

Lake Superior Action Research Conservation

PO Box 1
Montreal River Harbour, ON
P0S 1H0
action@lsarc.ca
www.lsarc.ca
www.lsarc.wordpress.com

Critique of the Heritage and Tourism Impact Assessment for Bow Lake Wind Farm Phase 1 and Phase 2 - Revised February 2012

January 18, 2013

Executive Summary:

The Heritage and Tourism Impact Assessment (HTIA) is flawed and reaches conclusions which are contradictory and not consistent with available evidence.

1 The HTIA itself makes the economic case for Tourism

2 The HTIA itself, observes that Hwy 17 North is:
"Arguably the most scenic highway in Ontario"

3 The HTIA itself acknowledges the Lack of Formal Recognition of the Area's Heritage Resources
"Many of the character defining features of a Cultural Landscape are apparent but lack recognition."
and suggests that, **"At some point there may be value in undertaking a complete Cultural Landscape Assessment in the region"** (*emphasis added*)

Given the above and a survey based on a statistically insignificant number of respondents it is evident that this HTIA is merely spin used as a pretext by the developer to further its own economic goals and not a legitimate assessment of the area's Heritage Resources and the impact that the Wind Farm will have on them, Tourism and the local economy.

Under guise of the REA "public consultation" process residents of Algoma have been subjected to outright lies and repeated efforts to deceive by wind developers on many topics, but most particularly on the matter of tourism, which is so important to our local economy. The wind industry in general and the Bow Lake Project developers in particular seem prepared to engage in serial mendacity.

1- IN THE FIRST INSTANCE:

The Irish developer DP Energy insisted that there would be no adverse effect on tourism based on the authority of a Scottish Government's report on tourism.

"The Economic Impacts of Wind Farms On Scottish Tourism", misinterpreted by DP as carte blanche to destroy the wilderness allure of this area, actually states:

"There is often strong hostility to developments at the planning stage on the grounds of the

scenic impact and the perceived knock on effect on tourism. However developments in the most sensitive locations do not appear to have been given approval so that where negative impacts on tourism might have been a real outcome there is, in practice, little evidence of a negative effect.” p.4

This is critical as transposed to the Ontario context where the most sensitive locations are NOT being seen to be protected and where the "knock on" effect can easily send tourists not just out of the area, but out of the country. It should be noted as well that the Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) survey indicated that there WOULD BE a negative impact on tourism and it was only reassuring to tourism in that the effect AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL would be minor. There were also criticisms to be made of the survey size and ability to extrapolate from a confusion of issues. However, it is clear that the misuse of this document by DP merely serves to hide the true harm to be done here.

Planning recommendations made in the Report include:

“... the impacts in some local areas are important enough to warrant specific consideration by planning authorities. These should include the following:

- Impact on local economy and community development
- Landscape character and visual amenity”

Here the repeated views of industrial machines in convoluted terrain will give the impression of multiple developments littering the landscape and the boating public will gaze upon a shore pocked by whirling, flashing beacons of the urban blight they sought to escape afloat on a pristine inland sea.

This too is considered by the SNH.

"It is the basic intrusion into the landscape that generates the loss...those tourists who do find wind turbines an objectionable presence are most likely simply to move to another area in Scotland. To ensure substitution opportunities it is important that areas are retained where turbine development is limited to supplying local needs in small remote communities, and indeed the wilderness nature of these areas publicised.” P.16

This is just such an area!

The fact that Helen McDade, director of the largest Scottish wildlands conservation group IN THE UK, the John Muir Trust, had already severely criticized the use of this report by wind developers to justify intrusion in scenic wilderness areas could not have gone unnoticed by the UK wind industry and is strong additional evidence that there was a deliberate effort to deceive.

DP Energy's quoting tourism numbers for Delabole in the UK was not just an insult to this area and our intelligence, it was yet more disinformation. Since the novelty of the first wind farm in the UK did not wear off soon enough to save the squandering of £5m on a visitors centre which had to close after three years, Delabole stands as an example of how the wind industry sells itself to the gullible and greedy. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/cornwall/3701894.stm

Consideration of Lake Superior in the same tourism context as the world's largest slate quarry is a damning indictment of the ability of the developers to properly assess tourism impacts in wilderness areas. Internationally the response to Industrial Wind Turbines has not been consistent with the wind industry's sales pitch on tourism potential.

