field, ClearSky Advisors has developed specific expertise in the renewable energy markets in general (in Ontario, Germany, and the US) and the Ontario renewable energy market in particular.

ClearSky Advisors' clients include energy sector equipment and materials manufacturers, project developers, EPC providers, investors and governments.



REVIEW

Open Access

Health effects and wind turbines: A review of the literature

Loren D Knopper^{1*} and Christopher A Ollson²

Abstract

Background: Wind power has been harnessed as a source of power around the world. Debate is ongoing with respect to the relationship between reported health effects and wind turbines, specifically in terms of audible and inaudible noise. As a result, minimum setback distances have been established world-wide to reduce or avoid potential complaints from, or potential effects to, people living in proximity to wind turbines. People interested in this debate turn to two sources of information to make informed decisions: scientific peer-reviewed studies published in scientific journals and the popular literature and internet.

Methods: The purpose of this paper is to review the peer-reviewed scientific literature, government agency reports, and the most prominent information found in the popular literature. Combinations of key words were entered into the Thomson Reuters Web of KnowledgeSM and the internet search engine Google. The review was conducted in the spirit of the evaluation process outlined in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.

Results: Conclusions of the peer reviewed literature differ in some ways from those in the popular literature. In peer reviewed studies, wind turbine annoyance has been statistically associated with wind turbine noise, but found to be more strongly related to visual impact, attitude to wind turbines and sensitivity to noise. To date, no peer reviewed articles demonstrate a direct causal link between people living in proximity to modern wind turbines, the noise they emit and resulting physiological health effects. If anything, reported health effects are likely attributed to a number of environmental stressors that result in an annoyed/stressed state in a segment of the population. In the popular literature, self-reported health outcomes are related to distance from turbines and the claim is made that infrasound is the causative factor for the reported effects, even though sound pressure levels are not measured.

Conclusions: What both types of studies have in common is the conclusion that wind turbines can be a source of annoyance for some people. The difference between both types is the reason for annoyance. While it is acknowledged that noise from wind turbines can be annoying to some and associated with some reported health effects (e.g., sleep disturbance), especially when found at sound pressure levels greater than 40 db(A), given that annoyance appears to be more strongly related to visual cues and attitude than to noise itself, self reported health effects of people living near wind turbines are more likely attributed to physical manifestation from an annoyed state than from wind turbines themselves. In other words, it appears that it is the change in the environment that is associated with reported health effects and not a turbine-specific variable like audible noise or infrasound. Regardless of its cause, a certain level of annoyance in a population can be expected (as with any number of projects that change the local environment) and the acceptable level is a policy decision to be made by elected officials and their government representatives where the benefits of wind power are weighted against their cons. Assessing the effects of wind turbines on human health is an emerging field and conducting further research into the effects of wind turbines (and environmental changes) on human health, emotional and physical, is warranted.

Keywords: Wind turbines, health, annoyance, infrasound, sound pressure level, noise

* Correspondence: lknopper@intrinsic.com

¹Intrinsic Environmental Sciences Inc., 1790 Courtwood Crescent, Ottawa ON, K2C 2B5, Canada

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

Background

Wind power has been identified as a clean renewable energy source that does not contribute to global warming and is without known emissions or harmful wastes [1]. Studies on public attitudes in Europe and Canada show strong support for the implementation of wind power [2]. Indeed, wind power has become an integrated part of provincial energy strategies across Canada; in Ontario, the Ontario Power Authority has placed a great deal of emphasis on procuring what they term “renewable and cleaner sources of electricity”, such as wind [3].

Although wind power has been harnessed as a source of electricity for several decades around the world, its widespread use as a significant source of energy in Ontario is relatively recent. As with the introduction of any new technology, concerns have been raised that wind power projects could lead to impacts on human health. These concerns are related to two primary issues: wind turbine design and infrastructure (i.e., electromagnetic frequencies from transmission lines, shadow flicker from rotor blades, ice throw from rotor blades and structural failure) and wind turbine noise (i.e., levels of audible noise [including low frequency noise] and infrasound). If left unchecked and unmanaged, it is possible that individually or cumulatively, these issues could lead to potential health impacts. In terms of noise, high sound pressure levels (loudness) of audible noise and infrasound have been associated with learning, sleep and cognitive disruptions as well as stress and anxiety [4-8].

As a result, minimum setback distances have been established world-wide to reduce or avoid potential effects for people living in proximity to wind turbines. Under the Ontario Renewable Energy Approval (REA) Regulation (O. Reg. 359/09, as amended by O. Reg. 521/10), a minimum setback distance of 550 m must exist between the centre of the base of the wind turbine and the nearest noise receptor (e.g., a building or campground). This minimum setback distance was developed through noise modeling under worst-case conditions to give a conservative estimate of the required distance to attain a sound level of 40 dB(A) [9], the noise level that corresponds to the WHO (Europe) night-noise guideline, a health-based limit value “necessary to protect the public, including most of the vulnerable groups such as children, the chronically ill and the elderly, from the adverse health effects of night noise” [8]. Globally, rural residential noise limits are generally set at 35 to 55 dB(A) [10].

This paper focuses on the research involving land-based wind turbine projects. There are several international off-shore marine projects that are in operation. There was considerable interest in Ontario in developing off-shore wind projects on the Great Lakes. However, in February, 2011 the Province announced that it

would not proceed with proposed offshore wind projects until further scientific research is conducted <http://www.news.ontario.ca/ene/en/2011/02/ontario-rules-out-off-shore-wind-projects.html>. This does not appear to have been related, however, to health concerns.

Regardless, debate is ongoing with respect to the relationship between reported health effects and wind turbines, specifically in terms of audible and inaudible noise. People interested in this debate tend to turn to two sources of information in order to make decisions: scientific peer-reviewed studies published in scientific journals, and the popular literature and internet. For the general public, the latter sources are the most readily available and numerous websites have been constructed by individuals or groups to support or oppose the development of wind farms. Often these websites state the perceived impacts on, or benefits to, human health to support the position of the individual or group. The majority of information posted on these websites cannot be traced back to a scientific peer-reviewed source and is typically anecdotal in nature. This serves to spread misconceptions about the potential impacts of wind energy on human health making it difficult for the general public (and scientists) to ascertain which claims can be substantiated by scientific evidence.

Accordingly, the purpose of this paper is to provide results of a review of the peer-reviewed scientific literature and the most prominent information found in the popular literature. We have selected this journal as the source of publication because it is a scientifically credible journal with peer-reviewed articles that are easily accessible by the general population who are interested in the subject of wind turbines and health effects. Results of this review are used to draw conclusions about wind turbines and health effects using a weight-of-evidence approach.

Methods

Peer-Reviewed Literature

Publication of scientific findings is the basis of scientific discourse, communication and debate. The peer review process is considered a fundamental tenet of quality control in scientific publishing. Once a research paper has been submitted to a journal for publication it is reviewed by external independent experts in the field. The experts review the validity, reliability and importance of the results and recommend that the manuscript be accepted, revised or rejected. This process, though not perfect, ensures that the methods employed and the findings of the research receive a high level of scrutiny, such that an independent researcher could repeat the experiment or calculation of results, prior to their publication. This process seeks to ensure that the published research is of a high standard of quality, accurate, can

be reproduced and demonstrates academic/professional integrity.

In order to assess peer-reviewed studies designed to test hypotheses about the association between potential health effects in humans and wind turbines, a review of the primary scientific literature was conducted. While our review did not strictly follow the evaluation process outlined in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [11], the standard for conducting information reviews in healthcare and pharmaceutical industries, it was conducted in the spirit of the Cochrane systematic review in that it was designed based on the principle that “science is cumulative”, and by considering all available evidence, decisions could be made that reflect the best science available. It also involves critical review and critique of the published literature and at times weighting some manuscripts over others in the same scientific field.

To facilitate this review, combinations of key words (i.e., annoyance, noise, environmental change, sleep disturbance, epilepsy, stress, health effect(s), wind farm(s), infrasound, wind turbines(s), low frequency noise, wind turbine syndrome, neighborhood change) were selected and entered into the Thomson Reuters (formerly ISI) Web of KnowledgeSM. The Web of KnowledgeSM is a database that covers over 10,000 high-impact journals in the sciences, social sciences, and arts and humanities, as well as international proceedings coverage for over 120,000 conferences. The Web of KnowledgeSM comprises seven citation databases, two of which are relevant to the search: the Science Citation Index Expanded (SCI-Expanded) and the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI). The SCI-Expanded includes over 6,650 major journals across 150 scientific disciplines and includes all cited references captured from indexed articles. Coverage of the literature spans the year 1900 to the present. On average, 19,000 new records per week are added to the SCI-Expanded. SSCI is a multidisciplinary index of the social sciences literature. SSCI includes over 1,950 journals across 50 social sciences disciplines from the year 1956 to the present. It averages 2,900 new records per week. Use of this literature search platform means the most up-to-date multidisciplinary studies published and peer-reviewed could be obtained.

Although hundreds of articles were found during the search, very few were related to the association between potential health effects and wind turbines. For example, numerous articles have been published about infrasound, but very few have been published about infrasound and wind turbines. Indeed, only fifteen articles, published between 2003 and 2011, were found relevant [12-26]. What can be seen from these articles is that the relationship between wind turbines and human responses to them is extremely complex and influenced by numerous

variables, the majority of which are nonphysical. What is clear is that some people living near wind turbines experience annoyance due to wind turbines, and visual impact tends to be a stronger predictor of noise annoyance than wind turbine noise itself. Swishing, whistling, resounding and pulsating/throbbing are sound characteristics most highly correlated with annoyance by wind turbine noise for those people who noticed the noise outside their dwellings. Some people are also disturbed in their sleep by wind turbines. In general, five key points have come out of these peer-reviewed studies with regards to health and wind turbines.

1. People tend to notice sound from wind turbines almost linearly with increasing sound pressure level

In the studies designed to evaluate the interrelationships amongst annoyance and wind turbine noise, as well as the influence of subjective variables such as attitude and noise sensitivity, Pedersen and Persson Waye [13-15] showed that people tend to notice sound from wind turbines almost linearly with increasing sound pressure level. Briefly, Pedersen and Persson Waye conducted cross-sectional studies (in 2004: n = 351; in 2007: n = 754) and gave people questionnaires regarding housing and satisfaction with the living environment, including questions about degree of annoyance experienced outdoors and indoors and sensitivity to environmental factors, wind turbines (noise, shadows, and disturbances), respondents' level of perception and annoyance, and verbal descriptors of sound and perceptual characteristics. The third section had questions about chronic health (e.g., diabetes, tinnitus, cardiovascular diseases), general wellbeing (e.g., headache, undue tiredness feeling tensed/stressed, irritable) and normal sleep habits (e.g., quality of sleep, whether or not sleep was disturbed by any noise source). The last section comprised questions on employment and working hours. Of import, the purpose of the study was masked in the questionnaires, which was done to reduce the potential for survey bias.

Of the 754 respondents involved in the Pedersen and Persson Waye study [14], 307 (39%) noticed sound from wind turbines outside their dwelling (range of sound pressure level: < 32.5, 32.5-35.0, 35.0-37.5, 37.5-40.0, and > 40.0 dB(A)) and the proportion of respondents who noticed sound increased almost linearly with increasing noise. In the 37.5-40.0 dB(A) range, 76% of the 71 respondents reported that they noticed sound from the wind turbines; 90% of respondents (n = 18) in the > 40.0 dB(A) category noticed sound from the wind turbines. The odds of noticing sound increased by 30% for each increase in dB(A) category. When data from both studies [13,14] were combined (n = 1095) results were the same: the proportion of respondents who noticed sound from wind turbines showed increased almost linearly with increasing

sound pressure level from roughly 5-15% of people noticing noise at 29 dB(A) to 45-90% noticing noise at 41 dB(A)[15].

In 2011 Pedersen [25] reported on the results of three cross-sectional studies conducted in two areas of Sweden (a flat rural landscape (n = 351) and suburban sites with hilly terrain (n = 754) and one location in the Netherlands (flat landscape but with different degrees of road traffic intensity (n = 725)) designed assess the relationship between wind turbine noise and possible adverse health effects. Questionnaires were mailed to people in the three areas to obtain information about annoyance and health effects in response to wind turbines noise. Pedersen included questions about several potential environmental stressors and did not allow participants to know that the focus of the study was on wind turbine noise, again in an attempt to reduce self-reporting survey bias. For each respondent, sound pressure levels (dB(A)) were calculated for nearby wind turbines. The questionnaires were designed to obtain information about people's response to noise (i.e., annoyance), diseases or symptoms of impaired health (i.e., chronic disease, diabetes, high blood pressure, cardiovascular disease, tinnitus, impaired hearing), stress symptoms (i.e., headache, undue tiredness, feeling tense or stressed, feeling irritable), and disturbed sleep (i.e., interruption of the sleep by any noise source). Results showed that the frequency of those annoyed with wind turbines was related to an increase in sound pressure level as shown by odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) greater than 1.0. Sleep interruption was associated with sound level in two of the three studies (the areas with flat terrain), but unlike the finding that people tend to notice sound from wind turbines almost linearly with increasing sound pressure level, sleep disturbance did not increase gradually with noise levels, but spiked at 40 dBA and 45 dBA.

2. A proportion of people that notice sound from wind turbines find it annoying

Results of the Pedersen and Persson Waye studies [13-15] also suggested that the proportion of participants who were fairly annoyed or very annoyed remained quite level through the 29-37 dB(A) range (no more than roughly 5%) but increased at noise levels above 37 dB(A), with peaks at 38 dB(A) and 41 dB(A), where up to 30% of people were very annoyed. Respondents in the cross-sectional studies (and other studies [12]) noted that swishing, whistling, resounding and pulsating/throbbing were the sound characteristics that were most highly correlated with annoyance by wind turbine noise among respondents who noticed the noise outside their dwellings. This was also found by Leventhall [16]. Seven percent of respondents (n = 25) from the Pedersen and Persson Waye study [13] were annoyed by noise from wind turbines indoors, and

this was related to noise category; 23% (n = 80) were disturbed in their sleep by noise. Of the 128 respondents living at sound exposure above 35.0 dB(A), 16% (n = 20) stated that they were disturbed in their sleep by wind turbine noise. The authors comment that some people may find wind turbine noise more annoying than that of other types of noise (e.g., airplane and traffic) experienced at similar decibel levels.

Similar results were shown by Pedersen and Persson Waye [14]: a total of 31 of the 754 respondents said they were annoyed by wind turbine noise. In the < 32.5 to the 37.5 dB(A) category 3% to 4% of people said they were annoyed by wind turbine noise; in the 37.5-40.0 dB(A) category, 6% of the 71 respondents were annoyed; and in the > 40.0 category, 15% of 20 of respondents said they were annoyed by wind turbine noise. In addition, 36% of those 31 respondents who were annoyed by wind turbine noise reported that their sleep was disturbed by a noise source. Nine percent of those 733 respondents not annoyed said their sleep was disturbed by a noise source. Results of Pedersen [25] showed similar results: the frequency of those annoyed was related to an increase in sound pressure level. Moreover, self reported health effects like feeling tense, stressed, and irritable, were associated with noise annoyance and not to noise itself (OR and 95% CI > 1.0). Sleep interruption, however, was associated with sound level and annoyance (OR and 95%CI > 1.0). Pedersen notes that this finding is not necessarily evidence of a causal relationship between wind turbine noise and stress but may be explained by cognitive stress theory whereby "an individual appraises an environmental stressor, such as noise, as beneficial or not, and behaves accordingly". In other words, it appears that it is the change in the environment that is associated with the self-reported health effects, not the presence of wind turbines themselves.

Keith et al. [17] proposed that in a quiet rural setting, the predicted sound level from wind turbines should not exceed 45 dB(A) at a sensitive receptor location (e.g., residences, hospitals, schools), a value below the World Health Organization guideline for sleep and speech disturbance, moderate annoyance and hearing impairment. The authors [17] suggest this level of noise could be expected to result in a 6.5% increase in the percentage of highly annoyed people. Since publication of the Keith et al. study, the WHO Europe Region has released new Night Noise Guidelines for Europe [8] and state that: "The new limit is an annual average night exposure not exceeding 40 decibels (dB), corresponding to the sound from a quiet street in a residential area". The value of 40 dB is considered the lowest observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) for night noise based on the finding that an average night noise level over a year of 30-40 dB can result in a number of effects on sleep such as body movements, awakening, self-reported sleep disturbance and arousals [8]. The WHO

states that even in the worst cases these effects seem modest [8].

3. Annoyance is not only related to wind turbine noise but also to subjective factors like attitude to visual impact, attitude to wind turbines and sensitivity to noise

Pedersen and Persson Waye [13] revealed that attitude to visual impact, attitude to wind turbines in general, and sensitivity to noise were also related to the way people perceived noise from turbines. For example, 13% of the variance in annoyance from wind farms could be explained by noise and the odds that respondents would be annoyed by noise from wind turbines increased 1.87 times from one sound category to the next. When noise and attitude to visual impact was statistically assessed, 46% of the variance in annoyance from wind farms could be explained and the odds that respondents would be annoyed from wind turbines increased 5.05 times from one sound category to the next. Statistical analyses showed that while attitude to wind turbines in general and sensitivity to noise were also related to annoyance, they did not have a greater influence on annoyance than visual effect. Building on their 2004 paper, Pedersen and Persson Waye [14] conducted a cross-sectional study in seven areas in Sweden across dissimilar terrains and with different degrees of urbanization. Three areas were classified as suburban; four as rural. Noise annoyance related to wind turbines was also statistically related to whether or not people live in suburban or rural areas and landscape (flat vs. hilly/complex). Visual impact has come out as a stronger predictor of noise annoyance than wind turbine noise itself. People who economically benefit from wind turbines had significantly decreased levels of annoyance compared to individuals that received no economic benefit, despite exposure to similar sound levels [18].

One suggestion of the difference between rural and suburban areas is level of background sound and interestingly, perception and annoyance was associated with type of landscape, "indicating that the wind turbine noise interfered with personal expectations in a less urbanised area... pointing towards a personal factor related to the living environment" [14]. The authors also concluded that visual exposure enhances the negative associations with turbines when coupled with audible exposure. They also point out that this study showed that aesthetics play a role in annoyance: "respondents who think of wind turbines as ugly are more likely to appraise them as not belonging to the landscape and therefore feel annoyed" [14].

In 2007 Pedersen et al. [19] conducted a grounded theory study to gain a deeper understanding of how people living near wind turbines perceive and are affected by them. Findings indicated that the relationship between exposure and response is complex and possibly

influenced by variables not yet identified, some of which are nonphysical. The notion that wind turbines are "intruders" is a finding not reported elsewhere. A conclusion of this paper is that when the impacts of wind turbines are assessed, values about the living environment are important to consider as values are firmly rooted within a personality and difficult to change.

In 2008, Pedersen and Larsman [20] conducted a study to assess visibility of wind turbines, visual attitude and vertical visual angle (VVA) in different landscapes. This study follows up on the findings of previous work showing a relationship between noise annoyance in people living near wind turbines and the impact of visual factors as well as an individual's attitude toward noise [13-15,25]. Overall, Pedersen and Larsman concluded that respondents in a landscape where wind turbines could be perceived as contrasting with their surroundings (i.e., flat areas) had a greater probability of noise annoyance than those in hilly areas (where turbines were not as obvious), regardless of sound pressure level, if they thought wind turbines were ugly, unnatural devices that would have a negative impact on the scenery. The enhanced negative response could be linked to aesthetical response, rather than to multi-modal effects of simultaneous auditory and visual stimulation. Moreover, VVA was associated with noise annoyance, especially for respondent who could see at least one wind turbine from their dwelling, if they were living in flat terrain and rural areas. Pedersen and Larsman suggest that these results underscore the importance of visual attitude towards the noise source when exploring response to environmental noise. In 2010 Pedersen et al. [21] hypothesized that if high levels of background sound can reduce annoyance by masking the noise from a wind farm, then turbines could cause less noise annoyance when placed next to motorways instead of quiet agricultural areas. In general, the hypothesis was not supported by the available data [15], further providing support for the notion of visual cue being a strong driver of annoyance.