Wilderness Scotland, (the 2005 Scottish Tourism Business of the Year), conducted a survey among clients in July 2005. This showed that 91% would not return to the Highlands if wind farms were significantly developed. Over 1600 people responded, from 21 different countries, illustrating the depth of feeling on this issue around the world. A poll was taken, in 2006, at the Monfragüe National Park in Spain. Only about 15% of tourists said windfarms would not affect their decisions when selecting a destination. 60% said they would NOT visit an area that had windfarms. The rest said they would only under certain conditions.

There are areas now which feel a sort of visual pollution tax should be levied on wind farms:

"Spain's autonomous region of Castile-La Mancha, currently with over 3.7GW online, has voted to clamp a visual impact levy on all wind plants above 5MW. The levy is set at 1.6% of plant generation income for existing and new capacity. The regional government's vice president, María Luisa Araújo, expects the levy to net €15 million annually and for it to be in force before 2012. South central Castile-La Mancha is the second region to establish such a tax. Galicia, in the north, enforced a "landscape impact" levy in 2009", (Credit: Michael McGovern, www.windpowermonthly.com),

while the Tirol region of Italy, preferring the natural beauty of its mountains, decided to become a turbine free zone.

2- IN THE SECOND INSTANCE:

How is it possible for the Bow Lake tourism report to conclude that,

"In terms of impact upon the tourism industry, the evidence also points to minimal impact. A full tourism impact assessment is part of this report including a survey of tourism operators. The findings from respondents to a survey of tourist operators along with other aspects of our assessment indicate no negative impact of the Wind Farm upon their business. Indeed, some suggest that it may actually stimulate additional business, as the Wind Farm would be one more interesting attraction in the area north of Sault Ste. Marie."?

Locally, potential Prince Wind Farm tours, as a tourist draw, have been discussed in disparaging terms. Prince Township's strategic plan review committee member, Hal McGonigal, called wind farm tours "old hat, or worse." Among the myths of the wind industry, the attraction of industrial wind turbines lives on in the ludicrous suggestion that they will somehow fascinate travellers who just can't get enough of them and are willing to pay money for the excitement of seeing more. This is such a preposterous idea that it immediately identifies those who have been subjected to the wind developer's spiel.

There is such a striking similarity to CANWEA's marketing language in some of the responses to the Tourism Operators Survey that there is cause for concern about undue influence and the integrity of the REA process.

Page 3, Q20. Are there other ways in which the Bow Lake Wind Farms may affect your business, either positively or negatively?, response 2 "If the guests perception of wind turbines is negative, then it'll be a negative effect. If the guests perception of wind turbines is positive, it's a positive effect. It's all in perception."

In fact the European surveys show this to be false,

The "Heritage and Tourism Impact Assessment (HTIA) for Bow Lake Phase 1 and Phase 2" (Rev.22/02/2012), submitted by Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Limited and TCI Management Consultants, is a deeply flawed study and a conflicted document, which arrives at unwarranted conclusions. The online Tourism Operators Survey is particularly egregious. Though the small number of respondents (15) makes it of no statistical significance, the responses are counted as a percentage and validated by their inclusion in the assessment. Answers include, as illustrated above, language somewhat suspect as it merely mimics developer marketing slogans.

Utterly and obviously false statements seem to be accepted at face value; for example, **Page 3, Q20. Are there other ways in which the Bow Lake Wind Farms may affect your business, either positively or negatively?** Response 8, "get on with this, people from southern onatrio are the ones bucking it and do not contribute to the costs in the area or pay taxes, I am at \$20000 in property taxes, over 10% of my annual revenue. the people complaining live in T.O. and contribute nothing to our economy."

The HTIA states:

"Tourism in this report has a dual role: it is treated as both a major historic theme defining the character of the area, as well as an ongoing development opportunity...

The task of this evaluation, commissioned by the proponents of the Bow Lake Wind Farm, is to determine the impact the proposed Wind Farm may have on heritage resources in the study zone, and on tourism opportunities in the region. In addition to determining impact, the purpose for undertaking a heritage assessment is to propose measures where necessary, to avoid, eliminate or mitigate any identified impacts."

Unfortunately the visual assessment starts on a completely inappropriate assumption:

"In all instances, the landscape users will be viewing the wind turbines along with the other historical and present-day industrial development in the region (forestry, mining, quarrying, power generation) that also represent influences that have altered the character of the landscape."