4. Turbines are designed not to pose a risk of photo-induced epilepsy

Harding et al. [22] and Smedley et al. [23] investigated the relationship between photo-induced seizures (i.e., photosensitive epilepsy) and wind turbine blade flicker (also known as shadow flicker). This is an infrequent event, typically modelled to occur less than 30 hours a year from wind turbine projects we have reviewed and would be most common at dusk and dawn, when the sun is at the horizon. Both studies suggested that flicker from turbines that interrupt or reflect sunlight at frequencies greater than 3 Hz pose a potential risk of inducing photosensitive seizures in 1.7 people per 100,000 of the photosensitive population. For turbines with three blades, this translates

to a maximum speed of rotation of 60 rpm. The normal practice for large wind farms is for frequencies well below this threshold.

Although shadow flicker from wind turbines is unlikely lead to a risk of photo-induced epilepsy there has been little if any study conducted on how it could heighten the annoyance factor of those living in proximity to turbines. It may however be included in the notion of visual cues. In Ontario it has been common practice to attempt to ensure no more than 30 hours of shadow flicker per annum at any one residence.

5. The human ear responds to infrasound

Infrasound is produced by physiological processes like respiration, heartbeat and coughing, as well as man-made sources like air conditioning systems, vehicles, some industrial processes and wind turbines. Salt and Hullar [24] provide data to suggest that the assumption that infrasound presented at an amplitude below what is audible has no influence on the ear is erroneous and summarize the results of previous studies that show a physiological response of the human ear to low frequency noise (LFN) and infrasound. At very low frequencies the outer hair cells (OHC) of the cochlea may be stimulated by sounds in the inaudible range. Salt and Hullar hypothesize that "if infrasound is affecting cells and structures at levels that cannot be heard this leads to the possibility that wind turbine noise could be influencing function or causing unfamiliar sensations". These authors do not test this hypothesis in their paper but suggest the need for further research.

To assess the possibility that the operation of wind turbines may create unacceptable levels of low frequency noise and infrasound, O'Neal et al. [26] conducted a study (commissioned by a wind energy developer, NextEra Energy Resources, LLC) to measure wind turbine noise outside and within nearby residences of turbines. At the Horse Hollow Wind Farm in Taylor and Nolan Counties, Texas, broadband (A-weighted) and one-third octave band data (3.15 hertz to 20,000 hertz bands) were simultaneously collected from General Electric (GE) 1.5sle (1.5 MW) and Siemens SWT-2.3-93 (2.3 MW) wind turbines. Data were collected outdoors and indoors over the course of one week under a variety of operational conditions (it should be noted that wind speeds were low during the measurements; between 3.2 and 4.1 m/s) at two distances from the nearest wind turbines: 305 meters and 457 meters. O'Neal et al. found that the measured low frequency sound and infrasound at both distances (from both turbine types at maximum noise conditions) were less than the standards and criteria published by the cited agencies (e.g., UK DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs); ANSI (American National Standards Institute); Japan Ministry of Environment). The

authors concluded that results of their study suggest that there should be no adverse public health effects from infrasound or low frequency noise at distances greater than 305 meters from the two wind turbine types measured.

Popular Literature

Scientific studies peer reviewed and published in scientific journals are one way of disseminating information about wind turbines and health effects. The general public does not always have access to scientific journals and often get their information, and form opinions, from sources that are less accountable (e.g., the popular literature and internet). Some of the same key words used to obtain references from the primary literature were entered into the common internet search engine Google: "health effects wind farms" returned 300,000 hits; "health effects wind turbines" returned 120,000 hits; "annoyance wind turbines" returned 185,000 hits and "sleep disturbance wind turbines" returned 19,500 hits. What is apparent is that numerous websites have been constructed by individuals or groups to support or oppose the development of wind turbine projects, or media sites reporting on the debate. Often these websites state the perceived impacts on, or benefits to, human health to support the position of the individual or group hosting the website. The majority of information posted on these websites cannot be traced back to a scientific, peer-reviewed source and is typically anecdotal in nature. In some cases, the information contained on and propagated by internet websites and the media is not supported, or is even refuted, by scientific research. This serves to spread misconceptions about the potential impacts of wind energy on human health, which either fuels or diminishes opposition to wind turbine project development.

Works by Dr. Michael Nissenbaum conducted at Mars Hill and Vinalhaven Maine [27] and Dr. Nina Pierpont in New York [28] seem to be the primary popular literature studies referenced on websites. These works suggest a causal link between human health effects and wind turbines. Works by Dr. Robert McMurtry and Carmen Krogh, and Lorrie Gillis, Carmen Krogh and Dr. Nicholas Kouwen [29] have also been used to suggest a relationship between health and turbines. These works have been presented as reports or as slide presentations on websites and authors of these studies have presented their findings in various forua such as invited lectures, affidavits, public meetings and open houses. Briefly, Nissenbaum evaluated 22 exposed adults (defined as living within 3500 ft of an arrangement of 28 1.5 MW wind turbines) and 27 unexposed adults (living about 3 miles away from the nearest turbine). Participants were interviewed and asked a number of questions about their perceived health, levels of

stress and reliance on prescription medications in relation to the turbines [27].

In 2009, a book entitled *Wind Turbine Syndrome: A Report on a Natural Experiment* by Dr. Nina Pierpont, was self-published and describes “Wind Turbine Syndrome”, the clinical name Dr. Pierpont coined for the collection of symptoms reported to her by people residing near wind turbines [28]. The book describes a case series study she conducted involving interviews of 10 families experiencing adverse health effects and who reside near wind turbines. Similar to the process followed by Nissenbaum, people living in proximity wind turbines were interviewed about their health. For all of these works, self-reported symptoms generally included sleep disturbance, headache, tinnitus (ringing in the ears), ear pressure, dizziness, vertigo, nausea, visual blurring, tachycardia (rapid heart rate), irritability, problems with concentration and memory and panic episodes. These symptoms have been purported to be associated with proximity to wind turbines, and specifically, to the infrasound emitted by the turbines. It should be noted that of the 351 people assessed by Pedersen and Persson Waye [13], 26% (91) reported chronic health issues (e.g., diabetes, tinnitus, cardiovascular diseases), but these issues were not statistically associated with noise levels. Results of Pedersen [25] showed similar results: self reported health effects like feeling tense, stressed, and irritable, were associated with noise annoyance and not to noise itself. Sleep interruption, however, was associated with sound level and annoyance.

In 2007, Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco <http://www.wind-watch.org/documents/industrial-wind-turbines-infrasound-and-vibro-acoustic-disease-vad/> issued a press-release suggesting that their research demonstrated that living in proximity to wind turbines has led to the development of vibro-acoustic disease (VAD) in nearby home-dwellers. It appears that this research has only been presented at a conference, has not been published in a peer-reviewed journal nor has it undergone thorough scientific review. Moreover, Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco appear to be the primary researchers that have promulgated VAD as a hypothesis for adverse health effects and wind turbines. Indeed, Dr. Pierpont has noted that VAD is not the same “wind turbine syndrome” [28].

To date, these studies have not been subjected to rigorous scientific peer review, and given the venue for their distribution and limited availability of data, it is extremely difficult to assess whether or not the information provided is reliable or valid. What is apparent, however, is that these studies are not necessarily scientifically defensible: they do not contain noise measurements, only measured distances from study participants to the closest turbines; they do not have adequate statistical representation of potential health effects; only limited rationale is provided for the selection of study participants (in some cases

people living in proximity to turbines have been excluded from the study); they suffer from a small number of participants and appear to lack of objectivity as authors are also known advocates who oppose wind turbine developments. Unlike the questionnaires used by Pedersen et al. [13-15,25], the purpose of the studies are not hidden from participants. In fact, the selection process is highly biased towards finding a population who believes they have been affected by turbines. This is not an attempt to discount the self-reported health issues of residents living near wind turbines. Rather, it points out that the self-reported health issues have not been definitively linked to wind turbines.

What the peer reviewed literature and popular literature have in common is the conclusion that wind turbines can be a source of annoyance for some people. Of note are the different reasons and possible causes for annoyance. In the peer reviewed studies, annoyance tends to peak in the > 35 dB(A) range but tends to be more strongly related to subjective factors like visual impact, attitude to wind turbines in general (benign vs. intruders) and sensitivity to noise rather than noise itself from turbines. In the popular literature, health outcomes tend to be more strongly related to distance from turbines and the claim that infrasound is the causative factor. Though sound pressure level in most of the peer reviewed studies was scaled to dB(A) (but refer to O’Neal et al. [26] for actual measurements of low frequency noise and infrasound), infrasound is a component of the sound measurements and was inherently accounted for in the studies.

Annoyance

Studies on the health effects of wind turbines, both published and peer-reviewed and presented in the popular literature, tend to conclude that wind turbines can cause annoyance for some people. A number of governmental health agencies agree that while noise from wind turbines is not loud enough to cause hearing impairment and are not causally related to adverse effects, wind turbines can be a source of annoyance for some people [1,30-34].

It has been hypothesized that the self reported health effects (e.g., sleep disturbance, headache, tinnitus (ringing in the ears), ear pressure, dizziness, vertigo, nausea, visual blurring, tachycardia (rapid heart rate), irritability, problems with concentration and memory, and panic episodes) are related to infrasound emitted from wind turbines [28]. Studies where biological effects were observed due to infrasound exposure were conducted at sound pressure levels (e.g., 145 dB and 165 dB [5,16]; 130 dB [7]) much greater than what is produced by wind turbines (e.g., see O’Neal et al. [26]). Infrasound is not unique to wind turbines but is ubiquitous in the environment due to natural and man-made sources, meaning that people living near wind turbines were exposed to

infrasound prior to turbine operation. For example, Berglund and Hassmen [35] reported that infrasound (a component of low frequency sound) is emitted from road vehicles, aircraft, industrial machinery, artillery and mining explosions, air movement machinery including wind turbines, compressors, and air-conditioning units, and Leventhall [5] reported that infrasound comes from natural sources like meteors, volcanic eruptions and ocean waves. Indeed, many mammals communicate using infrasound [36]. Given the low sound pressure levels of infrasound emitted from wind turbines and the ubiquitous nature of these sounds, the hypothesis that infrasound is a causative agent in health effects does not appear to be supported.

Peer reviewed and scientifically defensible studies suggest that annoyance and health effects are more strongly related to subjective factors like visual impact and attitude to wind turbines rather than to noise itself (both audible and inaudible [i.e., infrasound]). Indeed, many of the self reported health effects are associated with numerous issues, many of which can be attributed to anxiety and annoyance (e.g., Pedersen 2011 [25]). Shargorodsky et al. [37] published that roughly 50 million adults in the United States reported having tinnitus, which is statistically correlated (based on 14,178 participants) to age, racial/ethnic group, hypertension, history of smoking, loud leisure-time, firearm, and occupational noise, hearing impairment and generalized anxiety disorder (based on 2265 participants) identified using a World Health Organization Composite Diagnostic Interview). In fact, the odds of tinnitus being related to anxiety disorder were greatest for any of the variables tested. Folmer and Griest [38], based on a study of 174 patients undergoing treatment for tinnitus at the Oregon Health Sciences University Tinnitus Clinic between 1994 and 1997, reported that insomnia is associated with greater severity of tinnitus. Insomnia is also associated with anxiety and annoyance. Bowling et al. [39] described statistically that people's perceptions of neighbourhood environment can influence health. Perceptions of problems in the area (e.g., noise, crime, air quality, rubbish/litter, traffic, graffiti) were predictive of poorer health score. In their 2003 publication Henningsen and Priebe [40] discussed the characteristics of "New Environmental Illness", illnesses where patients strongly believe their symptoms are caused by environmental factors, even though symptoms are not consistent with empirical evidence and medically unexplained. A key component to such illnesses is the patient's attitude toward the source of the environmental factor. What is more, health effects from annoyance have been shown to be mitigated through behavioural and cognitive behavioural interventions [30,41], lending support to Pedersen's [25] conclusion that health effects can be explained by cognitive stress theory. In other words, it appears that it is the change in the

environment that is associated with health effects, not a turbine-specific variable like infrasound.

Conclusions

Wind power has been harnessed as a source of power around the world. Debate is ongoing with respect to the relationship between reported health effects and wind turbines, specifically in terms of audible and inaudible noise. As a result, minimum setback distances have been established world-wide to reduce or avoid potential effects for people living in proximity to wind turbines. People interested in this debate turn to two sources of information to make informed decisions: scientific peer-reviewed studies published in scientific journals and the popular literature and internet.

We found that conclusions of the peer reviewed literature differ in some ways from the conclusions of the studies published in the popular literature. What both types of studies have in common is the conclusion that wind turbines can be a source of annoyance for some people. In the peer reviewed studies, wind turbine annoyance and some reported health effects (e.g., sleep disturbance) have been statistically associated with wind turbine noise especially when found at sound pressure levels greater than 40 db(A), but found to be more strongly related to subjective factors like visual impact, attitude to wind turbines in general and sensitivity to noise. To date, no peer reviewed scientific journal articles demonstrate a causal link between people living in proximity to modern wind turbines, the noise (audible, low frequency noise, or infrasound) they emit and resulting physiological health effects. In the popular literature, self-reported health outcomes and annoyance are related to distance from turbines and the claim is made that infrasound is the causative factor for the reported effects, even though sound pressure levels are not measured. Infrasound is not unique to wind turbines and the self reported health effects of people living in proximity to wind turbines are not unique to wind turbines. Given that annoyance appears to be more strongly related to visual cues and attitude than to noise itself, self reported health effects of people living near wind turbines are more likely attributed to physical manifestation from an annoyed state than from infrasound. This hypothesis is supported by the peer-reviewed literature pertaining to environmental stressors and health.

The authors have spent countless hours at community public consultation events hosted by proponents announcing new projects and during updates to their environmental assessment process. Historically, citizens' concerns about wind turbine projects appeared to involve potential impact on property values and issues surrounding avian and bat mortality. Increasingly in North America the issue surrounding fears of potential harm to residents' health have come to the forefront of these

meetings. It is clear that the announcement of a new project can lead to a heightened sense of anxiety and annoyance in some members of the public, even prior to construction and operation of a wind turbine project. The authors have been involved in all manner of risk communication, consultation and risk assessment projects in the energy sector in Canada and it has been our experience that this heightened sense of annoyance, agitation or fear is not unique to the wind turbine sector. Whether the proposed project is a wind turbine, gas-fired station, coal plant, nuclear power plant, or energy-from-waste incinerator we have seen a level of concern in a sub-set of the population that goes well beyond anything that would be considered the traditional sense of not-in-my-back-yard (NIMBY). These people genuinely are fearful about the potential health effects that the project may cause, regardless of the outcomes of quantitative assessments that demonstrate that there is a *de minimus* of potential risk in living next to a particular facility. The literature and our own experience highlight the need for informative discussions between wind power developers and community members in order to attempt to reduce the level of apprehension. We encourage continued dialogue between concerned citizens and developers once projects become operational.

Canadian public health agencies subscribe to the World Health Organization definition of health. "*Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of infirmity or disease*", a quote often used by both sides of the wind turbine debate. We believe that the primary role of the environmental health/risk assessment practitioner is to ensure that physiological manifestation of infirmity or disease is not predicted to occur from exposure to an environmental contaminant. In terms of wind power, ethics dictate an honest reporting of the issues surrounding annoyance and the fact that it appears that a limited number of people have self-reported health effects that may be attributed to the indirect effects of visual and attitudinal cue. We believe that any physiological based effect can be mitigated through the use of appropriate setback distances. However, it is not clear that for this hypersensitive annoyed population that any setback distance could mitigate the indirect effects. Therefore, it is up to our elected officials and ministerial staff when establishing an energy source hierarchy to weigh all of the information before them to determine the trade-offs between "mental and social well-being" of these individuals against the larger demand for energy and its source.

A number of governmental health agencies agree that while noise from wind turbines is not loud enough to cause hearing impairment and are not causally related to adverse effects, wind turbines can be a source of annoyance for some people. Ultimately it is up to governments to decide the level of acceptable annoyance in

a population that justifies the use of wind power as an alternative energy source.

Assessing the effects of wind turbines on human health is an emerging field, as demonstrated by the limited number of peer-reviewed articles published since 2003. Conducting further research into the effects of wind turbines (and environmental change) on human health, emotional and physical, as well as the effect of public consultation with community groups in reducing pre-construction anxiety, is warranted. Such an undertaking should be initiated prior to public announcement of a project, and could involve baseline community health and attitude surveys, baseline noise and infrasound monitoring, observation and questionnaires administered to public during the siting and assessment process, noise modeling and then post-construction follow-up on all of the aforementioned aspects. Regardless it would be imperative to ensure robust study design and a clear statement of purpose prior to study initiation.

We believe that research of this nature should be undertaken by multi-disciplinary teams involving, for example, acoustical engineers, health scientists, epidemiologists, social scientists and public health physicians. Ideally developers, government agencies, consulting professionals and non-government organizations would form collaborations in attempt to address these issues.

List of Abbreviations

ANSI: American National Standards Institute; CI: Confidence intervals; dB(A): A-weighted decibels; DEFRA: Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs; LFN: low frequency noise; LOAEL: lowest observed adverse effect level; MW: mega watt; O.Reg.: Ontario Regulation; OR: odds ratio; OHC: outer hair cells; REA: Renewable Energy Approval; SCI: Science Citation Index; SSCI: Social Sciences Citation Index; VAD: vibro-acoustic disease; WA: vertical visual angle; WHO: World Health Organization

Acknowledgements

None

Author details

¹Intrinsic Environmental Sciences Inc., 1790 Courtwood Crescent, Ottawa ON, K2C 2B5, Canada. ²Intrinsic Environmental Sciences Inc., 6605 Hurontario Street, Suite 500, Mississauga, ON, L5T 0A3, Canada.

Authors' contributions

LDK and CAO both researched and wrote the manuscript. Both authors read and approved the final version.

Competing interests

In terms of competing interests (financial and non-financial), the authors work for a consulting firm and have worked with wind power companies. The authors are actively working in the field of wind turbines and human health. Dr. Ollson has acted as an expert witness for wind power companies during a number of legal hearings. Although we make this disclosure, we wish to reiterate that as independent scientific professionals our views and research are not influenced by these contractual obligations. The authors are environmental health scientists, trained and schooled, in the evaluation of potential risks and health effects of people and the ecosystem through their exposure to environmental issues such as wind turbines.

Received: 2 May 2011 Accepted: 14 September 2011
Published: 14 September 2011

References

- World Health Organization (WHO): **Fourth Ministerial Conference on Environment and Health**. Energy, Sustainable Development and Health; 2004.
- Devine-Wright P: **Beyond NIMBYism: towards an integrated framework for understanding public perceptions of wind energy**. *Wind Energy* 2005, **8**:125-139.
- Ontario Power Authority (OPA), 2008 Annual Report: **On the Path to a Sustainable Electricity Future**. 2008.
- Bronzaft AL: **The effect of a noise abatement program on reading ability**. *J Environ Psychol* 1981, **1**:215-222.
- Leventhall G, Pelmear P, Benton S: **A Review of Published Research on Low Frequency Noise and its Effects**. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, London, UK; 2003.
- Kristiansen J, Mathiesen L, Nielsen PK, Hansen AM, Shibuya H, Petersen HM, Lund SP, Jørgensen MB, Søgaard K: **Stress reactions to cognitively demanding tasks and open-plan office noise**. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 2009, **82**:631-641.
- Yuan H, Long H, Liu J, Qu L, Chen J, Mou X: **Effects of infrasound on hippocampus-dependent learning and memory in rats and some underlying mechanisms**. *Environ Toxicol Pharm* 2009, **28**:243-247.
- World Health Organization Europe: **Night Noise Guidelines for Europe**. 2009, ISBN 978 92 890 4173 7.
- Ontario Ministry of the Environment: *Development of Noise Setbacks for Wind Farms Requirements for Compliance with MOE Noise Limits* 2009.
- Walsh O: *No Global Standards* 2010 [http://www.windvigilance.com/international-symposium].
- Higgins JPT, Green S, editors: **Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, Version 5.0.2**. *The Cochrane Collaboration* 2009.
- van den Berg GP: **Effects of the wind profile at night on wind turbine sound**. *J Sound Vibrat* 2003, **277**:955-970.
- Pedersen E, Persson Wayne K: **Perception and annoyance due to wind turbine noise - a dose - response relationship**. *J Acoust Soc Am* 2004, **116**:3460-3470.
- Pedersen E, Persson Wayne K: **Wind turbine noise, annoyance and self-reported health and well-being in different living environments**. *J Occup Environ Med* 2007, **64**:480-486.
- Pedersen E, Persson Wayne K: **Wind turbines - low level noise sources interfering with restoration?** *Environ Res Lett* 2008, **3**:1-5.
- Leventhall G: **Infrasound from wind turbines - fact, fiction or deception?** *Can Acoust* 2006, **34**:29-36.
- Keith SE, Michaud DS, Bly SHP: **A proposal for evaluating the potential health effects of wind turbine noise for projects under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act**. *J Low Freq Noise V A* 2008, **27**:253-265.
- Pedersen E, van den Berg F, Bakker R, Bouma J: **Response to noise from modern wind farms in The Netherlands**. *J Acoust Soc Am* 2009, **126**:634-643.
- Pedersen E, Hallberg LR-M, Persson Wayne K: **Living in the vicinity of wind turbines—a grounded theory study**. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 2007, **4**:49-63.
- Pedersen E, Larsman P: **The impact of visual factors on noise annoyance among people living in the vicinity of wind turbines**. *J Environ Psychol* 2008, **28**:379-89.
- Pedersen E, van den Berg F, Bakker R, Bouma J: **Can road traffic mask the sound from wind turbines? Response to wind turbine sound at different levels of road traffic**. *Energy Policy* 2010, **38**:2520-2527.
- Harding P, Wilkins A: **Wind turbines, flicker, and photosensitive epilepsy: Characterizing the flashing that may precipitate seizures and optimizing guidelines to prevent them**. *Epilepsia* 2008, **49**:1095-98.
- Smedley ARD, Webb AR, Wilkins AJ: **Potential of wind turbines to elicit seizures under various meteorological conditions**. *Epilepsia* 2010, **51**:1146-1151.
- Salt AN, Hullar TE: **Responses of the ear to low frequency sounds, infrasound and wind turbines**. *Hear Res* 2010, **268**:12-21.
- Pedersen E: **Health aspects associated with wind turbine noise—Results from three field studies**. *Noise Control Eng J* 2011, **59**:47-53.
- O'Neal RD, Hellweg Jr, Lampeter RM: **Low frequency noise and infrasound from wind turbines**. *Noise Control Eng J* 2011, **59**:135-157.
- Nissenbaum M: **Affidavit of Dr. Michael M. Nissenbaum**. [http://www.wind-watch.org/documents/affidavit-of-dr-michael-m-nissenbaum-m-d/].
- Pierpont N: *Wind Turbine Syndrome* Santa Fe, NM: K-Selected Books; 2009.
- Krogh K, Gillis L, Kouwen N: **A self-reporting survey: adverse health effects with industrial wind turbines and the need for vigilance**. *Wind Vigilance for Ontario Communities* [http://5468964569013158095-a-1802744773732722657-s-sites.googlegroups.com/site/windvigilancecom/health_survey_rev14final.pdf?attachauth=ANoY7cplDenR6Eib4UJc45F7PTCtAT_SA73tC9MnPHDzR2r3AYn7hZlh0cPyETeKl4lbbkal2GMyhydn6NuzAp5e9BnDWc aJJKqC6Uj_tkKwVS_U_eUdydnYt-EpqvskDtJgVF_cDNsbND596DS4C2_Ofk8VwXYrP_aAHk8zkwfCuQWreczFRDbiBRDSHmnoPq2PifKvMHS7LNfOkGkouLWNdu3xAkeA%3D%3D&attredirects=0].
- Leventhall G, Benton S, Robertson D: **Coping strategies for low frequency noise**. *J Low Freq Noise V A* 2008, **27**:35-52.
- Chatham-Kent Public Health Unit: *The Health Impact of Wind Turbines: A Review of the Current White, Grey and Published Literature* 2008.
- Minnesota Department of Health Environmental Health Division: *Public Health Impacts of Wind Turbines* 2009.
- Chief Medical Officer of Health (CMOH) Ontario: *The Potential Health Impact of Wind Turbines* 2010.
- Australian Government, National Health and Medical Research Council: *Wind Turbines and Health: A Rapid Review of the Evidence* 2010.
- Berglund B, Hassmen P: **Sources and effects of low-frequency noise**. *J Acoust Soc Am* 1996, **99**:2985-3002.
- Langbauer WR: **Elephant Communication**. *Zoo Biol* 2000, **19**:425-445.
- Shargorodsky J, Curhan GC, Farwell WR: **Prevalence and Characteristics of Tinnitus among US Adults**. *Am J Med* 2010, **123**:711-718.
- Folmer RL, Griest SE: **Tinnitus and Insomnia**. *Am J Otolaryngol* 2000, **21**:287-293.
- Bowling A, Barber J, Morris R, Ebrahim S: **Do perceptions of neighbourhood environment influence health? Baseline findings from a British survey of aging**. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2006, **60**:476-483.
- Henningsen P, Priebe S: **New environmental illnesses: What are their characteristics?** *Psychother Psychosom* 2003, **72**:231-234.
- Tazaki M, Landlaw K: **Behavioural mechanisms and cognitive-behavioural interventions of somatoform disorders**. *Int Rev Psychiatr* 2006, **18**:67-73.

doi:10.1186/1476-069X-10-78

Cite this article as: Knopper and Ollson: Health effects and wind turbines: A review of the literature. *Environmental Health* 2011 **10**:78.


Submit your next manuscript to BioMed Central and take full advantage of:

- Convenient online submission
- Thorough peer review
- No space constraints or color figure charges
- Immediate publication on acceptance
- Inclusion in PubMed, CAS, Scopus and Google Scholar
- Research which is freely available for redistribution

Submit your manuscript at
www.biomedcentral.com/submit



Ontario's Long-Term Energy Plan



Building Our Clean Energy Future



table of contents

Foreword	2
Overview	5
1. Demand	12
2. Supply	16
3. Conservation	37
4. Reliable Transmission/Modern Distribution	41
5. Aboriginal Communities	48
6. Energy in Ontario's Economy — Capital Investments	51
7. Electricity Prices	57
Appendix One: Who Does What	
Appendix Two: Consultations and Next Steps	
Appendix Three: Installed Capacity	
Glossary	

foreword

Maintaining a clean, modern and reliable electricity system for all Ontarians is this government's number one energy priority. Ontario families, businesses and the economy rely on the efficiency, dependability and environmental sustainability of electric power. We have to keep the lights on in Ontario homes, schools, hospitals and businesses and power everything from the coffee-maker to the CT scanner. We also need a clean system that won't threaten the health of current and future generations.

Ontarians deserve balanced, responsible long-term energy planning for electricity to ensure that Ontario has clean air, reliable energy and a strong economy for our children and grandchildren. This report represents an update to the McGuinty government's long-term energy plan and outlines how we are helping families and businesses with increasing electricity costs.

Prior to 2003, Ontario's electricity system was weakening and unreliable. Our reliance on coal meant that our electricity sources were polluting and dirty. Between 1995 and 2003, the electricity system lost 1,800 megawatts (MW) of power — the equivalent of Niagara Falls running dry. A brief deregulated pricing experiment in 2002 resulted in sharply increased prices, prompting the government of the time to freeze consumer prices. Energy infrastructure was crumbling, a shortage of supply caused risks of brownouts.

Worst of all, Ontario relied heavily on five air-polluting coal plants. This wasn't just polluting our air, it was polluting our lungs. Doctors, nurses and researchers stated categorically that coal generation was having an impact on health increasing the incidence of various respiratory illnesses. A 2005 study prepared for the government found that the average annual health-related damages due to coal could top \$3 billion. For the sake of our well-being, and our children's well-being, we had to put a stop to coal.

Over the past seven years, the McGuinty government has made tremendous progress after inheriting a system with reduced supply and little planning for the future. Today, our system is cleaner, more modern, more reliable and we plan ahead.

The McGuinty government has made electricity cleaner: we are on track to eliminate coal by 2014, the single largest climate change initiative in North America in that timeframe. We have already reduced the use of coal by 70 per cent. Last year our greenhouse gas emissions from the electricity sector reached the lowest they have been in 45 years. In 2009, more than 80 per cent of our generation came from emissions-free sources like wind, water, solar, biogas and nuclear.

Conservation efforts have been working — many Ontario families and businesses are becoming very active energy conservers. Through various programs, Ontarians have conserved more than 1,700 MW of electricity since 2005 — the equivalent of more than half a million homes being taken off the grid.

Today we have enough electricity to power our homes, businesses, schools and hospitals. Our government has increased Ontario's energy capacity by adding over 20 per cent (more than 8,000 MW) of new supply to the system — enough to power two million homes. Investments in Ontario are transforming the electricity system and have helped to make Ontario a leading jurisdiction in North America for renewable and reliable energy. And since 2007, we've used a formal 20-year planning process to help us forecast and meet the province's electricity needs.

Ontario's electricity system is more reliable. Investments in new generation and upgrades to 5,000 kilometres of our transmission and distribution lines — about the width of Canada from coast to coast — have ensured that our electricity system is able to manage peak and sudden swings in demand and supply availability.

We are moving toward a modern, smart electricity system that will help consumers have greater control over their energy usage — even when they're not at home. A smart grid can isolate outages allowing for faster or even automated repair. This will improve overall reliability for all electricity consumers and make it easier for consumers to produce their own power.

As part of the Open Ontario plan, the McGuinty government is moving Ontario from dirty coal dependency to a clean, modern and reliable energy economy that creates jobs. Energy is one of the engines of our economy and employs more than 95,000 Ontarians. Recent investments to modernize the system are helping to create and support jobs and opportunities for people and communities across the province. Ontario's landmark Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009 is projected over three years to support over 50,000 direct and indirect jobs in smart grid and transmission and distribution upgrades, renewable energy and conservation.

We've accomplished a great deal in the past seven years, but there is more to do. Ontario has sufficient electricity supply — but we will require more clean power for the future. As Ontario's energy infrastructure ages, we will need to rebuild or create another 15,000 MW of generating capacity over the next 20 years. We will also need to continue to upgrade and update transmission and distribution lines.

While we are proud of our collective efforts so far, we must continue to develop cleaner forms of electricity and foster a conservation-oriented culture. We need to have a balanced low-carbon supply mix to meet energy needs cleanly and reliably — Ontario will be ready for when North America moves to greenhouse gas regulation. We also need to maximize the electricity assets we have and ensure that those assets continue to provide clean, reliable supply.

overview

Ontario Electricity 1906-2003

On October 11, 1910, when Adam Beck lit up a Kitchener street sign that read “For the People,” the town went wild, and the electrification of Ontario began. It was the first major project of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, created in 1906 as the world’s first publicly owned electric utility. Beck, a municipal and provincial politician, believed that it was essential to the province’s economic development that electricity be available to every Ontarian.

The Queenston-Chippawa power station at Niagara (renamed Sir Adam Beck I in 1950) helped Ontario meet the growing demand for electricity during the postwar economic boom. But despite continued expansion, it had become increasingly clear that hydropower alone would not be able to keep up with the province’s demand.

As a result, Ontario began to diversify its supply mix in the 1950s, adding new sources of power, including six coal-fired generating stations built near areas where demand was highest. Between the early 1970s and the early 1990s, nuclear power was also added at three generating facilities. In the meantime, in 1974, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission was recognized as a crown corporation and renamed Ontario Hydro.

This trio of electricity sources — hydro, coal and nuclear — would support Ontario’s economic prosperity into the 1990s. By then, much of the province’s electricity infrastructure was aging and in need of replacement or refurbishment. The system had become unreliable, and there was widespread concern about whether supply would be able to meet projected demand.

Between 1996 and 2003, Ontario’s generation capacity fell by six per cent — the equivalent of Niagara Falls running dry, while electricity demand grew by 8.5 per cent. Investments to build new supply and the upkeep of lines were modest. Investments in upgrades to transmission and distribution were less than half of current levels. There were no provincially funded conservation programs.

In 1998, Ontario passed legislation that authorized the establishment of a market in electricity. In April 1999, Ontario Hydro was re-organized into five successor entities. The move to break up Ontario Hydro and partially privatize the electricity system saddled Ontario with a stranded debt of over \$20 billion.

The necessary, unavoidable investments that Ontario has been making in our electricity system are paid by ratepayers. The cost to bring our system back up to date and build a clean energy economy is having an impact on household and business bills.

We are all paying for previous decades of neglect. In Ontario, in order to have clean air, reliable generation and modernized transmission, residential prices over the next 20 years are expected to increase by about 3.5 per cent per year.

Increases to electricity bills are not easy for Ontario families and businesses. Even though Ontarians are committed to clean air, every increase takes a bite out of take-home income, and that is difficult for families during lean times. To help with rising costs, the McGuinty government has created a number of tax credits for families and seniors to help manage electricity increases. But we need to do more.

In this Plan, and the government’s 2010 Economic Outlook and Fiscal Review we have taken steps to ensure that we help families and businesses with electricity costs while investment in clean energy continues. On November 18, 2010, the McGuinty government introduced the Ontario Clean Energy Benefit.

If passed, the Ontario Clean Energy Benefit will give Ontario families, farms and small businesses a 10 per cent benefit on their bills for five years. That would be 10 per cent off your electricity bill every month, effective January 1, 2011.

The proposed Clean Energy Benefit will help families, hard-working small business owners and Ontario farms. The McGuinty government is doing this to help those who are feeling the pinch of the rising cost of living and especially, rising electricity prices. Every little bit helps during lean economic times.

This balanced and responsible Plan sets out Ontario’s expected electricity needs and the most efficient ways to meet them.



The Honourable Brad Duguid
Minister of Energy

A brief market-deregulation scheme saw electricity prices spike an average of over 30 per cent in just seven months. The government of the day was forced to cap prices for residential and small business owners — an unsustainable policy. The cap just masked the underlying problem of rising cost pressures in an electricity system in need of renewal and additional supply.

Ontario was also heavily reliant on coal-fired generation. About 25 per cent of electricity generation came from polluting coal-fired plants. In addition, Ontario imported coal power from neighbouring American states. Ontario, a province with ample power resources, had become a net importer of power.

Ontario Electricity Accomplishments 2003-2010

After taking office in 2003, the Ontario government faced a number of challenges including: a shortfall in supply, a system reliant on dirty coal-fired generation, a lack of conservation programs, an unsustainable pricing regime and little long-term planning.

The shortfall in supply was restored with investments of over \$10 billion to keep the lights on in the province's homes and businesses. Since 2003, about 8,400 megawatts (MW) of new cleaner power have come on line — over 20 per cent of current capacity. That's enough electricity to power cities the size of Ottawa and Toronto. Ontario completed the return to service of Pickering A Unit 1 and enabled hydro and other renewable projects. The province also invested \$7 billion to improve some 5,000 kilometres of transmission and distribution lines — the equivalent of the distance between Toronto and Whitehorse, Yukon.

Ontario's power has become cleaner by shutting down coal-fired generation and investing in renewables. In 2005, the government permanently shut-down the Lakeview coal-fired plant in Mississauga — the equivalent of taking 500,000 cars off the road. The province is on track to phase out coal-fired electricity by 2014, the largest climate change initiative of its kind in North America.

Currently, Ontario is Canada's solar and wind power leader, and home to the four largest operating wind and solar farms in the country. The province is developing a smart electricity grid that will help integrate the thousands of megawatts of new renewable power from these projects and others.

Public conservation programs were reintroduced to Ontario in 2005 to encourage and provide incentives for families, businesses and industry to consume less energy. Conservation is now a cornerstone of long-term electricity planning, recognizing that all Ontarians — for generations to come — will benefit from cleaner air and a lower carbon footprint.

In 2004, the government introduced a stable pricing regime that better reflected the true cost of electricity in Ontario. As a result, in 2005 the Ontario Energy Board (OEB) released a Regulated Price Plan, which brought predictability to electricity prices for residential and small business consumers. The OEB updates rates and adjusts prices every six months to reflect the costs of supply for that period.

Ontario has also taken steps to lower the stranded debt left by the previous government. Since 2003, Ontario has decreased the stranded debt by \$5.7 billion.

In 2004, the government established the Ontario Power Authority (OPA) as the province's long-term energy planner. That set into motion a planning process that would ensure that Ontario's energy infrastructure would continue to be modernized. In 2007, the OPA prepared a 20-year energy plan (formally known as the Integrated Power System Plan or IPSP). The 2007 Plan focused on creating a sustainable energy supply, targeted to improving current natural gas and renewable assets at a sustainable and realistic cost. The government has made significant progress on the items outlined in the 2007 Plan.

2007 Plan Goal/Target	Accomplishments
Ensure adequate supply	Invested over \$10-billion to bring about 8,400 MW of new supply online — enough capacity to meet the annual requirements of 2 million households.
Double the amount of renewable supply (to 15,700 MW by 2025)	More than 1,500 MW of clean, renewable energy online since 2003, enough power for more than 400,000 homes.
Reduce demand by 6,300 MW by 2025.	More than 1,700 MW of conservation (reduction in demand) since 2005, equivalent to more than 500,000 homes being taken off the grid.
Replace coal in the earliest practical time frame	Phasing out coal-fired generation by 2014 Four units closed in 2010, ahead of schedule.
Strengthen the transmission system	Over \$7 billion in investments since 2003 — upgrades to more than 5,000 kilometres of wires Moved forward on transmission projects to enable additional renewables; import potential; and refurbished nuclear generation
Ensure stable energy prices for Ontarians	The Regulated Price Plan introduced in 2005 has provided predictability Electricity prices have increased on average by about 4.5 percent per year over the past seven years Introduced energy tax credits to help residential and small business consumers with electricity costs

In 2009, the government introduced the groundbreaking Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009 (GEA). The GEA is sparking growth in clean and renewable sources of energy such as wind, solar, hydro, and bioenergy. A series of conservation measures in the GEA are providing incentives to lower energy use. In its first three years, the GEA will help create 50,000 clean energy jobs across the province. A clean-energy manufacturing base has been growing in the province and creating jobs for Ontarians.

Ontario's Energy Future 2010-2030

The priorities that the government sets and the investments the government makes today are laying the groundwork for an Ontario of tomorrow that will feature a modern, clean and globally competitive economy; healthy, vibrant and liveable communities; and an exceptional quality of life for all Ontarians. The government has a responsibility to ensure a clean, modern and reliable system for the health and well-being of Ontario families and businesses.

By 2030, Ontario's population is expected to rise about 28 per cent — a gain of almost 3.7 million people. Ontario's population will become more urbanized with population growth taking place in primarily urban areas. The Greater Toronto Area (GTA) population will increase by almost 38 per cent over the same period.

The overall composition of the economy will evolve as high-tech and service industries grow and manufacturers change how they do business to keep pace with technological advances and global competition. The output of large industrial customers, which accounts for about 20 per cent of electricity demand, is expected to grow moderately.

Getting around will be easier for all Ontarians. Improved regional and local transit systems that form integrated transportation networks will make it easy to travel, both within and between urban centres. There will be more electric cars on the road — Ontario's goal is that by 2020, about one in every 20 vehicles on the road will be electric.

All of this means that Ontario needs a more modern energy system and a diverse supply mix. Clean, reliable energy is the fuel that will power Ontario's future economic prosperity. Ontario must take steps today to ensure that the right kind of energy will continue to be there for us tomorrow.