Justifying the violation of the wilderness ethos in this context based on the precedent of the existing hydro development and selective logging is egregiously wrong in its comparison of discrete low profile reservoirs and dams set in the woodland context of beaver damned ponds and lakes, to noisy, obtrusive, flashing blinking 146 meter-tall industrial machinery ruinous to views for a 30km radius, rearing above forested hills which reliably attract fall foliage tourists every year. *None of the other influences have an equivalent impact on the present day landscape, as we well know from the experience of the existing Prince Wind Farm!* To imply otherwise is to entirely misconstrue, or to deliberately misrepresent, the situation.

The researchers claim that,

"An attempt has been made to describe the extent to which the visibility of the wind turbines from the specific features identified in Chapter 3 constitutes a change on a particular site by defining three levels of visual change..."

they list three categories which, as defined, present a skewed result.

- No Impact, indicates that the wind turbines cannot be seen or are only visible as part of a background.

Any industrial infrastructure as part of an otherwise unblemished background stands out as a sore thumb and particularly in the immediate vicinity of Bow Lake which is a favourite hunting and fishing resource and an area of spectacular beauty which somehow escapes valuation, though hunting and fishing are acknowledged to be prime tourism draws.

- Some Impact, indicates that turbines can be seen but because of distance, limited opportunity of the viewer and/or forest cover, they are only intermittently visible or can be seen only at night with red navigation beacons.

In the discussion of viewing from the tour train, a minute and a half (referred to as only 90 seconds) is plenty of time for tourists riveted to windows to notice and recoil from IWT instantly recognized from other locations. Photographs only take seconds, comparisons with pre-construction advertising shots will be possible ... And the dark sky status of all the good stargazing locations will be eliminated where:

"The coastline is dominated by high hills (actually the last visible edge of the Canadian Shield prior to plunging into Lake Superior) that rise up at the shoreline. Lake Superior is 183 metres (600 ft) above sea level. The summits of the hills proposed for Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the development range in height from 440 to 600 metres (approx. 1444 to 1968 ft) above sea level, or approximately 260 to 420 metres (approx. 853 to 1378 ft) above the surface of the lake."

- High Impact, refers to those locations where the turbines are a dominant feature in the viewshed for at least two seasons and can be seen both day and night times.

This level of impact is sufficient to doom small tourism ventures which are already subject to cyclical economic stresses and should be considered EXTREME where the scenic value of landscape is the greatest draw.

"The section of the Lake Superior Coast is rugged, indented with pronounced wave motion, with a gently sloping beach area rising fairly sharply into a series of steep, sloping knolls, thickly vegetated with tall trees. Because of local landforms and vegetation, the Wind Farm will be screened from view throughout much of the area from which the turbines will theoretically be visible. The Wind Farm can be viewed from the shore in a very few locations:

- At the end of Point aux Mines at the south end of Alona Bay (a few hundred metres of shoreline);
- Along a short section north of Point Mamainse (a few hundred metres, and only the tips of a few turbines from over 25 km away);
- Around Agawa Bay to just beyond Agawa Point (approximately 9 km of shoreline);
- A short section of shoreline near Katherine Cove (approximately 2 km of shoreline, but difficult visibility due to distance of approximately 27 km)."

These are prime Park locations! The report admits the brutal effects:

"Views of the turbines from the Park will constitute a visual intrusion. The impact is related to the lessening of sense of wilderness and the associative values of the Cultural Landscape. The southern boundary of the Park borders the Montreal River and the proposed Wind Farm will be one of its closest neighbours. The turbines will be noticeable mainly at the southern entrance to the Park along Highway 17 where the land rises and the road corridor creates a viewshed over the Montreal River directly to the Wind Farm."

Extreme visual impact, if that category properly existed, would appropriately describe these sites, as well as the highly scenic immediate impact zone of Bow Lake itself.

The report mentions the panoramic views from off shore where even at 30km out the IWT will be visible... yet not how detrimental it will be to the values which enhance the great tourism potential identified in kayaking and cruising along this coast. The report speaks here of what is now in peril:

"Lake Superior has been (and is recovering as) an important source of native/sport and commercial fishing. Increasing numbers of boat owners (power and sail) are using Lake Superior plus there is a major growth of kayak and canoe users of the coastal shoreline and offshore islands in the area. Historically the lake supports themes of: fur trade, tourism, and commercial shipping/water access."

Consider this description from 3.2 THE GREAT LAKES HERITAGE COAST - LAKE SUPERIOR

"Lake Superior is the largest of the five Great Lakes. It is world's third largest lake by volume and its surface is 82,400 square km (approx. 51200 square miles). Canada's second smallest province Nova Scotia (55,283 km²) would fit into Lake Superior 1.5 times.

The lake's physical features along the Eastern and Northern Coast feature a rugged rocky coastline with occasional stone beaches or rare sand beaches. Typically, this coastline rises sharply out the water into medium to tall hills hundreds of metres above the waters of Lake Superior. This dramatic relationship of the water to the land represents the visible edge of the Canadian Shield."

It is a rare and unique feature, a glorious gift of the glaciers, a global freshwater treasure and understood by many to represent the grandeur of nature; vastness is an essential part of the aesthetic appeal of the landscape which is worthy of conservation.

"The Heritage Impact Assessment must include all heritage resources, which are defined in O. Reg. 359/09 as a "real property that is of cultural heritage value or interest and may include a building, structure, **landscape** or other feature of real property". Therefore, the HIA must address the entire project location (as defined in the REA regulations) and any heritage resources identified through public consultation." (*emphasis added*)

Reading like a litany of error on the part of the Province, Section 1.3: Assumptions and Caveats, admits.

"There are certain cautions and caveats permeating this assessment that should be brought to the attention of the reader."

These are:

- 1) Perception of Proliferation of Wind Farms on the North Shore: Throughout the interview

process, we heard numerous comments to the effect that the Bow Lake development may be the 'slippery slope' or the 'thin edge of the wedge' of Wind Farm development in the region, and that **there could be large numbers of additional Wind Farms developed if Bow Lake were to go ahead** (there is a common sentiment that 16 additional developments have been proposed). However, the current reality is that only one other proposal has Feed In Tariff (FIT) approval and the others are in the early stages. Furthermore, there are significant questions about the extent to which any additional developments would be able to fit into the electrical interconnection capacity of the region in any event. Accordingly, as the mandate of this assessment is restricted to assessing the Bow Lake development alone, we do not comment on future Wind Farm proliferation, other than to mention that it was raised as a common concern. *(emphasis added)*

2) Perception of Lack of Effective Provincial Government Policy: Another theme heard frequently throughout the interview process was that provincial government policy was too weak in terms of protecting the north shore of Lake Superior from development of all kinds. **A related lament was that the province has not been more active in protecting, interpreting and celebrating the North Shore as the 'Great Lakes Heritage Coast', which might entail policies offering stronger protection from visual encroachment.** Be that as it may, it was not the intent of this specific assessment of the Bow Lake development to evaluate or recommend provincial government policy. This specific review of the Bow Lake Wind Farm takes only the current policy context into account. *(emphasis added)*

3) Lack of Timely Input from Art Historians: One of the dimensions of the analysis in this assessment is the extent to which key painting sites of Group of Seven members (who painted throughout the North Shore area) might be affected by the development of the Bow Lake Wind Farm project. Our own research has identified only nine painting sites in the project area that can be specifically geographically identified within the 30 km Zone of Visual Impact (see Table 3.1 in Appendix C) and none of these will suffer any further adverse effects as a result of the development of the project beyond those which have already occurred as a result of other industrial resource development. To augment our assessment, repeated attempts were made to contact knowledgeable art historians and other local experts who may know about any more obscure Group of Seven painting sites that might exist. However, despite repeated attempts, several of the potential knowledge sources either did not respond or declined to provide any information. We were fortunate to have the opportunity to consult with Jim Waddington. He and his wife Susan have researched painting sites in the area for over 35 years and were able to identify 12 pieces in the study area.

While to the best of our knowledge, there are not any additional sites to be assessed, the possibility remains that additional sites revealed by local interests may be identified in the future (for a full discussion see Section 3.9 and Appendix C).