Ontario is building a culture of conservation and as a result, it is expected that the province's demand for energy will grow only moderately over the next 20 years. Increased demand in the long term will be due to the rising population, industrial growth and increased use of electrical appliances and vehicles.

The Smart House of the Future

A smarter electricity grid will enable Smart Houses in the future by using technologies that have built-in intelligence. With Smart Grid infrastructure, homes will be able to use power when it is least expensive, charge electric vehicles, generate their own power via solar panels or other generation — and all of this can be controlled by the owner online, or by smart phone.

The Plan

Since the 2007 Plan, developments in technology, trends in demographics, changes in the economy and the advancements of the renewable energy sector (the success of the Feed-in-Tariff program) mean that Ontario needs an updated plan. This updated long-term energy plan will help to ensure that Ontario can meet the needs of an evolving economy and shifting electricity demands, while providing affordable electricity.

Currently, Ontario's electricity system has a capacity of approximately 35,000 MW of power. The OPA forecasts that more than 15,000 MW will need to be renewed, replaced or added by 2030. Because of capacity brought online in recent years, Ontario has some flexibility moving forward. The challenge is in choosing the right mix of generation sources and the necessary level of investment to modernize Ontario's energy infrastructure to meet future needs.

Through initiatives already underway, the province will be able to reliably meet electricity demand through 2015. Ontario needs to plan now for improving the power supply capacity to meet the province's electricity needs beyond 2015. Ontario must plan in advance because:

- Insufficient investment between 1995 and 2003 left an aging supply network and little new generation
- Additional clean generation will be needed to ensure a coal-free supply mix after 2014
- Nuclear generators will need to go offline while they are being modernized
- The population is projected to grow.

To meet these needs Ontario will need a diverse supply mix. Each type of generation has a role in meeting overall system needs. Ontario requires the right combination of assets to ensure a balanced supply mix that is reliable, modern, clean and cost-effective. Ontario will also, first and foremost, make the best use of its existing assets to upgrade, expand or convert facilities.

As part of a reliable network, the system needs both small and large generators. Nuclear power will continue to reliably supply about 50 per cent of the province's electricity needs. It does not emit air pollutants or emissions during production. Hydroelectric power is expanding to include increased capacity from the Niagara Tunnel project and the Lower Mattagami project — producing clean energy by tapping into a renewable and free fuel source. Natural gas-fired plants have the flexibility to respond when demand is high — acting as peak source or cushion for the electricity system. Natural gas is the cleanest of the fossil fuels, emitting less than half of the carbon dioxide emitted by coal.

Ontario is also planning for future energy generation that will focus on efficient, localized generation from smaller, cleaner sources of electricity rather than exclusively from large, centralized power plants transmitting power over long distances. This strategy is known as “distributed generation”. Distributed generation also opens up opportunities for smaller power producers, allowing individuals, Aboriginal communities and small co-operatives or partnerships to become generators.

Renewable energy—wind, solar, hydro, and bioenergy—is an important part of the supply mix. Once the initial investment is made in equipment and infrastructure, fuel cost and greenhouse gas emissions are zero or very low. Renewable energy makes it possible to generate electricity in urban and rural areas where it was not feasible before.

In developing this report, the government heard from over 2,500 Ontarians (individuals, energy organizations, community representatives, and First Nation and Métis leaders and groups). Their views have helped to inform this report. In addition, the Ontario Power Authority (OPA), Hydro One, Ontario Power Generation (OPG), the Ontario Energy Board (OEB) and the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) contributed information and advice.

Ontario's Long-Term Energy Plan will help guide the province as it continues to build a clean, modern, and reliable electricity system for Ontario families now and well into the future. It will ensure Ontario continues to be a North American leader for clean energy jobs and technology and becomes coal-free by 2014. Key features of the plan include:

- Demand will grow moderately (about 15 per cent) between 2010 and 2030.
- Ontario will be coal-free by 2014. Eliminating coal-fired generation from Ontario's supply mix will account for the majority of the government's greenhouse gas reduction target by 2014. Two units at the Thunder Bay coal plant will be converted to gas and Atikokan will be converted to biomass. Two additional units at Nanticoke will be shut down in 2011.
- The government is committed to clean, reliable nuclear power remaining at approximately 50 per cent of the province's electricity supply. To do so, units at the Darlington and Bruce sites will need to be modernized and the province will need two new nuclear units at Darlington. Investing in refurbishment and extending the life of the Pickering B station until 2020 will provide good value for Ontarians.
- Ontario will continue to grow its hydroelectric capacity with a target of 9,000 MW. This will be achieved through new facilities and through significant investments to maximize the use of Ontario's existing facilities.
- Ontario's target for clean, renewable energy from wind, solar and bioenergy is 10,700 MW by 2018 (excluding hydroelectric) – accommodated through transmission expansion and maximizing the use of the existing system. Ontario will continue to grow the clean energy economy through the continuation of FIT and microFIT programs.

- Natural gas generation for peak needs will be of value where it can address local and system reliability issues. Natural gas will support the increase in renewable sources over time and supplement the modernization of nuclear generators.
- Combined Heat and Power is an energy-efficient source of power and the OPA will develop a standard offer program for projects under 20 MW.
- Ontario will proceed with five priority transmission projects needed immediately for reliability, renewable energy growth, and changing demand. Future Plans will identify more projects as they are needed.
- Ontario is a leader in conservation and the government will continue to increase and broaden its targets to 7,100 MW and reduce overall demand by 28 terawatt-hours (TWh) by 2030.
- Over the next 20 years, estimated capital investments totalling \$87 billion will help ensure that Ontario has a clean, modern and reliable electricity system.
- Measures outlined in this Plan will help create and sustain jobs and investments in Ontario's growing clean energy economy.
- Residential bills are expected to rise by 3.5 per cent per year over the next 20 years. Industrial prices are expected to rise by 2.7 per cent per year over the next 20 years.
- The government is proposing an Ontario Clean Energy Benefit to give Ontario families, farms and small businesses a 10 per cent benefit on their electricity bills for five years.


This plan will help ensure that Ontario is able to meet its electricity needs until 2030 and build a modern, clean, reliable system that will provide energy to Ontario homes and businesses for generations to come.

1 demand – an updated forecast

A forecast of the demand for electricity establishes the context for long-term planning — it predicts the amount of electricity Ontario will need.

System planning requires a complex forecast of the total amount of electricity that will be used over the course of a year, as well as the amount required to meet peak demand. The next step is to match these requirements with available generation and transmission capacity. Demand fluctuates with the time of day, weather, time of year and the structure of the economy. Ontario's demand can fluctuate between 11,000 MW on an early Sunday morning in spring to 25,000 MW on a hot Thursday afternoon in summer.

FIGURE 1: ONTARIO ELECTRICITY DEMAND COMPARISON



Unlike other forms of energy, electricity cannot be easily stored. Ontario's electricity system must be able to produce and move enough electricity to meet the changing demand for it instantaneously — all day and all night, every day and every night.

Ontario is part of an interconnected grid consisting of thousands of generators linked by tens of thousands of kilometres of transmission lines, crossing international, provincial and regional borders. The interconnected nature of the grid, supported by mandatory reliability standards, helps to ensure a stable power supply even when major components fail or when demand exceeds what can be met with domestic resources. Trade in electricity takes place over this interconnected system — for instance, between Ontario, Quebec and the U.S. — on a daily basis. In 2003, Ontario was a net importer and much of this imported supply came from U.S. coal power, which increased prices and reduced Ontario's air quality. Ontario is now a net exporter of electricity.

Electricity demand in Ontario has declined since reaching a peak in 2005. For the next 10 years, demand is expected to recover from the recent recession and then stay relatively flat as conservation efforts and an evolving economy change Ontario's energy needs.

Accomplishments

Ontario families and businesses have participated in conserving energy through various government conservation programs and shifting the demand away from peak hours.

- Ontario's conservation initiatives have been successful. Since 2005, Ontarians have saved enough energy to meet the combined electricity demand of Mississauga and Windsor.
- "peaksaver", a residential and small business electricity demand reduction program that temporarily powers down central air conditioning systems, has conserved enough to power a community the size of Thunder Bay.

Future Needs

Demand is recovering slowly in 2010 after the global economic recession. Future demand will depend on a number of factors including: the speed of Ontario's economic recovery, population and household growth, greater use of electronics in appliances and home entertainment systems, the pace of the recovery of large, energy-intensive industry and the composition of the economy (e.g. a shift to more high-tech and service jobs). Demand will also be impacted by the success of conservation efforts, as well as the potential electrification of public transit and the number of electric vehicles on the road. Weather can also have a pronounced effect.

To account for generation maintenance, extreme weather or significant changes in the amount of electricity the province needs, it is important to have electricity capacity in reserve.

The Plan

Based on OPA analysis, this Plan outlines three potential scenarios (net of conservation) for electricity demand:


1. Low growth (yellow) assumes that Ontario's manufacturing and industrial sectors continue to grow modestly in accordance with the current trend. Some of the recent decline in consumption is due to conservation, some to restructuring in the various industrial sectors, and some due to the recession. This forecast assumes a lower rate of population growth than in the other two scenarios. It further assumes that only 13 per cent of people use electricity for heating and that small appliance use accounts for 30 per cent of growth.

2. Medium growth (brown) represents moderate growth in the industrial sector and in population. This scenario assumes continued growth in the residential, commercial and transportation sectors. This forecast assumes that there is a consistent move towards high-tech and service industries and somewhat higher provincial population growth than the low growth scenario. This scenario is consistent with the current government goal for electric vehicles: five per cent by 2020.
3. High growth (orange), or aggressive electrification, assumes that there is a significant increase in electric transportation — both public and private. It assumes that there is aggressive North American greenhouse gas regulation, faster population growth than the low growth scenario, significant industrial change and that by 2030 about 12 per cent of vehicles on the road are electric.

Based on the medium growth scenario, Ontario's demand will grow moderately (15 per cent) between 2010 and 2030, based on the projected increase in population and conservation as well as shifts in industrial and commercial needs. As a result, for planning purposes, the system should be prepared to provide 146 TWh of generation in 2015 rising to 165 TWh in 2030.

Ontario is also planning to create sufficient flexibility in the system to accommodate the higher growth scenario.

FIGURE 2: RANGE OF ENERGY DEMAND FORECAST



The three scenarios do not differ significantly until 2018, allowing time to adjust as the Long-Term Energy Plan will be updated every three years. For planning purposes, the government is using the medium growth line to predict future electricity needs. The medium growth scenario balances the expected growth in residential and commercial sectors, with modest, post-recession growth in the industrial sector. The addition of 1.1 million households and the expected increase in the use of entertainment electronics, and small appliances will increase residential electricity demand. The addition of 132 million square metres of commercial space and the associated use of air-conditioning, lighting and ventilation will increase electricity demand in the commercial sector.

2 supply


With a long-term demand forecast in place, Ontario must determine the most effective way to meet that demand so that there is no gap in supply. Ontario needs a balanced, cost-effective supply mix that supports the economy, is modern, can adapt to future changes and provides clean, reliable electricity to Ontario families and businesses for generations to come.

A clean, reliable energy system relies on a balance of resources. Good system planning includes a sustainable supply mix that meets the demands of the public. It also means continually looking for efficiencies and emphasizing the best use of current resources. Ontario's supply mix includes:

- Conservation: As the best and first resource, it reduces consumption and therefore demand on the system. By avoiding the need to build new generation, all consumers benefit through cost savings.
- Baseload power: Generation sources, such as nuclear and hydro stations, designed to continuously operate (Niagara Falls, for example). Baseload power is the foundation of a stable, secure supply mix.
- Variable or intermittent power: Generation sources that produce power only during certain times such as wind and solar projects. These are important contributors to a cleaner supply mix.
- Intermediate and peak power: Generation sources designed to ramp up and down as demand changes throughout the day such as natural gas and hydro generation with some storage capability. These function as a cushion to the system to ensure reliability when demand is highest.

This supply mix balances reliability, cost and environmental performance.

FIGURE 3: FORECAST SUPPLY AND DEMAND (2010-2030)



Energy Storage can help to balance the electricity grid by storing off-peak generation and using it during peak hours. This helps to reliably incorporate more renewable generation into the grid. Energy storage is an important part of the move to a Smart Grid. Ontario will continue to investigate the potential for new storage technologies. There are a number of issues that impact the development of energy storage:

- The capital costs for large-scale electricity storage are high largely due to high engineering and construction costs.
- Research is underway on flywheel storage, plug-in vehicle storage, various forms of thermal storage as well as other storage options.
- There are growing opportunities for small storage projects, particularly as battery technology improves.
- Ontario has a pumped storage facility in the Sir Adam Beck Pumping Generating Station at Niagara Falls. OPG is currently studying the possible expansion of the reservoir to allow for further storage at the station.

The capacity of the system is necessarily larger than what is actually generated. It is critical to have more capacity than generation to be able to manage normal equipment maintenance and shutdowns, unprecedented peak demands or an unexpected shutdown of an electricity generator. Generation, or the amount of electricity Ontario produces, is measured in terawatt hours (TWh or billion kWh). The capacity of the system, or what it is able to generate, is measured in megawatts (MW).

FIGURE 4: CONTRAST BETWEEN GENERATION AND INSTALLED CAPACITY



Selecting a supply mix and investment in supply is a matter of choices and trade-offs. A variety of power supply sources — some designed for baseload requirements, some designed for meeting peak requirements — is superior to relying heavily on only one source. For this long-term plan the government has considered environmental, economic, health, social and cost implications to come up with the best possible supply mix.


This improved supply mix will be cleaner, sustainable, modern and reliable. It phases out coal-fired generation at a faster pace, it modernizes Ontario's nuclear fleet, it includes more renewables, it maximizes hydroelectric power over the near term, and it advances Ontario's conservation goals.

By 2030, Ontario will have completely eliminated coal as a generation source and will have also increased wind, solar and bioenergy from less than one per cent of generation capacity in 2003 to almost 13 per cent. To ensure reliability, the strategic use of natural gas will be required to complement renewable generation. Nuclear will continue to supply about 50 per cent of Ontario's electricity needs.

The following chapter will include a review of the various components of Ontario's electricity supply:

- Coal
- Nuclear
- Renewables: Hydroelectric
- Renewables: Wind, Solar and Bioenergy
- Natural gas
- Combined Heat and Power (CHP)

FIGURE 5: BUILDING A CLEANER ELECTRICITY SYSTEM



Coal Free

The Ontario government is committed to improving the health of Ontarians and fighting climate change. Coal-fired plants have been the single largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the province and among the largest emitters of smog-causing pollutants. Ontario's reliance on coal-fired generation shot up 127 per cent from 1995-2003, significantly polluting the province's air. During that period Ontario also relied on importing coal-fired power from the United States. An Ontario study found the health and environmental costs of coal at \$3 billion annually ("Cost Benefit Analysis: Replacing Ontario's Coal-Fired Electricity Generation," April 2005).

Since 2003, the government has reduced the use of dirty coal-fired plants by 70 per cent. Eliminating coal-fired electricity generation will account for the majority of Ontario's greenhouse gas reduction target by 2014 — the equivalent of taking 7 million cars off the road.

The Plan

Coal-fired plants will cease to burn coal in 2014. Ontario will shut down two additional units at Nanticoke Generating Station before the end of 2011.

The government recognizes the potential benefits of continuing to use Ontario's existing electricity-generating assets and sites. Coal-fired plants could be converted to use alternative fuels, such as natural gas. Similar to coal, biomass and/or natural gas can provide electricity on demand for peak periods.

In line with the Growth Plan for Northern Ontario and future needs of the Ring of Fire, the province is replacing coal at Atikokan and Thunder Bay and re-powering these facilities with cleaner fuel sources.

Converting the Atikokan Generating Station to biomass by 2013 will create up to 200 construction jobs and help protect jobs at the plant. It will also support jobs in Ontario related to the production of wood pellets and sustain other jobs in the forestry sector. The project is expected to take up to three years to complete. Once converted, the plant is expected to generate 150 million kilowatt-hours of renewable power, enough to power 15,000 homes each year.

At the Thunder Bay Generating Station, two units will be converted to natural gas in a similar timeframe. The Thunder Bay plant is needed not only for local supply to the city of Thunder Bay, but for system reliability in northwestern Ontario, particularly during periods of low hydroelectric generation and until the proposed enhancement to the East-West tie enters operation. The government will work with suppliers on the planning process to convert the Thunder Bay units.

Ontario will continue to explore accelerating the closure of the remaining six units (four at Nanticoke and two at Lambton), taking into consideration the impact of the closures on system reliability.

Ontario will monitor the progress of the continued operation of nuclear units at Pickering. The government expects in 2012 to have an update on the progress of extending the life of these units. At this time, Ontario will consider the possible conversion of some of the units at Nanticoke and Lambton to natural gas, if necessary for system reliability. Due to the lead times involved, planning and approval work for the natural gas pipeline infrastructure required to Nanticoke will begin soon.

Ontario will continue to explore opportunities for co-firing of biomass with natural gas for any units converted to natural gas. Decisions on other biomass opportunities will have to carefully take into account the ability to bring in fuel supply and the cost of conversion.

In addition, Ontario Power Generation (OPG) is required to meet strict government-mandated greenhouse gas emission targets, including ensuring that between 2011 and 2014 annual emissions are two-thirds lower than 2003 levels.

Ontario is the only jurisdiction in North America that is phasing out coal-fired generation. The government has committed to eliminating coal-fired generation by 2014 and is introducing clean and reliable sources of energy in its place. Until then, coal and natural gas plants will continue to provide power in peak-demand periods to maintain the reliability of the system.

Accomplishments


The government of Ontario has shut down eight coal units since 2003 (3,000 MW) and will close the remaining units by 2014 or earlier.

- Lakeview (Mississauga) – four units closed April, 2005
- Nanticoke – two units closed October, 2010
- Lambton – two units closed October, 2010

After the closure of four coal units on October 1, 2010, coal-fired generation makes up only 13 per cent of Ontario's electricity capacity.


Ontario's electricity sector emissions will decrease dramatically to only five megatonnes post-2020 as a result of becoming coal-free. Between 2015 and 2019, extensive nuclear refurbishments will take place and Ontario will rely on its natural gas-fired stations to maintain reliable electricity supply.

**FIGURE 6:
REDUCING EMISSIONS IN ONTARIO'S ELECTRICITY SECTOR**



Nuclear – New/Modernized

Nuclear power is a reliable, safe supplier of the province's baseload generation needs — accounting for about 36 per cent of the province's installed electricity capacity. Nuclear operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week and it produces about 50 per cent of the electricity generated in Ontario. Nuclear power does not produce any primary air pollution or release greenhouse gases into the atmosphere.



Nuclear power plants are able to operate steadily, providing a plentiful, consistent supply of energy for decades at stable prices. In addition, the fuel cost for a nuclear power plant is a small portion of its total costs, so nuclear power is generally not impacted by fuel price escalation or fluctuations.

- Ontario has used nuclear power for more than 40 years.
- In 2009, more than half of the province's electricity came from nuclear energy.
- Ontario's nuclear power stations and waste storage facilities have an excellent safety record. OPG won the Zeroquest Platinum (Sustainability) Award from the Infrastructure Health and Safety Association (IHSA) in June 2010.
- Over 70,000 jobs in Canada are directly or indirectly related to the nuclear power industry.

Future Needs

Nuclear power is crucial to providing reliable electricity to the province. Units at Bruce B and Darlington are expected to reach the end of their service lives over the next decade. To extend the life of these units, each would have to be shut down for about three years while being modernized.

At the time of the 2007 Plan, there was a need for new nuclear planning to begin immediately. Since then, demand has declined and renewable generation has become a bigger contributor to the system. Investment in renewables, the reduction in demand and the availability of natural gas have all reduced the immediate need for new nuclear. However, to preserve the long-term reliability of the system, particularly for baseload generation, additional investment in nuclear generation will be required.