4) Lack of Formal Recognition of the Area's Heritage Resources: One of the difficulties in working in the area and assessing impact is the lack of formal recognition of the area's significant cultural resources. **Many of the character defining features of a Cultural Landscape are apparent but lack recognition.** The Great Lakes Heritage Coast is a policy document only, with no active implementation plan. The Agawa Pictographs are part of Lake Superior Provincial Park, which is classified as a "Natural Environment" park with protection as set out in the Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act (PPCRA) 2006, c. 12, s. 8 *(emphasis added)*

(5) **Highway 17 is reported to be one of Canada's most scenic highways but has no**

management plan, development restrictions, setbacks, or guidelines. The Group of Seven captured the wilderness spirit of Algoma on numerous canvases. As an intangible resource their works support the concept of associative values if there was a designated Cultural Landscape. **At some point there may be value in undertaking a complete Cultural Landscape Assessment in the region.** (*emphasis added*)

Under the heading of Contextual Value find the evidence of why people are shocked to learn that their cherished watershed is NOT protected even after the huge Provincial investment of time and money which left them with the impression that the Province had finally done something intelligent.

"The Great Lakes Heritage Coast is a landmark, one of nine featured areas determined by the MNR in Ontario Living Legacy Land Use Strategy, 1999.14

Each of these featured areas warrants a special policy statement that identifies the Great Lakes coast for special planning and management consideration with the intent of protecting the significant natural, cultural, and recreational values of the coast."

Instead Lake Superior and her minimally impacted watershed has experienced callous betrayal and now this treachery, maybe a more valid reason for the lack of participation in the Tourist Operators Survey than that suggested by the so-called tourism experts. The unwillingness to participate in yet another pointless public consultation which merely mocks the participants for their gullibility is not lack of concern, but utter disillusionment.

"These management considerations are intended to apply to all Crown lands, waters, lakebeds, Crown islands and intervening coastal areas along the Great lakes shoreline from Port Severn in Georgian Bay, through the North Channel of Lake Huron, to the international border south of Thunder Bay on Lake Superior. The boundary of Heritage Coast varies in width along the shoreline. Along Lake Superior the inland boundary generally follows Highway 17. Just north of Montreal River it follows the inland boundaries of Lake Superior Provincial Park. The Heritage Coast does not apply to Aboriginal land or privately owned lands. The heritage coast boundary borders the southern edge of Highway 17; hence the Bow Lake project location is not within the designated area of the coast."

The HTIA itself, observes that Hwy 17 North is:

"Arguably the most scenic highway in Ontario, this 580 km route snakes around the east and north shores of Lake Superior, passing through some the most picturesque terrain seen in this province. The route begins in Sault Ste. Marie, north towards the Montreal River. As the highway passes over the first range of mountains near Highway 552, there are good views of Batchawana Bay and low ranges of rounded, forested large hills extend westerly.

The highway closely hugs the shore of Lake Superior for over 100 km, sandwiched between Lake Superior, and the mountains which lay a short distance inland. At Montreal River, the coastline becomes too rugged for the highway to pass through, and the road abruptly doglegs and begins to ascend up through the hills as it enters Lake Superior Provincial Park. After a relatively flat section around the Agawa River, the highway once again is forced away from the coast, and up through the mountains. For the next 100 km, the highway briefly returns to the coast on several occasions, but for the most part is inland."

The HTIA itself makes the economic case for Tourism:

As an internationally traded service, inbound tourism has become a major world trade category. The overall export income generated by inbound tourism including passenger travel, exceeded US \$ 1 trillion in 2010.

Globally, as an export category tourism ranks fourth worldwide after fuels, chemicals and automotive products. For many developing countries tourism is one of the main sources of foreign exchange income and the number one export category, creating much-needed employment opportunities for development.

Tourism contribution to worldwide gross domestic product (GDP) is estimated to be on the order of 5%. Tourism's contribution to employment trends tends to be slightly higher; it is estimated that in the order of 6 to 7% of overall number of jobs worldwide direct and indirect are related to tourism.

Tourism is an important economic driver in every region of Canada. The sector directly employed 622,900 people in 2008. Total tourism spending of \$C74.7 billion in 2008 represented a 1.9% increase over 2007. Tourism's share in the economy was 2% of GDP or \$C 30.3 billion in 2008.