Ontario will continue to rely on nuclear power — at its current level of contribution to the supply. Nuclear generation is ideally suited for providing baseload generation because of its unique economic and operating characteristics. Nuclear plant operational design and economics depend on the plants being able to operate steadily throughout the year. A generation mix of 50 per cent nuclear combined with baseload hydroelectric generation is sufficient to meet most of Ontario's baseload requirements.

If nuclear capacity beyond this were added, the hours in the year in which nuclear capability exceeded Ontario demand could substantially increase. Under such surplus conditions, some nuclear units might need to be shut down or operate differently than intended. This could lead to significant system and operating challenges and so therefore, generating too much nuclear is undesirable.

The Plan

Over the first 10 to 15 years of this Plan, 10,000 MW of existing nuclear capacity will be refurbished. Investment should focus first and foremost on the improvement of existing assets so that those facilities can continue to provide reliable, affordable electricity. A coordinated refurbishment schedule was agreed to in 2009 by a working group including OPG, Bruce Power, the OPA and the Ministry of Energy. This schedule will be regularly reviewed and updated to reflect current information on resources and plant performance and conditions.

The government is committed to continuing to use nuclear for about 50 per cent of Ontario's energy supply — a capacity of 12,000 MW will produce that amount of energy. The remaining nuclear capacity of 10,000 MW at Darlington and Bruce will need to be refurbished and modernized.

Accomplishments

A number of nuclear power producing units have been modernized and returned to service since 2003 including:

- Pickering A Unit 1, in November 2005, providing 515 MW (or about 6 per cent of new supply)
- Bruce Unit 3, in March 2004, providing 770 MW (or about 9 per cent of new supply)
- Bruce Unit 4, in November 2003, providing 770 MW (or about 9 per cent of new supply)

The remainder of the nuclear capacity that Ontario will need for its projected demand (about 2,000 MW) will be made up of new nuclear at Darlington.

The construction of new nuclear infrastructure requires a significant lead time (approximately 8 to 10 years to commercial operation) and while new nuclear supply will be needed in Ontario, it must be provided at a fair price to ratepayers. Both refurbishment and new build will have significant positive impacts on local economies – and considerable employment opportunities.

In February 2008, the government of Ontario launched a process to procure two new units at the Darlington site. Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) was one of three vendors who met the February 2009 bid submission deadline. AECL emerged as the only compliant bidder in the process; however the AECL bid price exceeded the province's target. Ontario then sought to finalize a deal with the company to procure the units at an acceptable price.

During the discussions between the Ontario government and the federal government, the federal government announced its intention to sell AECL in May 2009. The news cast a great deal of uncertainty over Ontario's procurement process. The position of uncertainty that the federal government placed AECL in, together with a much higher than anticipated price, made it very difficult for Ontario to finalize a procurement that was in the best interest of ratepayers. As a result, Ontario suspended the RFP process in June 2009.

The Province continued to engage AECL, as the only compliant bidder, in discussions with the hope that a deal could still be finalized. The talks did not lead to any demonstrable progress. Consequently, the Premier of Ontario wrote to the Prime Minister requesting that the process to sell AECL be halted. It was Ontario's position that both levels of government should try to complete the procurement with AECL before the company was sold so that Ontario's need for significant nuclear refurbishment and new nuclear generation could be met while simultaneously protecting jobs and preserving the industry in Canada. This proposal was not pursued by the federal government and their process is continuing without a deal with Ontario being completed.

It is anticipated that the federal government will identify a preferred vendor by the end of this year. Ontario is expecting that the federal government will restructure AECL in a manner that will allow Ontario to be able to complete a deal with the new owner at a price that is in the best interest of ratepayers.

The decrease in demand together with the new supply added in recent years, means that Ontario is well-positioned to examine a number of options for negotiating new nuclear production at the right time and at a cost-effective price.

In the meantime, OPG is continuing with two initiatives that were underway prior to the suspension of the new build procurement process: the environmental assessment and obtaining a site preparation licence at Darlington. It is essential that the province stay ready to construct new nuclear plants as part of the government's ongoing commitment to modernize Ontario's nuclear fleet.

OPG will invest \$300 million to ensure the continued safe and reliable performance of its Pickering B station for approximately 10 years, to 2020. Following this, OPG will begin the longer term decommissioning process and will work with the community of Pickering and the advisory committee to explore future opportunities for the site.


A 2010 report by the Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters estimates the employment and economic benefits from refurbishing and operating the Bruce and Darlington reactors will be substantial: almost 25,000 jobs and annual economic activity of \$5 billion.

In developing a new-build procurement and modernization strategy Ontario will:

- Secure an acceptably priced contract for construction of nuclear new build under specified timeframes.
- Pursue project terms that are in the best interest of ratepayers.
- Retain the maximum number of high-quality, high-paying nuclear industry jobs in the province while providing opportunities for long-term growth of the nuclear industry.

Renewables: Hydroelectric

Ontario has been generating renewable power from water — hydroelectric power — for over 100 years. Hydroelectric power is clean, renewable, cost-effective and helps to contribute to clean air quality. Hydro currently makes up the vast bulk — about 90 per cent — of Ontario's total renewable energy supply, representing 8,127 MW of capacity. It is a reliable source of electricity that can continue to provide clean energy for generations to come.




Accomplishments

The 2007 Plan projected a total of 7,708 MW of hydroelectric capacity by 2010. The government has exceeded this goal. Ontario has also launched significant hydroelectric projects — the first major investments in 40 years. Since October 2003, 317 MW of new hydro projects have been brought online.

FIGURE 8: HYDROELECTRIC CAPACITY

Some of the larger completed and ongoing hydro projects to meet Ontario's future needs include:

- Niagara Tunnel project, which will increase the amount of water available for power generation at the Sir Adam Beck Generating Station
- The Lower Mattagami project expansion – the largest hydroelectric project undertaken in Ontario in 40 years. This project will add about 440 MW of clean electricity generating capacity to Ontario's energy grid, while providing \$2.6 billion of investment in the North
- Healey Falls, a 15.7 MW facility near Campbellford, east of Peterborough
- Lac Seul Generating Station, a 12.5 MW facility near Peterborough
- Trent Rapid Hydroelectric Station, an 8 MW facility near Peterborough
- Sandy Falls, a 5.5 MW facility on the Mattagami River, near Timmins.



Future need

More hydroelectric power will be added to Ontario's electricity system in the next eight years than over the previous 40 years. Unlike Quebec, Ontario does not have the geography to support massive reliance on hydroelectric power. (Quebec has almost four times the hydro capacity of Ontario.) New hydroelectric generation will continue to be an important part of a clean, reliable system over the next 20 years. The government is also reviewing how crown land is made available for waterpower projects, particularly for smaller Feed-in-Tariff (FIT) Program projects.

The Plan

Ontario will continue to develop the province's hydroelectric potential and is planning for 9,000 MW of hydroelectric capacity by 2018.

Once the Niagara Tunnel expansion is complete, it will provide enough electricity to power 160,000 homes. When the capacity expansion at Lower Mattagami is complete, the project will provide enough electricity to power over 300,000 homes. These projects will help to maximize Ontario's existing hydro projects.

Existing hydro is the cheapest form of generation in Ontario and in many cases, it can help to meet peak power demand. There are a number of projects that are currently under consideration, such as:


- Two hydroelectric generating stations on the Little Jackfish River (north of Lake Nipigon) that could add 100 MW of capacity
- New Post Creek, a 25 MW project in the development stage
- Mattagami Lake Dam, a 3-6 MW development at Kenogamissi Falls on the Mattagami River.

Ontario will plan for future hydroelectric development where it is cost-effective to build. This will mean FIT-level hydro projects (less than 50 MW) will also be considered.

New hydro projects complement other renewable initiatives and help to eliminate coal by 2014. Some additional projects will be considered, but large-scale projects, usually in remote locations, are not economically feasible at this time due to high capital and construction costs. Transmission, engineering and environmental factors are also challenges. However, due to the importance of hydroelectric generation, Ontario will continue to study Northern hydro options over the period of the Plan.

Renewables: Wind, Solar and Bio-energy

Ontario has become a North American leader in producing energy from sources that are continually renewed by nature such as wind, sun and bioenergy. Renewables do not produce harmful emissions, which contribute to smog, pollution and climate change.



In creating Ontario's renewable energy supply helps reduce the province's reliance on fossil fuels. Greater investments and reliance on renewable energy help to ensure that Ontario has a clean and reliable electricity system for generations to come.

Accomplishments

Ontario is now Canada's leading province for wind and solar capacity and home to the country's four largest wind and solar farms. The world's largest photovoltaic solar farm is in Sarnia (Enbridge's 80 MW Sarnia Solar) and Canada's largest wind farm is near Shelburne (the 199.5 MW Melancthon EcoPower Centre). In 2003, Ontario had 10 wind turbines; today, the Province has more than 700.

Since October 2003, the government has signed more than 16,000 renewable energy supply contracts from wind, water, solar and bio-energy sources. This includes almost 2,400 MW of small and large renewable power projects under North America's first comprehensive Feed-in Tariff (FIT) Program, introduced in 2009. These FIT contracts represent a private sector investment of \$9 billion and are projected to create approximately 20,000 direct and indirect clean energy jobs.

The success of the FIT Program has also attracted the notice of global investors, including a consortium of companies led by Samsung C&T Corporation, laying the foundation for Ontario to become a global clean energy production and manufacturing hub.

Ontario's Feed-in Tariff (FIT) Program combines stable, attractive prices and long-term contracts for energy generated using renewable resources.

Homeowners, business owners and developers may apply to the FIT Program if they use one or more forms of renewable energy, including wind, waterpower, solar photovoltaic (PV) power and bioenergy.


The Program is the first comprehensive FIT program in North America. It was launched through the Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009.

Over 1,000 FIT contracts are currently in place for clean energy projects.

Some 51 community projects will provide renewable electricity supply to the grid through the Ontario FIT program. From these projects, more than 200MW of clean electricity will be generated by communities engaging in, solar, wind and bio-energy projects across Ontario.

Thousands of Ontarians are also participating in the microFIT Program. Homeowners, farmers or small business owners, are able to develop a very small or "micro" renewable electricity generation project (10 kilowatts or less in size) on their properties. Under the microFIT program, they are paid a guaranteed price for all the electricity they produce for 20 years.

FIGURE 9: PROGRESS ON 50,000 PROJECTED GREEN ENERGY ACT JOBS



Major Private-Sector Renewable Investments in Ontario

The \$7-billion Green Energy Investment Agreement with Samsung C&T Corporation and Korea Electric Power Corporation (Consortium), is the single largest investment in renewable energy in provincial history. It will:

- Build 2,500 MW of wind and solar power.
- Deliver an estimated 110 million megawatt-hours of emissions-free electricity over the 25-year lifetime of the project — enough to supply every Ontario home for nearly three years.
- Create more than 16,000 new clean energy jobs to supply, build, install and operate the renewable generation projects.
- Lay the groundwork with major partners to attract four manufacturing plants.

Out of the 16,000 new clean energy jobs, this investment is expected to create or sustain 1,440 manufacturing and related jobs, building wind and solar technology for use in Ontario and export across North America.

As part of the Green Energy Investment Agreement, Samsung and Siemens have announced plans to build Ontario's first wind turbine blade manufacturing plant, which will create up to 900 direct and indirect jobs. The Consortium will negotiate with manufacturing partners to locate three other plants in Ontario for wind turbine towers, solar inverters and solar module assembly.

Under the agreement, three of the four manufacturing facilities are scheduled to be ready in 2013, while the fourth is scheduled to be in operation by the end of 2015. The Consortium also intends to use Ontario-made steel and other Ontario content in its renewable energy projects for items such as wind turbine towers.

More than 20 companies have publicly announced plans to participate in Ontario's clean energy economy, in the last year. These companies are currently operating or plan to set up solar and wind manufacturing facilities in Ontario in the following categories: solar PV modules, mounting systems, inverters, wind turbine blades and wind turbine towers. Some recent examples include:

- Heliene Inc., producing modules in Sault Ste. Marie;
- Canadian Solar, will manufacture modules in Guelph;
- Photowatt, producing modules in Cambridge;
- Samco, an auto parts manufacturer now also producing solar mounting systems in Scarborough;
- Schletter, producing solar mounting systems in Windsor;
- Sustainable Energy Technologies partnering with Melitron to produce inverters in Guelph;
- Satcon, producing inverters in Burlington;
- Siemens will be producing wind turbine blades; and,
- DMI Industries is producing wind turbine towers in Fort Erie.

Future Needs

Ontario will continue to be a leader in renewable energy development and generation. The growth of the renewable energy sector will be influenced by electricity demand, the ability of the system to accommodate additions to the grid, continued innovation in the renewable technology sector and global demand for renewable energy production. Expansions and upgrades to the transmission and distribution system will be necessary to increase the capacity for renewable energy in Ontario.

As more and more of Ontario's electricity comes from renewable energy sources and research and innovation of Smart Grid technologies continues, there will be increased opportunities for renewable energy projects, both large and small to be established in Ontario.

There will also be greater opportunity for employment in this field. Renewable energy projects require skilled labour, such as engineers as well as construction and maintenance labour across the province. As renewable energy projects are established, the need for skilled and general labour will continue to provide jobs for thousands of Ontarians over the next decade. Innovation in new technology also contributes high skilled jobs and economic opportunities for Ontario.

Biomass is dispatchable and can be used as a peaking resource. This attribute allows it to complement increased wind and solar generation. The conversion of Atikokan Generating Station to run on biomass will contribute to long-term system reliability, especially during low water conditions in the region. The conversion from coal to biomass at Atikokan by 2013 will create up to 200 construction jobs and help protect jobs at the plant. It will also support jobs in Ontario related to the production of wood pellets and sustain other jobs in the forestry sector. Ontario will continue to monitor the conversion of Atikokan and consider future potential of biomass generation.

The Plan

Ontario will continue to develop its renewable energy potential over the next decade. Based on the medium growth electricity demand outlook, a forecast of 10,700 MW of renewable capacity (wind, solar, and bioenergy) as part the supply mix by 2018 is anticipated. This forecast is based on planned transmission expansion, overall demand for electricity and the ability to integrate renewables into the system. This target will be equivalent to meeting the annual electricity requirements of two million homes.


The province's renewable energy capacity target will be met with the development of renewable energy projects from wind, solar, biogas, landfill gas and biomass projects across Ontario.

Future rounds of FIT projects will be connected to the Bruce to Milton transmission line and the priority transmission projects identified as part of this Long-Term Energy Plan. This will enable 4,000 MW of new renewable energy projects to be connected.

In the near term, the OPA will be releasing information regarding the status of all FIT applications not offered contracts as of June 4, 2010. These applications will be subject to the first Economic Connection Test (ECT) under the FIT program. The ECT process, to be conducted on a regular basis and in alignment with major planning or system development milestones, will help to determine whether the costs of grid upgrades to allow a FIT project to connect to the grid are economically viable.

Natural Gas

Natural gas plants have the flexibility to respond well to changes in demand, making them an important cushion for Ontario's electricity system — particularly for peak periods.



Natural gas produces electricity either by burning to directly power a gas turbine or by producing steam to drive a steam turbine. A combined cycle gas plant combines these two technologies. Natural gas can supplement baseload power supply and, because it responds quickly to increases in demand, it can also complement the intermittent nature of wind and solar electricity generation.

Natural gas is much cleaner than coal. Some air emissions — particularly mercury and sulphur dioxide — are totally eliminated when natural gas replaces coal. Carbon dioxide emissions are reduced by between 40 and 60 per cent. Currently, Ontario's electricity generation capacity from natural gas is over 9,500 MW.

By replacing coal with natural gas and renewable energy sources, Ontario has greatly reduced greenhouse gas emissions from its electricity supply mix. This policy has prepared Ontario for the possibility of greenhouse gas regulation in the North American market.

Accomplishments

The Ontario government and the OPA have launched a number of clean natural gas and cogeneration projects since 2003 to help with local reliability and peak demand.

The 2007 Plan projected that some 12,000 MW of natural gas would be needed by 2015. Since then, changes in demand and supply — including about 8,400 MW of new, cleaner power across the system and successful conservation efforts — means that less capacity will be required.

Future Needs

In 2009, about 10 per cent of Ontario's electricity generation came from natural gas. In the coming years, the government anticipates that it will be necessary to maintain the amount of natural gas supply at its current level in the supply mix.

For the period after 2018, depending on changes in demand, Ontario will look for opportunities to increase the development of renewable energy projects and expand renewable energy capacity in the Province. Ontario will review the electricity demand outlook in the next Long-Term Energy Plan to explore whether a higher renewables capacity forecast is required.

FIT contract prices were set following extensive consultations and are designed to ensure a reasonable rate of return for investors while providing good value for clean, renewable energy for Ontario ratepayers.

As part of the scheduled two-year review of the FIT Program in 2011, the FIT price of renewables in Ontario will be re-examined. Successful and sustainable FIT programs in a number of international jurisdictions (such as Germany, France and Denmark) have decreased price incentives. Advances in technology and economies of scale reduce the cost of production. A new price schedule will be carefully developed to achieve a balance between the interests of ratepayer and the encouragement of investment in new clean energy in Ontario.

The response to the microFIT and FIT programs has been a tremendous. Thousands of Ontarians are participating in the program to feed clean energy into the grid.

Given the popularity of Ontario's growing clean energy economy, applications to the microFIT and Capacity Allocation Exempt (CAE FIT) program are outpacing needed upgrades to the grid. To continue to ensure the growth of small clean energy projects, Ontario will continue to invest in upgrades to the transmission and distribution systems to accommodate renewable supply.

In areas where there are technical challenges, the OPA, Hydro One and Local Distribution Companies will continue to work with proponents that have already applied to the CAE FIT or microFIT program.

The Plan

Natural gas will continue to play a strategic role in Ontario's supply mix as it helps to:

- Support the intermittent supply from renewables like wind and solar
- Meet local and system reliability requirements
- Ensure adequate capacity is available as nuclear plants are being modernized

The 2007 Plan outlined a forecast need for an additional three gas plants in the Province, including one in the Kitchener-Waterloo-Cambridge and one in the southwest GTA.

Because of changes in demand along with the addition of approximately 8,400 MW of new supply since 2003, the outlook has changed and two of the three plants — including the proposed plant in Oakville — are no longer required. However, a transmission solution to maintain reliable supply in the southwest GTA will be required.

As indicated in 2007 Plan, the procurement of a peaking natural gas-fired plant in the Kitchener-Waterloo-Cambridge area is still necessary. In that region, demand is growing at more than twice the provincial rate.

Ontario is taking advantage of its existing assets with the conversion of two coal-fired units in Thunder Bay to natural gas. (See page 21 on Coal.)

Over the next few years, non-utility generation contracts, which were entered into between the private sector and the former Ontario Hydro in the early 1990s, will begin to expire. Many of these are natural gas-fired. These non-utility generators — or NUGs as they are known — have been part of Ontario's overall supply mix for 20 years. They can contribute up to 1,550 MW of clean power to the system.

The contracts with NUGs are currently held by the Ontario Electricity Financial Corporation, an agency of the Ministry of Finance.

As non-utility generator contracts expire, the IESO and the OPA will determine if the generation is still required to help ensure reliability. The government will direct the OPA to design contracts that will encourage NUGs to operate during periods when it would most benefit the electricity system. The OPA will be authorized to enter into new contracts where this generation is needed and will negotiate to get the best value for consumers.

CHP (Combined Heat and Power/Cogeneration)

Combined Heat and Power is the simultaneous production of electricity and heat using a single fuel such as natural gas. The heat produced from the electricity generation process is captured and used to produce steam or hot water that can then be used for industrial and commercial heating or cooling purposes, such as district energy systems.

CHP can make more efficient use of fuel and therefore reduce greenhouse gas emissions. CHP overall efficiency can exceed 80 per cent — which means that 80 per cent of the energy can be captured as electricity or usable heat.

Accomplishments

Currently, the total industrial CHP capacity in Ontario is estimated to be about 2,000 MW, or about 6 per cent of Ontario's installed generation capacity.

In October 2006, the OPA awarded seven contracts with a total capacity of 414 MW — enough to provide the power for 400,000 Ontario homes. Much of this new capacity (395 MW) will be coming from industrial projects. These facilities are in communities across the province including: Windsor, Kingsville, London, Oshawa, Markham, Sault Ste. Marie and Thorold.

Algoma Energy Cogeneration Facility

The 63 MW Algoma Energy Cogeneration Facility is located in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. The facility uses the by-product fuels from cokemaking and ironmaking (blast furnace and coke oven gas) to generate electricity and steam used for steel manufacturing operations.

The facility reduces Essar Steel Algoma's reliance on the provincial power grid by 50 per cent on average, freeing up this capacity for the rest of the province. This cogeneration facility helps to reduce Essar Steel Algoma's nitrous oxide emissions by 15 per cent (approximately 400 metric tonnes a year).


3 conservation

The Plan

Ontario will target a total of 1,000 MW of CHP. It will be procured through the OPA and will include existing contracts, individual negotiations for large projects and a new standard offer program for smaller projects in key strategic locations.

The government will encourage new local CHP generation projects, where price, size and location make sense. The government will work with the OPA to develop options for small, targeted programs. Over the next 20 years, Ontario will see more community-scale CHP projects. The OPA will create a new standard offer program for CHP projects under 20 MW in specific locations.

The OPA will continue to negotiate larger CHP projects on an individual basis. For example, the OPA and St. Marys Paper Corporation recently signed a 10-year contract for the company to generate clean electricity at a new 30 MW biomass-fuelled plant to be built next to St. Marys existing mill in Sault Ste. Marie. The plan is expected to reach commercial operation by early 2014 and will support 550 direct and indirect jobs.



Conservation is Ontario's most environmentally friendly and cost-effective resource. Conservation initiatives save money and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Reducing consumption reduces bills for consumers and reduces demand on the system, avoiding the need to build new generation. For every dollar that is invested in conservation, two to three dollars of net savings are realized over the life of the investment. Conservation can also create local jobs in energy audits and energy services.

Accomplishments

From 1995 to 2003, there were no provincial conservation programs — it was not a priority. Since 2003, Ontario has had goals for conservation and as a result, this province has become a North American leader. The goal to reduce peak demand by 6,300 MW by 2025 was included in the 2007 Plan. Ontario is on target to meet this goal.

Ontario's A+ 2009 National Energy Efficiency Report Card from the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance

The province raised its grade from a "C-" in 2004 to an A+ in 2009 with its strong commitment to energy efficiency and conservation as cornerstones of its energy plan. In addition to the Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009, the report lauds Ontario's energy conservation programs, improved energy efficiency in building codes and product standards, as well as other initiatives supporting energy efficiency.

To improve the quality of the province's air and the efficiency of the system, Ontario invested about \$1.7 billion in conservation programs from 2006 to 2010. This will save ratepayers \$3.8 billion in avoided costs.

Conservation programs also give customers the tools to help them manage costs, and balance demand in peak periods in winter and summer. Conservation programs also create jobs in the clean energy sector.

Ontario has helped to create a culture of conservation since 2003 by:

- Updating Ontario's building code to make energy efficiency a core purpose.
- Delivering the Home Energy Savings Program which has helped over 393,000 homeowners with energy audits and helped nearly 250,000 homeowners with energy savings and retrofits. Despite the federal government's early withdrawal from funding this conservation program in March 2010, Ontario will continue to support the Home Energy Savings Program until March 31, 2011. This program helped save annual greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to taking over 83,000 cars off the road.
- Initiating the OPA's Great Refrigerator Round Up which has removed more than 230,000 old appliances since 2007. It will result in lifetime savings of more than one million megawatt hours over the life of the program.
- Providing \$550 million over two years for energy retrofits in schools.
- Launching the Ontario Solar Thermal Heating Initiative for solar water and air heating projects for institutional, commercial or industrial organizations. The program continues until March 31, 2011. Almost 600 projects have been launched or completed to date.
- Moving forward with Smart Meters and Time of Use billing to encourage consumers to shift electricity consumption away from peak periods of demand; Avoided system expenditures help keep costs down for Ontarians.
- Reducing electricity consumption in government buildings through initiatives such as deep lake water cooling — a reliable, efficient and sustainable way to cool buildings while reducing demand on the grid.

Over the past five years, Ontario's conservation programs have generated over 1,700 MW of peak demand savings — the equivalent of over 500,000 homes being taken off the grid. Local Distribution Companies have been partners in helping Ontario achieve its conservation targets.

Conservation efforts are measured by looking at the results of conservation programs. The impacts of the global economic recession are not counted as part of conservation efforts, although they did result in a significant reduction in electricity demand. The recession also affected the level of participation in conservation programs which, although successful, are not expected to allow Ontario to meet its 2010 interim target. Confirmation of this will occur late in 2011, after program results undergo rigorous verification by independent third-parties. Had the global recession not had a significant impact on Ontario's economy, 2010 conservation achievements would have been significantly higher.

The Plan

Working together to reduce electricity use at peak times makes sound economic and environmental sense. Providing consumers with the benefit of up-to-date and accurate electricity consumption readings is also critical to the creation of a culture of conservation. The government is committed to moving forward with implementation of a Time-of-Use pricing structure that balances benefits for both the consumer and the electricity system as a whole.

To help families, Ontario will move the off-peak period for electricity users to 7 p.m. which will provide customers with an additional two hours in the lowest cost period. This change will be in effect for the May 2011 Regulated Price Plan update.

Time-of-Use

"On average, most farmers will pay slightly less on time-of-use billing than they currently pay. Advantages for farmers will be modest with a savings in the range of one to five per cent. However, the advantages for the power supply system will be substantial..."

- Don McCabe, Ontario Federation of Agriculture

Ontario is already a North American leader in conservation (the province conserved over 1,700 MW since 2005). The government's target is 7,100 MW and 28 TWh by 2030. This would mean the equivalent of taking 2.4 million homes off the grid. This level of conservation will reduce Ontario's greenhouse gas emissions by up to 11 megatonnes annually by 2030. These targets are among the most aggressive in North America.

As part of the Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009, Local Distribution Companies (LDCs) will become a more recognizable "face of conservation" and have been assigned conservation targets which they must meet as a condition of their licence. LDCs will meet their targets through a combination of province-wide and local conservation programs.

Ontario proposes to provide support for homeowners to have energy audits to become better informed of the opportunities to improve the energy efficiency of their homes.

4 reliable transmission/ modern distribution

Reliable transmission and modern delivery is the backbone of Ontario's electricity system. It is crucial for supporting Ontario's evolving supply mix, including the closing of coal-fired plants by 2014 and the further expansion of Ontario's clean energy resources. Reliable, safe transmission brings electricity from large generators to Ontario's largest industries and local distribution companies who in turn, deliver to homes and businesses. A modern distribution system, utilizing new technology, allows for greater customer control, incorporates renewable energy, enhances reliability, and supports new technology like electric vehicles.


Transmission

Ontario must take the transmission system that's been built over the past century and continue to renew and update it to meet Ontario's growing population, evolving supply mix, and enable more distributed generation.

The Ontario government has taken early and decisive steps to enhance existing electricity infrastructure. It is important to ensure that Ontario can efficiently upgrade the grid to carry additional renewable generation to homes, businesses and industries.

Since 2003, Hydro One has invested more than \$7 billion in its transmission and distribution systems. The average annual investment has been double what it was from 1996-2003.

FIGURE 10: GRID INVESTMENTS



Conservation targets

Date	2015	2020	2025	2030
Capacity	4,550 MW	5,840 MW	6,700 MW	7,100 MW
Generation	13 TWh	21 TWh	25 TWh	28 TWh

These targets will be met through a combination of programs and initiatives:

- Innovative energy efficiency programs for residential, commercial and industrial sectors
- Next-generation building code updates and standards for appliances and products
- Demand response programs to help reduce peak demand
- Time-Of-Use rates

The government anticipates that the commercial sector will contribute 50 per cent of the conservation target; residential sector will contribute 30 per cent; and industrial sector 20 per cent.

Over the next 20 years, Ontario's conservation targets and initiatives are projected to save about \$27 billion in ratepayer costs on the basis of a \$12 billion investment. Conservation will also do more than that by helping to ensure that Ontario's air is cleaner and the electricity sector reduces its impact on the environment.

Ontario will continue to provide broad support for achieving these targets through policy initiatives such as bringing forward a proposed regulation to require the broader public sector (municipalities, universities, schools and hospitals) to develop energy conservation plans.

In early 2011, together with LDCs, Ontario will launch a number of new programs, which will allow the province to meet its conservation targets over the next few years and make up for the slower period between 2009 and 2010. The programs will target all sectors, be better coordinated and have greater customer focus than previous programs.

Ontario is designing, implementing and funding a province-wide electricity conservation and demand management program for low-income residential consumers. Ontario is also developing a low-income energy program comprised of natural gas conservation, customer service standards and emergency financial assistance.

These new conservation programs, together with programs for very large industrial customers, will require an investment of about \$3 billion over the next five years. The results will be significant: an avoided lifetime supply cost of \$10 billion and a net benefit to Ontario ratepayers of about \$7 billion over the life of the conservation measures.

Some of Ontario's recent investments include:

- The launch of the Bruce to Milton transmission expansion project — the largest electricity transmission investment in Ontario in the last 20 years, which will connect refurbished nuclear units and additional renewable energy to the grid.
- Ongoing work to reinforce the power transfer capability between northern and southern Ontario including additional 750 MW of planned clean northern generation (Lower Mattagami and some northern FIT Program projects).
- The new Ontario-Québec Interconnection Project (2010), which increased access to 1,250 MW of hydroelectric power and enhanced system reliability in eastern Ontario.
- Additional transmission projects that will facilitate the retirement of coal-fired generation, including transmission reinforcement in the Sarnia area, the installation of new transformers in the northern GTA, and voltage support facilities in the Niagara, London and Kitchener areas. These projects represent an investment of over \$400 million.
- Over 15 per cent of transformer stations across Ontario have received overhauls in the past five years, amounting to a total investment of \$850 million.
- Installation of almost 4.3 million smart meters across the province, which are already helping with outage management and remote meter reading and reducing the number of estimates for consumers.
- Early investments in Smart Grid infrastructure and technologies, including pilots and demonstration projects. These projects will help Ontario move toward a Smart Grid system that can integrate energy monitors, home automation systems, in-home renewable generation and electric cars.
- Hydro One's \$125-million Grid Control Centre opened in 2004 and uses some of the most sophisticated technology in the world to efficiently manage the bulk of Ontario's electricity network.

Reliability has also been improved since 2003 due to a combination of new generation, transmission upgrades, reduced load growth and successful conservation programs. For example, Toronto's reliability was enhanced with the installation of two new underground cables between downtown transfer stations and will be further assisted by reinforcement and upgrade projects worth about \$360 million. Annual capital investments by Ontario's Local Distribution Companies, including Hydro One, have averaged \$1.1 billion between 2004 and 2009, maintaining reliable and high quality power for Ontario's electricity customers. These investments have made the operation of the system more cost-effective, which will have an impact on Ontarians' bills over the long term.

Modern Distribution

Local distribution systems are an important link in how electricity moves from generators to homes and businesses. In 2003, Ontario's distribution systems often relied on older technology. The government's move towards a Smart Grid was driven by the need to replace aging infrastructure, introduce customer control, incorporate more renewable energy and accommodate new adaptive technology such as electric vehicle charging. Over time, LDCs will have to replace old mechanical infrastructure with newer automated infrastructure that meets Ontario's future needs.

A modern distribution system must be able to accommodate new energy supply from a variety of sources and deliver it reliably to consumers. It must take advantage of Smart Grid technologies to enable efficient and cost-effective delivery of electricity, helping customers to better manage their electricity use, and integrate more renewable energy.

Building a Smart Grid that can coordinate the production of power from large numbers of small power producers and allow utilities to more efficiently manage their grid infrastructure is another essential element of Ontario's clean energy future. Other jurisdictions (Australia, Great Britain and California) are moving toward a smarter grid, but Ontario is leading the way in many areas. By leveraging existing communications technology, a Smart Grid will enable the two-way power flow of electricity across the grid. The Smart Grid will help incorporate distributed generation. It will also improve grid automation with real-time information that will help save energy, reduce the cost of supply over time and increase reliability.


A Smart Grid is a more intelligent grid infrastructure, incorporating communications technology and automation to:

- Maximize existing infrastructure
 - o Rather than building out more traditional grid infrastructure (poles, wires, etc), a Smart Grid will use Information Technology solutions to improve and automate distribution.
- Modernize the grid
 - o The current distribution system in some places is decades old. A modernized grid is critical for improving reliability, home automation and adapting to evolving transportation needs.
- Lay the foundation for Smart Homes
 - o A Smart Grid will put in place the intelligent infrastructure required to support applications for home automation, conservation and smart charging for electric vehicles.

The Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009 identified three main areas of focus for Ontario's Smart Grid:

- Helping consumers become active participants in conservation.
- Connecting new and renewable sources of energy to the overall system (consumers and businesses produce energy that can be connected to the local system) to help address power demands.

FIGURE 11: TRANSMISSION INVESTMENTS: COMPLETE, UNDERWAY AND PROPOSED



- Creating a flexible, adaptive grid that can accommodate the use of emerging, innovative energy-saving technologies and control systems.

Smart meters provide a foundation for the Smart Grid and provide customers with timely and accurate information about their electricity use. Smart meters also provide utilities with automatic notification of outages, save on in-person meter-reading costs and enable Time-of-Use pricing.

Smart meters also help avoid system costs that in turn save money for ratepayers: Hydro Ottawa saved \$200,000 in meter reading in 2008 and Toronto Hydro estimates that smart meters will cut meter-reading costs by \$2.5 million by 2010.

Future Needs

The Ontario government, working with its agencies, will move forward responsibly on a number of new and modernizing transmission projects as well as on improving and maintaining the province's existing infrastructure across all regions in Ontario. These improvements will also balance environmental concerns and the cost to ratepayers. In addition to evaluating the province's need for transmission to integrate renewables, meet provincial demand growth and ensure reliable service, system planning will address community needs. For example, a transmission solution to maintain reliable supply in the southwest GTA will be required.

The Plan

In 2009, the government asked Hydro One to start planning and developing a series of new transmission and distribution projects. Since that time, there have been a number of developments, such as the substantial interest in the Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009 to develop renewable energy projects.

Based on the advice of the OPA, the government will prudently move forward with cost-effective priority transmission projects that meet current and future demand and also:

- Accommodate renewable projects;
- Serve new load; and
- Support reliability.

Ontario will proceed first with an investment of approximately \$2 billion in five priority projects to be completed in the next seven years, which will ensure a growing mix of renewable sources can be reliably transmitted across the province. These priority projects together with the Bruce to Milton line, in addition to various other station and circuit upgrades, will enable approximately 4,000 MW of additional renewable energy.

FIGURE 12: PRIORITY TRANSMISSION PROJECTS

Project	Type	Need	Target Completion Date
Series compensation in Southwestern Ontario	Upgrade	Add renewables to grid	2014
Rewiring west of London	Upgrade	Add renewables to grid	2014
West of London	New Line	Add renewables to grid	2017
East-West Tie	New Line	Maintain system reliability, allow more renewables, accommodate electricity requirements of new mineral processing projects.	2016-17
Line to Pickle Lake	New line	Serve industry needs and help future remote community connection	Pending consultation

To build a modern system, the government will issue a set of Smart Grid principles and objectives to the Ontario Energy Board. These will provide guidance to LDCs in modernizing their distribution systems and enable the smart home of the future. LDCs will develop smart grid plans and ensure that these are coordinated across the Province. The government will also establish a Smart Grid Fund in 2011 which will provide assistance to Smart Grid companies with a strong Ontario presence. This will lead to new economic development opportunities and bolster Ontario's position as a leader in the Smart Grid.

Given the nature of the transmission upgrades in southwestern Ontario, including series compensation, rewiring and a new line west of London, the government intends to direct Hydro One to carry out these projects immediately.

The East-West tie will be submitted to the OEB to carry out a designation process to select the most qualified and cost-effective transmission company to develop the line.

To ensure successful and timely implementation of the line to Pickle Lake, the government will work with its agencies and the multiple parties involved, including the Federal government, local industries, and First Nation communities that stand to benefit from the project to establish an implementation schedule and a proponent for the line.

Transmission planning will also continue at the regional level, using an approach that considers conservation, demand management, distributed generation and transmission. Regional plans will assess needs based on a region's unique resource mixes and community priorities. Load growth and system reliability are also factors in determining system planning and transmission solutions. Ontario will continue to plan and study additional transmission projects as demand and changes to supply require.

5 aboriginal communities

Accomplishments

The Ontario government is committed to encouraging opportunities for Aboriginal participation in the energy sector and has launched several initiatives to support participation by First Nation and Métis communities in energy projects, including:

- The Aboriginal Energy Partnerships Program
- The FIT Program: 17 aboriginal-led or partnered projects have secured contract offers
- The \$250-million Aboriginal Loan Guarantee Program

Ontario also has a significant partnership at the \$2.6 billion Lower Mattagami hydroelectric project, which will see Moose Cree First Nation have up to a 25 per cent equity position with OPG.

Future Needs

First Nation and Métis communities have diverse energy needs and interests. Ontario will work to ensure there is a wide range of options for Aboriginal participation in Ontario's energy future.

Conservation

Conservation priorities and the applicability of programs will vary between First Nation and Métis communities. Community education and youth engagement are also critical for conservation success. Ontario will launch programs to support participation in conservation initiatives, including Aboriginal Community Energy Plans and targeted conservation programs.

Renewable Energy

Future opportunities for First Nation and Métis communities include:

- Partnerships with private developers on confirmed FIT projects under development,
- Development of smaller renewable microFIT projects, like small wind or solar, to build community capacity in energy and generate income.

Existing Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009 support programs will be adjusted to ensure that aboriginal communities can take advantage of these opportunities. Aboriginal participation levels will also be reviewed during the regular FIT program review to determine whether adjustments are needed to the rules and incentives.

Transmission

Where new transmission lines are proposed, Ontario is committed to meeting its duty to consult First Nation and Métis communities in respect of their aboriginal and treaty rights and accommodate where those rights have the potential to be adversely impacted. Ontario also recognizes that Aboriginal communities have an interest in economic benefits from future transmission projects crossing through their traditional territories and that the nature of this interest may vary between communities.

There are a number of ways in which First Nation and Métis communities could participate in transmission projects. Where a new transmission line crosses the traditional territories of aboriginal communities, Ontario will expect opportunities be explored to:

- Provide job training and skills upgrading to encourage employment on the transmission project development and construction.
- Further Aboriginal employment on the project.
- Enable Aboriginal participation in the procurement of supplies and contractor services.

Ontario will encourage transmission companies to enter into partnerships with aboriginal communities, where commercially feasible and where those communities have expressed interest. The government will also work with the OPA to adjust the Aboriginal Energy Partnerships Program — currently focussed on renewable energy projects — to provide capacity funding for aboriginal communities that are discussing partnerships on future transmission projects.

The Plan

Ontario recognizes that successful participation by First Nation and Métis communities will be important to advance many key energy projects identified under a Long-Term Energy Plan. The path forward needs to be informed by regular dialogue with First Nation and Métis leadership through distinct processes. Working with First Nation and Métis leadership, Ontario will look for opportunities to promote on-going discussion of these issues.

6 energy in Ontario's economy — capital investments

Ontario's remote First Nation communities currently rely on diesel generation for their electricity supply — but diesel fuel is expensive, difficult to transport, and poses environmental and health risks. According to analysis done so far, transmission connection would be less expensive over the long term than continued diesel use for many remote communities.

New transmission supply to Pickle Lake is a crucial first step to enable the connection of remote communities in northwestern Ontario. A new transmission line to Pickle Lake — one of this plan's five priority projects — will help to service the new mining load and help to enable future connections north of Pickle Lake. Subject to cost contributions from benefiting parties, Ontario will focus on supplying Pickle Lake from the Ignace/Dryden area immediately. A line to serve the Nipigon area specifically will continue to be considered as the need for it evolves.

As part of this project, the government will also ask the OPA to develop a plan for remote community connections beyond Pickle Lake, including consideration of the relevant cost contributions from benefiting parties, including the federal government. This plan may also consider the possibility of onsite generation such as small wind and water to reduce communities' diesel use.

Energy has a significant impact on Ontario's economy. Ontario businesses rely on electricity to produce goods and services and it is essential to our quality of life.

- Ontario's electricity sector is a \$15 billion annual industry.
- Energy accounts for eight per cent of Canada's GDP.
- Some 95,000 Ontarians are currently directly and indirectly employed in the energy sector.
- More than \$10 billion has been invested in Ontario in new clean energy projects that are online or under construction.
- Ontario has attracted more than \$16 billion in private sector investments in the energy sector in the past year.

Ontario's progress in modernizing and upgrading electricity has not only benefited electricity users, it has strengthened the economy by attracting investment and creating jobs. Large infrastructure projects typically have high GDP and employment impacts, and this is also true of the ongoing and planned investments in Ontario's electricity sector.

Hydroelectric investment

Waterpower has been helping to fuel Ontario's economic growth for more than 100 years and is the backbone of renewable supply.

Ontario hydroelectric producers spend \$250 million annually in operating and maintenance costs and in the past decade alone have made additional capital investments of \$400 million to bring new waterpower online. Today, Ontario's hydroelectric producers directly employ more than 1,600 people and support an additional 2,000 jobs.

Hydroelectric has an even greater impact in Ontario's north, where it accounts for more than 80 per cent of the electricity generated. Twenty-four of 65 generating stations run by OPG are located in Ontario's north, representing close to 2,000 MW.

Many older hydroelectric facilities date to Ontario's early industrial mining and forestry activities and some of these sites are being rebuilt at higher capacity. Recent substantial investments are playing an important economic role in the north. The Lower Mattagami River Hydroelectric Project, Ontario's largest hydroelectric project in 40 years, will bring a \$2.6-billion investment into northeastern Ontario and create up to 800 construction jobs.

In southwestern Ontario, work is underway on the Niagara Tunnel project, the single biggest construction project for the Niagara region since the Beck 2 Generating Station was built 55 years ago. The project means that region will benefit from over 230 construction jobs.

Wind, Solar and Bio-Energy investment

Ontario is creating a new sector for investment and is becoming a global destination of choice for clean energy developers and suppliers. Ontario's Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009 has laid the foundation for economic opportunities throughout the province. In the coming years, over 20,000 people will be employed in renewable energy and development activities including manufacturing triggered by North America's most comprehensive FIT program.

Ontario has already attracted more than \$16 billion of private sector investment and over 20 companies have announced plans to set up or expand operations in Ontario. This activity will create or support indirect jobs in areas such as finance, consulting and other manufacturing, service, and development industries.

Many communities that were hard-hit during the recent economic downturn are reaping benefits of Ontario's growing clean energy economy. According to the Windsor Essex Economic Development Commission, of the 6,000 new jobs created in Windsor in the past 10 months, five to 10 per cent are tied to renewable energy.

The Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009 has already attracted the single-largest investment in renewable energy in provincial history. The Consortium, led by Samsung C&T Corporation, is investing \$7 billion to create 2,500 MW of new wind and solar power in Ontario. The investment will lead to more than 16,000 new clean energy jobs to build, install and operate the renewable generation projects and associated manufacturing. The consortium is also working with major partners to secure four manufacturing plants in the province. This will lead to the creation of 1,440 manufacturing and related jobs to build wind and solar technology for use in Ontario and export across North America.

Plans for the first of the four plants have already been announced. Samsung and Siemens have said they intend to build Ontario's first wind turbine blade manufacturing plant, creating up to 900 direct and indirect jobs. The supply chain of Ontario's new clean energy economy is providing benefits to other sectors of the economy. For example, the Consortium intends to use Ontario steel in its projects, subject to necessary quality standards.

The clean energy sector is also providing new opportunities to people in rural Ontario. Farmers are leasing portions of their land for wind turbines, allowing them to generate income while continuing to farm. For example, in Port Alma, local farmers and landowners are leasing their land to the 44-turbine Kruger Energy wind power project, which produces enough clean electricity to power 30,000 households.

Province-wide, farmers and agri-food businesses received a total of \$11.2 million to develop and build generating systems that produce clean energy, reduce electricity costs and contribute to local economies through OMAFRA's Biogas Systems Financial Assistance Program, which ran from September 2008 to March 2010.

"Building a clean energy economy is not an issue that splits left from right. It's about past and future. People of all political stripes who are entrusted in building a modern economy can – and do – look ahead."

- Rick Smith, founding partner of Blue Green Canada

Modernization of nuclear fleet

The nuclear sector has contributed a great deal to Ontario's economy over the past forty years. According to the Canadian Nuclear Association, the sector supports over 70,000 jobs across Canada and injects some \$6 billion into the national economy every year. The Organization of CANDU Industries estimates that its 165 members employ over 30,000 people, many of them here in Ontario. Its members supply goods and services for nuclear reactors in domestic and export markets.

Plans to upgrade and refurbish Ontario's nuclear plants are expected to create and support thousands of jobs and inject billions of dollars into this sector over the next decade. A report by the Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters estimates that the refurbishment and operation of the Bruce and Darlington units will create or sustain 25,000 jobs and provide \$5 billion in annual economic activity.

The design and construction of two new nuclear units at Darlington will employ up to 3,500 people and support many thousands more indirect jobs. Ongoing operation at the plant will require a further 1,400 tradespeople, nuclear operators, and engineering and technical support staff for the duration of the plant's life.

Transmission upgrades

Thousands of Ontarians are employed in the province's electricity transmission sector and billions of dollars in planned upgrades to and expansion of the system are expected to support and create thousands more jobs in the future.

Fully owned by the Province of Ontario, Hydro One is the province's largest electricity transmission and distribution company. It owns 97 per cent of the transmission facilities in the province and employs approximately 5,400 workers, many of them highly skilled technicians, in communities throughout Ontario.

This Plan includes a commitment to develop five priority transmission projects. Employment on the five priority projects alone will peak at over 5,000 in 2013. This new transmission capacity will enable further generation development, including many new private-sector renewable projects.

The rollout of new transmission projects will also allow communities, including Aboriginal communities, to develop more small-scale renewable generation and, in certain cases, reduce their dependence on polluting forms of electricity generation.

Coal plant conversion

Converting Ontario's existing coal-fired generating stations to new fuels will create new construction jobs and support clean energy jobs in operations and maintenance.

For example, the Atikokan biomass conversion project will create up to 200 construction jobs and help protect jobs at the plant. It will also support an estimated 20 to 25 jobs in Ontario related to the production of wood pellets and sustain other jobs in the forestry sector. The project will provide engineering and construction jobs during the conversion as well as ongoing employment in the forestry and transportation sectors to keep the station supplied with fuel. Natural gas conversion at Thunder Bay will provide additional jobs in pipeline construction and ongoing operations.

Conservation

Conservation programs contribute to local and regional jobs, creating employment and new business opportunities in a number of areas, including technology and product development, manufacturing, distribution, marketing, sales, installation and maintenance. For example, Ontario's \$3-billion investment in conservation programs over the next five years is expected to create or sustain about 5,000 jobs annually.


Capital Investments

Ontario's electricity sector is a \$15-billion annual industry. Investments in the electricity system are helping to clean Ontario's air, improve the reliability of the energy supply and create jobs and economic opportunities in communities across the province. Since 2003, over \$10 billion has been invested to bring new supply on line, and over \$7 billion has been spent to strengthen the transmission system. Ontario has also attracted more than \$16 billion in private sector investment through the FIT program.

Investments over the past seven years to build new cleaner generation and modernize electricity infrastructure has increased significantly to make up for years of underinvestment. Needed capital investments in Ontario's energy system over the next 20 years will be significant, and are in line with the government's efforts to upgrade and replace aging infrastructure. For example, the ReNew Ontario Infrastructure plan invested \$30 billion over four years in capital projects across the province.

This Plan outlines essential capital expenditures to continue building a clean and modern electricity system and to keep the lights on for Ontario families and businesses. The total capital cost in 2010 dollars is estimated to be \$87 billion over the life of the Plan. This accounts for new and refurbished energy supply, transmission and distribution infrastructure and conservation investments. This Plan provides more investments over the 2007 Plan due to increased investments in renewables, updated capital cost assumptions, and more certainty on the costs of nuclear refurbishments and new build. These cost estimates will be further refined by the OPA in the coming months and then submitted to the OEB.

FIGURE 13: ESTIMATED CAPITAL COST OF LONG-TERM ENERGY PLAN: 2010 TO 2030 (\$ BILLIONS)



7 electricity prices

The capital investments outlined are through both the private and public sector, and the majority will be paid for by electricity consumers spread over many years, depending on the cost recovery mechanism. (For example, electricity generators typically recover their investment over 20 years, whereas transmission investments may take up to 40 years to be fully repaid). This ensures that the annual costs to consumers, as reflected on electricity bills are spread over a longer period of time.

Conservation expenditures in this Plan include direct program costs and additional capital expenditures driven by higher appliance energy efficiency standards and higher building code efficiency standards.

Overall, renewables account for one third of total expenditures, nuclear just over one third, and natural gas, conservation and transmission the remainder. The breakdown is reflective of the Plan's objective to deliver a balanced and diverse supply mix that is cost effective, clean and helps create clean energy jobs.

Over the past 20 years, the price of water, fuel oil and cable TV have outpaced the price of electricity. Over the next 20 years, Ontario can expect stable prices that also reflect the true cost of electricity. The government will need to take a balanced and prudent approach to investment and pricing that ensures that Ontario's children and grandchildren have a clean, reliable system.

Ontarians now pay the true cost of electricity to ensure that essential investments are made in clean energy and modern transmission. About 40 per cent of Ontario's electricity generation is subject to price regulation, contributing significantly to predictable prices for Ontario consumers. Regulated Price Plan (RPP) rates (adjusted every six months) ensure pricing reflects the true cost of generating electricity. This helps to provide stable and predictable electricity prices for consumers.

Accomplishments

In 2003, the electricity system was in significant decline but Ontario families and businesses have invested in the creation of cleaner sources and the restoration of reliability. The cost of energy has increased in order to provide cleaner, more reliable energy for generations to come.

The government has also taken several steps to keep the cost of electricity down for Ontario families and businesses. Actions taken to prudently manage expenditures total over \$1 billion, including:

- Freezing the compensation structures of all non-bargained public sector employees for two years – which include the five energy agencies.
- Limiting travel costs and other expenses for public sector workers.
- Requesting that Hydro One and Ontario Power Generation revise down their 2010 rate applications to find savings and efficiencies.
- The IESO has reduced costs by \$23 million over the past seven years.
- For 2011, the OPA has reduced its overall operating budget by 4.1 per cent.
- Hydro One will reduce operations costs by \$170 million in 2010 and 2011.
- Information technology upgrades will save \$235 million over the next four years.
- OPG is reducing operations costs by more than \$600M over the next four years.

Ontario has taken steps to lower the hydro debt left by the previous government. In 1999, the restructuring of Ontario Hydro and the attempt to sell-off Hydro left electricity consumers with a debt of \$20.9 billion. Since 2003, Ontario has decreased that stranded debt by \$5.7 billion. Payments toward the debt are made through Payments in Lieu of Taxes, dedicated income from government energy enterprises, and by ratepayers through the Debt Retirement Charge.

The government has also launched a number of initiatives to help Ontario families and businesses manage electricity bill increases. Some of these include:

- The Northern Ontario Energy Credit, a new, permanent annual credit to help families and individuals in the North who face high energy costs. The yearly credit of up to \$130 for a single person and up to \$200 for a family would be available to over half of all northern Ontario households.
- Ontario Energy and Property Tax Credit, starting with the 2010 tax year, to low-income Ontarians who own or rent a home would receive up to \$900 in tax relief, with seniors able to claim up to \$1,025 in tax relief to help with both their energy costs and property tax. Overall, the proposed Ontario Energy and Property Tax Credit would provide a total of about \$1.3 billion annually to 2.8 million Ontarians.

Energy Consumer Protection Act, 2010:

On January 1, 2011, new rules will take effect under the Energy Consumer Protection Act, 2010 that will help protect electricity and natural gas consumers by putting an end to unfair practices by energy retailers. The rules will ensure that consumers receive accurate price disclosure from all energy retailers before they sign contracts, helping to protect Ontario families and seniors.

Ontario is helping low-income Ontarians with their energy costs through a province-wide strategy to help consumers better manage their energy consumption and costs, including:

- Establishing a new emergency energy financial assistance fund.
- Implementing enhanced customer service rules that will assist all customers, particularly low-income Ontarians.

Ontario is also developing a comprehensive electricity conservation program for low-income households in coordination with the natural gas utilities. Through the conservation measures, customers will be better able to manage their energy bills.


The Plan

Industrial Users

Due to investments to make the electricity system cleaner and more reliable for industry, the government projects that the industrial rate will increase by about 2.7 per cent annually over the next 20 years. The Ontario government has introduced initiatives to enhance the efficiency and competitiveness of large industrial consumers as well as protect jobs and local economies. These include:

- The Industrial Conservation Initiative will help the province's largest industrial and manufacturers to conserve energy, save on costs and increase their competitiveness. By changing the Global Adjustment Mechanism, large industrial users can shift their usage off peak times and save on electricity costs.
- The OPA's Industrial Accelerator Program has been launched to assist transmission-connected industrial electricity users to fast-track capital investment in major energy-efficiency projects.
- The Northern Industrial Energy Rate Program provides electricity price rebates for qualifying northern industrial consumers who commit to an energy efficiency and sustainability plan. On average, the program reduces prices by about 25 per cent for large facilities.

FIGURE 14: INDUSTRIAL PRICE PROJECTIONS (2010-2030)



Helping Ontario Small Businesses and Families

In order to ensure that Ontario has a clean, modern system that increases renewables, ensures reliability and creates jobs, continued investments in the electricity system are essential.


Based on the significant investments in clean, modern energy outlined in this plan, the government projects, based on current forecasts, that electricity prices will increase. Over the next 20 years, prices for Ontario families and small businesses will be relatively predictable. The consumer rate will increase by about 3.5 per cent annually over the length of the long-term plan.

Over the next five years, however, residential electricity prices are expected to rise by about 7.9 per cent annually (or 46 per cent over five years). This increase will help pay for critical improvements to the electricity capacity in nuclear and gas, transmission and distribution (accounting for about 44 per cent of the price increase) and investment in new, clean renewable energy generation (56 per cent of the increase).

Continued investments in transmission, conservation and supply are needed for a system that provides more efficient and reliable electricity to consumers whenever they need it and does not pollute Ontario's air or negatively affect the health of citizens and future generations.

After five years, Ontario will have largely completed the transition to a cleaner more reliable system due to the replacement of coal-fired generation and new renewable generation under the GEA. Once these investments have been made, price increases are expected to level off. The investments that the entire province is making in the future of electricity will help to ensure that Ontario never finds itself in the dire straits it was in just seven years ago.

FIGURE 15: RESIDENTIAL PRICE PROJECTIONS (2010-2030)



However, in the next five years, the government recognizes that the increases will have an impact on Ontario families and businesses.

The government's 2010 Ontario Economic Outlook and Fiscal Review took action to help Ontarians who are feeling the pinch of rising costs and electricity prices. The Ontario government proposed direct relief through a new Ontario Clean Energy Benefit (OCEB).

For eligible consumers, the proposed OCEB would provide a benefit equal to 10 per cent of the total cost of electricity on their bills including tax, effective January 1, 2011. Due to the length of time required to amend bills, the price adjustments would appear on electricity bills no later than May 2011, and would be retroactive to January 1, 2011.

Every little bit of assistance helps during lean times. The proposed OCEB together with the Northern Ontario Energy Credit and the Ontario Energy and Property Tax Credit will all help mitigate electricity costs for families.

Eligible consumers would include residential, farm, small business and other small users. The proposed OCEB would help over four million residential consumers and over 400,000 small businesses, farms and other consumers with the transition to an even more reliable and cleaner system.

Benefits for Eligible Consumers

Customer Monthly Consumption	Current Estimated Monthly Bill	Estimated Bill after Ontario Clean Energy Benefit	Monthly Benefit* (10%)	Yearly Benefit (10%)
Typical Residential 800kWh	\$128	\$115.20	\$12.80	\$153.60
Small Business 10,000kWh	\$1,430	\$1,287	\$143	\$1,716
Farm 12,000kWh	\$1,710	\$1,539	\$171	\$2,052

*Typical 2011 monthly benefit for a consumer. Benefit amount will vary based on actual price, consumption and location

Providing the 10 per cent OCEB to Ontarians is a responsible way of helping Ontario families and businesses through the transition to a cleaner electricity system. The OCEB would help residential and small business consumers over the next five years as the grid is modernized. The government has introduced legislation to implement the proposed OCEB.

Working together to reduce electricity use at peak times makes sound economic and environmental sense. Providing consumers with the benefit of up-to-date and accurate electricity consumption readings is also critical to the creation of a culture of conservation. The government is committed to moving forward with implementation of a Time-of-Use pricing structure that balances benefits for both the consumer and the electricity system as a whole.

To help families, Ontario will move the off-peak period for electricity users to 7 p.m. which will provide customers with an additional two hours in the lowest cost period. This change will be in effect for the May 2011 Regulated Price Plan update.

This plan has outlined a new clean, modern and reliable electricity system for the people of Ontario. Instead of a system that was polluting, unreliable and in decline with unstable pricing, Ontarians will have a North American-leading clean energy system that keeps the lights on for generations to come, creates jobs for Ontario families and ensures that the air they breathe is cleaner.

Appendix One: who does what

Ontario Power Generation: Generates 60 per cent of Ontario's electricity.

Hydro One: Operates 97 per cent of Ontario's transmission network.

Independent Electricity System Operator: Ensures reliability, forecasts short-term demand and supply, monitors supply, and manages the Ontario wholesale market.

Ontario Power Authority: Responsible for system planning (generation, transmission, demand and conservation), contracts for new generation and conservation, and manages contracts for about 40 per cent of Ontario's generation.

Ontario Energy Board: Independent, quasi-judicial regulator of Ontario's energy sector

Licensed Transmission System Operators: Transmit electricity (There are five; Hydro One Networks is the largest).

Local Distribution Companies: More than 80, mostly owned by municipalities, deliver electricity and serve customers in a given area.

Electricity Retailers: Seventy-seven private-sector companies that sell contracts to businesses and consumers

Privately-owned generators: Facilities that produce energy (Bruce Power, wind and solar energy companies)

FIGURE 16: SAMPLE BILL


Your Electricity Bill	
Service Address:	Customer Name:
Address:	City, Ontario
Monthly Statement	
Account Number	Statement Date
000 000 000 000 0000 0	June 30, 2011
Meter Number	
00000000	
Electricity Used This Billing Period	
Measured usage in kilowatt-hours = 800 kWh	
Your Electricity Charges	
Electricity	
On-Peak: 153.50 kWh @ 0.100¢/kWh	\$15.21
Mid-Peak: 216.40 kWh @ 0.100¢/kWh	\$17.09
Off-Peak: 229.90 kWh @ 0.100¢/kWh	\$21.83
Delivery	\$45.90
Regulatory	\$8.04
Debt Retirement Charge	\$5.60
Your Total Electricity Charges	\$113.27
HST	Federal \$5.67
	Provincial \$9.06
	Subtotal
	\$128.00
Adjustments	
	Ontario Clean Energy Benefit (-10%)
	-\$12.80 CR
Total Amount	\$115.20

Sample bill for illustrative purposes only. Other adjustments may apply.

Appendix Two:

consultations and next steps

Ontario's Long-Term Energy Plan was informed by public and stakeholder consultations as well as advice from the OPA. In addition to issuing this plan, the government is posting a proposed supply mix Directive on the Environmental Registry for a 45 day public comment period. Following this posting, the directive will be finalized and sent to the OPA. The OPA will consult publicly during the development of the Integrated Power System Plan (IPSP) and submit the plan to the OEB. The OEB will conduct a review of the IPSP including public hearings. The final IPSP will constitute the detailed long-term energy plan for the next 20 years. It will be updated every three years as required by regulation.



Appendix Three:

installed capacity (MW)

Installed Capacity	2003	2010 (Projected)	2030 (Projected)
Nuclear	10,061	11,446	12,000
Renewables – Hydroelectric	7,880	8,127	9,000
Renewables – Wind, Solar, Bioenergy	155	1,657	10,700
Gas	4,364	9,424	9,200
Coal	7,546	4,484	0
Conservation	0	1,837	7,100
Total	30,006	36,975	48,000

glossary – of energy terms

Baseload Power: Generation sources designed to operate more or less continuously through the day and night and across the seasons of the year. Nuclear and generally large hydro generating stations are examples of generators that operate as baseload generation.

Biomass: Energy resources derived from organic matter, including wood, agricultural waste and other living cell material that can be burned to produce heat energy or electricity.

Demand Response (DR): Programs designed to reduce the amount of electricity drawn by customers from the grid, in response to changes in the price of electricity during the day, incentive payments and/or other mechanisms. In Ontario, both the OPA and the IESO run demand response programs.

Dispatchable Generation: Sources of electricity such as natural gas that can be dispatched at the request of power grid operators; that is, output can be increased or decreased as demand or availability of other supply sources changes.

Distribution: A distribution system carries electricity from the transmission system and delivers it to consumers. Typically, the network would include medium-voltage power lines, substations and pole-mounted transformers, low-voltage distribution wiring and electricity meters

Feed-in Tariff (FIT): A guaranteed rate program that provides stable prices through long-term contracts for energy generated using renewable resources

Greenhouse Gas (GHG): Gases that contribute to the capture of heat in the Earth's atmosphere. Carbon dioxide is the most prominent GHG, in addition to natural sources it is released into the Earth's atmosphere as a result of the burning of fossil fuels such as coal, oil or natural gas. Widely acknowledged as contributing to climate change.

Intermittent Power Generation: Sources of electricity that produce power only during certain times such as wind and solar generators whose output depends on wind speed and solar intensity.

Kilowatt (kW): A standard quantity of power in a residential-size electricity system, equal to 1,000 watts (W). Ten 100-watt light bulbs operated together consume one kW of power.

Kilowatt-hour (kWh): A standard unit of electrical energy in a residential-size system. One kWh (1,000 watt-hours) is the amount of electrical energy produced or consumed by a one-kilowatt unit during one hour. Ten 100-watt light bulbs, operated together for one hour, consume one kWh of energy.

Load or Demand Management: Measures undertaken to control the level of energy usage at a given time, by increasing or decreasing consumption or shifting consumption to some other time period.

Local Distribution Company (LDC): An entity that owns a distribution system for the local delivery of energy (gas or electricity) to consumers.

Megawatt (MW): A unit of power equal to 1,000 kilowatts (kW) or one million watts (W).

Megawatt-hour (MWh): A measure of the energy produced by a generating station over time: a one MW generator, operating for 24 hours, generates 24 MWh of energy (as does a 24-MW generator, operating for one hour).

MicroFIT: Ontario residents are able to develop a very small or “micro” renewable electricity generation project (10 kilowatts or less in size) on their properties. Under the microFIT Program, they are paid a guaranteed price for all the electricity they produce for at least 20 years.

Peaking Capacity: Generating capacity typically used only to meet the peak demand (highest demand) for electricity during the day; typically provided by hydro, coal or natural gas generators.

Peak Demand: Peak demand, peak load or on-peak are terms describing a period in which electricity is expected to be provided for a sustained period at a significantly higher than average supply level.

Photovoltaic: A technology for converting solar energy into electrical energy (typically by way of photovoltaic cells or panels comprising a number of cells).

Regulated Price Plan (RPP): Rates (adjusted every six months) to ensure electricity pricing reflect the true cost of generating electricity. They provide stable and predictable electricity prices for consumers.

Smart Grid: A Smart Grid delivers electricity from suppliers to consumers using digital technology with two-way communications to control appliances at consumers' homes to save energy, reduce costs and increase reliability and transparency.

Supply Mix: The different types of fuel that are used to produce electricity in a particular jurisdiction. Normally the mix is expressed in terms of the proportion of each type within the overall amount of energy produced.

Terawatt-hour (TWh): A unit of power equal to a billion kilowatt-hours. Ontario's annual electricity consumption is around 140 TWh.

Transmission: The movement or transfer of electricity over an interconnected group of lines and associated equipment between points of supply and points at which it is transformed for delivery to consumers, or is delivered to other, separate electric transmission systems. Transmission of electricity is done at high voltages (50kV or higher in Ontario); the energy is transformed to lower voltages for distribution over local distribution systems.

© Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2010

ISBN 978-1-4435-5025-3 (Print)

ISBN 978-1-4435-5026-0 (PDF/HTML)



FSC
www.fsc.org

MIX

Paper from
responsible sources

FSC® CJ



Ontario

Consulting Report

Wind Energy Study - Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario



Prepared for:

CANADIAN WIND ENERGY ASSOCIATION

Prepared By:

George Canning, AACI, P.App.

and

L. John Simmons, AACI, FRI, CMR, PLE

February 2010

February 4, 2010

CanWEA,
170 Laurier Avenue West,
Suite 810,
Ottawa Ontario
K1P 5V5

Attention: Mr. Tom Levy, P. Eng., Manager of Technical and Utility Affairs

**Re: Wind Farm Study – Effect on Real Estate Values
in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario**

Further to your request, we have now completed our study analysing the effect on real estate values arising from the installation and operation of wind turbines. For the purpose of preparing this consulting report, the location selected for analysis comprised an area of South Western Ontario, south of the City of Chatham, along the north shore of Lake Erie near the community of Merlin.

The following consulting report was prepared in accordance with the *Canadian Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice* for the **APPRAISAL INSTITUTE OF CANADA**. The report was required to enable the addressee to consider the impacts on the market value of nearby residential properties and their marketability, on behalf of the Association members. The applicability of the study results to wind farm developments in other regions of Ontario and Canada is discussed herein. The report, if necessary, may also form the basis of testimony at subsequent hearings.

A more detailed description of the properties analysed, together with the reasoning leading to the conclusions reported herein, is contained in the body of this report.

Wind Farm Study – Effect on Real Estate Values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario

This report demonstrates the following:

In the study area, where wind farms were clearly visible, there was no empirical evidence to indicate that rural residential properties realized lower sale prices than similar residential properties within the same area that were outside of the viewshed of a wind turbine.

The opinions reported herein are subject to the extraordinary assumptions, qualifications, limiting conditions and underlying assumptions as set out herein. This report contains 85 pages including Addendums, and is not valid unless it contains original signatures.

The authors reserve the right to revise the opinions set out herein, in light of any facts and conditions that become known subsequent to the date of the report, which have an impact on the conclusions reached.


A special note of thanks is extended to Paul Puopolo of the IBI Group in Kitchener for his help in providing background material etc. An outline of their most recent experience in the Electrical Energy related field has been included in Addendum “B”.

Thank you for choosing our firms to conduct this important study on wind farms.

Respectfully submitted,

John Simmons Realty Services Ltd.

Canning Consultants Inc



L. John Simmons, AACI, FRI, CMR, PLE



George R. Canning, AACI, P.App, PLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 6

BACKGROUND AND STUDY PURPOSE 10

 CLIENT AND FUNCTION 11

 PROPERTY RIGHTS ANALYSED 11

 DATE OF INSPECTION 11

 EFFECTIVE DATE OF REPORT 11

 DEFINITION OF MARKET VALUE 11

 DEFINITIONS 14

 CRITICAL AND EXTRAORDINARY ASSUMPTIONS 16

 SCOPE OF VALUATION AND REPORTING PROCESS: 17

VALUATION PROBLEM 18

STUDY AREA SELECTION..... 20

GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY AREA 21

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY 26

APPLICATION OF MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (MRA) 31

 OPTIMAL 46

 USING THE CEM MATCHING SEQUENCE 52

PAIRED SALES ANALYSIS 54

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION 59

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES 61

 APPLICABILITY OF STUDY RESULTS TO OTHER REGIONS 64

CONTINGENT AND LIMITING CONDITIONS 66

CERTIFICATION..... 68

ADDENDUM “A” – PRIVACY STATEMENT..... 70

ADDENDUM “B” – AUTHORS QUALIFICATIONS.....	72
CANNING CONSULTANTS, INC	73
L. JOHN SIMMONS, AACI, FRI, CMR, PLE	78
IBI GROUP	80
ADDENDUM “C” – REFERENCED STUDIES	82
ADDENDUM “D” – ONTARIO GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS	84

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

STUDY PURPOSE: Execute a market-based empirical study into the effect of wind turbines on local residential real estate values. This study focuses only on the Municipality of Chatham-Kent.

FUNCTION OF REPORT: Provide an independent, objective and reproducible analysis of market evidence into the effect of wind turbines on real estate values in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent.

BACKGROUND: Wind energy development has occurred in many countries around the world for decades. While some real estate value studies have been undertaken, there have been a limited number executed in Canada. Most studies have their basis in subjective analysis, relying on anecdotal evidence and survey responses to form a basis for conclusions. This report considers only market based evidence, and applies a widely recognized and accepted approach to statistical evaluation of data sets in order to evaluate the effect on real estate values.

SCOPE OF ANALYSIS: Due to the number of existing wind energy projects in the Province of Ontario, it was necessary to select a study area wherein:

- there have been a sufficient volume of sales of properties that have taken place in close proximity to a wind farm following its completion;
- there have been a sufficient volume of sales of similar properties in the same general area but not in proximity to a wind farm (beyond the viewshed); and
- there is sufficient access to registry office sales records, and local area real estate board listing information.

STUDY AREA SELECTION: The Chatham-Kent Region of Ontario was selected as a suitable study area as it met the primary selection criteria listed above, and a sufficient volume of property sale transactions for which MLS® and registry office details were available.

IMPACTS CONSIDERED: Data was analyzed to determine the effect on real estate values as a result of proximity to wind turbines and, more specifically, on properties within the viewshed and those not within the viewshed of wind turbines. Some concerns expressed by those near proposed or existing wind farms include:

- aesthetics;
- shadow flicker; and
- sound, audible and low frequency.

None of the above influences on price were measured independently. If there is an effect on real estate values from any or all of these influences, it will be measurable from market data. Recommendations for future studies are presented within the body of the report.

DATE OF INSPECTIONS: The study area was visited on several occasions between May 18, 2009 and June 31, 2009 in order to view all properties within the viewshed as well as the control group of properties. This is known as a “ground-truthing” exercise.

EFFECTIVE TIME FRAME: Primary research material was obtained during the month of May 2009, while additional data was obtained during the month of June 2009.

STUDY METHODOLOGY: A Multiple Regression Analysis (MRA) statistical technique formed the basis for evaluating market data for this study. The MRA procedure is the most definitive tool to segregate data in a numerical format for further analysis and interpretation. Within the MRA framework data was divided into those characteristics that best explain the variance in selling prices of comparable real estate. The focus of this study is the measurement of the effect on real estate values due to the presence of wind farms; therefore, the data was further assigned a viewshed and a control group value.

MRA is used to determine the causal effect between variables by assigning a coefficient to each variable and determining its standard error as a function of sample size relative to population size. The “T score” is defined as the relationship between the coefficient of every variable and its respective standard error.

Data sampling did not return as large a volume of sale data as expected. Accordingly, other evaluation techniques were employed to aid in the evaluation of the data through improved matching of datasets. Within the report, Optimal and Coarsened Exact Matching (CEM) techniques were relied upon as additional data matching tools to further enhance the ability to analyze data by obtaining more closely matched pairs of data from the original dataset.

The study was not limited to MRA itself, nor was it limited to data filtering systems; rather, the study also explored the raw data that formed 14 pairs of identical property sales that were sold within and beyond the viewshed of a wind turbine. This is the more traditional approach to evaluating effects on real estate, and it was considered useful to compare merits of various options of data analysis available.

STUDY CONCLUSIONS

No statistical inference to demonstrate that wind farms negatively affect rural residential market values in Chatham-Kent was apparent in this analysis. Furthermore, this study did not find any consistent evidence from the analyzed data that such a negative correlation exists in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent. During the course of gathering data, there were no unusual quantities of rural residential properties listed for sale in the study area. Four unrelated data processes were used in studying the property sales information for Chatham-Kent. The only consistency was that each evaluation methodology found that it was highly unlikely that any type of a causal relationship exists between wind farms and the market values of rural residential real estate.

BACKGROUND AND STUDY PURPOSE

Wind farm developers have out of necessity been required to address some concerns from local property owners adjacent and nearby to proposed development locations that their real estate values could decline due to the presence of a wind farm within their viewshed. Some segments of the population feel that wind turbines can intrude on viewsheds. Opposition has, in some cases been based on a belief that real estate values will diminish. While it is understandable that some property owners do not like change in their communities that they deem to be undesirable, it becomes difficult for wind farm developers to address objectors in a subjective manner.

In North America, some studies have attempted to evaluate the relationship between residential real estate values and proximity to a wind turbine. While some of these studies have found a negative effect on nearby real estate value that has been attributed to the proximity of a wind farm, others have not found such a correlation.

This study has focused entirely on tangible market-based data obtained through recognized means such as MLS®. In addition, some research has been conducted into similar studies in other jurisdictions. Although exhaustive research was not conducted, studies conducted in the U.S.A., Australia, England and one in Ontario were reviewed. Some of these were based on anecdotal evidence and some on the basis of survey responses. To the best of our knowledge, no reports have been produced within Canada presenting a comprehensive analysis of market data, such as that presented herein.

CLIENT AND FUNCTION

This report has been prepared for the Canadian Wind Energy Association (CanWEA) to assess the effect of wind turbines on the market value of local residential real estate in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario.

PROPERTY RIGHTS ANALYSED

The ownership rights of those properties analysed in this report are those of the “**Fee Simple Interest**”, subject to the four powers of government: taxation, expropriation, police power and escheat. A “**Fee Simple Interest**” may be defined as “*the ownership of real property rights unencumbered by any other interest.*”¹

DATE OF INSPECTION

Properties adjacent and near to various existing wind energy developments were identified, researched and inspected by the authors during the months of May and June 2009. The initial site inspection was conducted on May 18, 2009.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF REPORT

July 1, 2009 has been selected as the effective date of this report as it encompassed the time frame of inspections and data research.

DEFINITION OF MARKET VALUE

“Market Value” is defined² as:

The most probable price which a property should bring in a competitive and open market as of the specified date under all conditions requisite to a fair sale, the buyer and seller each acting prudently and knowledgeably, and assuming that the price is not affected by undue stimulus.

¹ The Appraisal of Real Estate, (Canada Edition, 1992), 12

² Canadian Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Conduct 04/15/2008

Implicit in this definition are the consummation of a sale as of the specified date and the passing of title from seller to buyer under conditions whereby:

- 1) buyer and seller are typically motivated;*
- 2) both parties are well informed or well advised, and acting in what they consider their best interests;*
- 3) a reasonable time is allowed for exposure in the open market*
- 4) payment is made in terms of cash in Canadian Dollars or in terms of financial arrangements comparable thereto; and*
- 5) the price represents the normal consideration for the property sold unaffected by special or creative financing or sales concessions granted by anyone associated with the sale.*

The foregoing definition of Market Value assumes a competitive scenario with more than one potential buyer, and a seller who is willing to sell in accordance with the Highest and Best Use of the property. This inherently assumes that the seller no longer needs or wants the property and wishes to convert the asset to cash.

The intent of this study is to evaluate the effect of wind farms on the market value of nearby residential properties.

EXPOSURE TIME:

With respect to Item 3 above in the Market Value definition, exposure time is the estimated length of time the property interest being appraised would have been offered in the market prior to its hypothetical sale at the estimated market value on the effective date of the appraisal. Reasonable exposure encompasses not only adequate, sufficient and reasonable time, but also adequate, sufficient and reasonable effort. In addition to price, exposure time is also a function of use and type of real estate.

As this study does not estimate market value of a specific property, consideration of the exposure time as a specific undertaking is unnecessary. The relationship of exposure time to selling price was considered in general terms relative to the impact of nearby wind farms.

Some studies attempting to reflect or measure a loss in market value due to the proximity to a wind farm have suggested that the influence has resulted in increased marketing times. In order to address this possibility, a review of MLS® listings in the area was undertaken to ascertain if the exposure to a view or proximity to a wind turbine contributed to the length of time a property was listed on the market before a sale was recorded. While many properties were listed on a 90 day listing basis, some listings sold within that time frame, and some expired unsold. Some were relisted for sale and others not, while others were relisted at reduced prices, and still others not. There are a number of variables that can influence the length of time that a property is listed for sale, including:

- asking price was too high;
- condition of the property less than desirable;
- poor curb appeal;
- location relative to employment;
- undesirable neighbouring properties;
- regional economic conditions/unemployment levels;
- time of year;
- volume of competing listings; and
- inadequate marketing/agency representation.

These are the primary reasons, within which there are subcategories of more specific issues that may explain the length of time a property is listed for sale. A study incorporating a detailed analysis of these factors and isolating any specific influence of proximity to a wind turbine is beyond the scope of this report. Further, a greater volume of sales data would be required over an extended period of time. Reliance on anecdotal opinions as a basis for a credible indication of value influence or loss is not evidentiary, nor is it reproducible.

Even though the review of the evidence conducted for this study did not disclose any probative evidence to suggest that proximity to a wind turbine had an influence on the length of listing time, this issue would require a more comprehensive (and independent) study to reach a firm conclusion.

DEFINITIONS

In this report certain words and terms have been used that require defining for those readers unfamiliar with this type of report. As considered by the authors, these are as follows:

Algorithm:	A step by step method of solving a problem using numbers in computations.
Avg:	This is the short form for Average being the number of observations divided by their total.
Bins:	Bins are used in statistical graphing or displaying of items of a similar value or characteristic.
CEM:	Coarsened Exact Matching is the name of another matching data program used in the study.
Coefficient:	The coefficient is the returned number allocated to a specific property variable from using regression analysis.
Control Group:	That group of properties not affected by the alleged impacts of a wind turbine.
Histogram:	A bar chart that represents a frequency distribution of data.
Log:	The log is the power that a base number is raised to.
Mean(s):	A mean, or arithmetic mean, is the total of a list of numbers divided by the number. It is an average. It reflects a central tendency.
MW:	Short form of “megawatt”, which equals 1,000 kilowatts or 1,000,000 watts.
Optimal:	This is the name of a matching data program used in the study.
Rated Capacity:	Manufacturer specified maximum power output of a wind turbine. Typical large wind turbines have rated capacities of 1.5 megawatts or more.

Regression:	The relationship between the mean value of a random variable and the corresponding values of one or more independent variables.
Scatterplot:	This is a graph that shows any variable on the “X” axis plotted against any variables on the “Y” axis.
Viewshed:	A point within the study area whereby a sale property had a view of one or more wind turbines.
Viz:	Short form for visible.
No Viz:	Short form for not being Visible
Wind Farm:	A project containing more than one wind turbine, each electrically connected to each other, for the purpose of selling electricity to the electrical grid.
Wind Turbine:	A structure that uses airfoils (commonly referred to as a blade) to extract kinetic energy from the wind, and converts this to electrical energy. Each wind turbine typically contains three blades. In this study area, typical wind turbines have hub heights of 80 m, blade lengths of 41m, for a total max height of 121 meters.