The HTIA itself acknowledges the Lack of Formal Recognition of the Area's Heritage Resources:

One of the difficulties in working in the area and assessing impact is the lack of formal recognition of the area's significant cultural resources. **Many of the character defining features of a Cultural Landscape are apparent but lack recognition.** *(emphasis added)*

AND suggests that,

"At some point there may be value in undertaking a complete Cultural Landscape Assessment in the region" *(emphasis added)*

Lake Superior Action Research Conservation lsarc.ca tested the developer's hypothesis that tourists would not object to IWT in this area by offering travellers who stopped on the Alona Bay scenic lookout the opportunity to sign a letter (see attached) of objection to the Premier. This was not an attempt to capture all travellers over the course of time but rather to do spot sampling which would permit a statistically significant average to be calculated (spreadsheet and analysis attached). More than a poll since it required people to sign in agreement but less than a study for the simple reason that lack of financial resources necessitated volunteer effort which would be immediately challenged as biased.

What this was meant to do was simply provide the basis for the argument that the time for a complete cultural heritage landscape IS PRIOR to the destruction of something which is cherished by so many for its cultural landscape values and above all "bequest value" to future generations.

LSARC.CA's information and letter signing campaign at the Alona Bay Scenic Lookout took place every long week end starting with the 2012 Victoria Day week end and ending with the 2012 Thanksgiving week end from 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM every day except one. 89% of the people approached signed the letter to the Ontario Premier and expressed dismay at the prospect of industrializing the Eastern Shore of Lake Superior with Wind Power Generating Stations.

According to the Provincial Highway Traffic Volumes, 1988–2007, Ontario Ministry of Transportation, the Trans Canada, Highway 17, brings the largest number of persons into the general area of the proposed Bow Lake development. The annual average daily traffic in 2007 of 2,512 vehicles each

with an average of 2.1 persons per vehicles means that 1,925,448 travellers (2,512 vehicles x 2.1 passengers per car x 365 days) per year are moving through this transportation corridor.

Based on the figures above, it suggests that had LSARC.CA conducted its campaign every day for a year, everywhere people stop along the Eastern Shore, it would have received 1,713,648 signatures from people/tourists who give the scenic features of the Lake Superior coastline drive a high priority and who don't want to see the visual allure of the region damaged by the construction of Industrial Wind Turbines.

The opinion of such a very significant number of tourists is very important to a region which derives 17% of local employment from tourism-related businesses.

Here is where people have seen something of our past which has survived in a condition which inspires hope for our future. Please halt the industrialization of this area to at least show it the respect of proper due diligence. This is the point in time to undertake a complete Cultural Landscape Assessment in the region, please intervene to make it happen.

According to the Provincial Highway Traffic Volumes, 1988–2007, Ontario Ministry of Transportation:

The Trans Canada, Highway 17, brings the largest number of persons into the general area of the proposed Bow Lake development. The annual average daily traffic in 2007 of 2,512 vehicles each with an average of 2.1 persons per vehicles means that 1,925,448 travelers (2,512 vehicles x 2.1 passengers per car x 365 days) per year are moving through this transportation corridor.

In Summer (July/August 2007) traffic volumes in the Highway 17 corridor increased by 935 vehicle per day or 27% compared to the other ten months. This translates to approximately 121,750 additional persons passing through the Highway 17 corridor during the months of July and August compared to the other ten months of the year.

An average of 5,300 persons a day travel through the Zone of Visual Impact using Highway 17. During the prime tourism months of July and August the number of travelers in the highway corridor increases by 35% or an additional 1,900 persons daily.

According to the Heritage and Tourism Impact Assessment for the Bow Lake Wind Farm Phase 1 and Phase 2, Revised - February 2012, page 55, prepared by the developer's consultants:

“During the prime summer tourism period of July and August there is a reduction of 31,000 vehicles in the section of Highway 17 from the turn-off at the Lake Superior Provincial Park Visitor Centre at Agawa Bay and the next traffic count location at Wawa 80 km distant. Reasons for this drop-off of traffic volume cannot be fully explained, but a plausible explanation might suggest that a high portion of these 500 daily vehicles stop their northward journey at this point or slightly beyond as the driver and passengers have decided they only want to focus on the coastal features of Lake Superior and are not prepared to go farther northward as the highway moves away from the Lake Superior coastline for the next 250 km until Marathon. Logically most drivers and vehicles that in this category return to Sault Ste. Marie as their destination. This points out the priority which tourists give the scenic features of the Lake Superior coastline drive.”

LSARC.CA's information and letter signing campaign at the Alona Bay Scenic Lookout took place every long week end starting with the 2012 Victoria Day week end and ending with the 2012 Thanksgiving week end from 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM every day except one. 89% of the people approached and asked if they would care to sign a letter to the Ontario Premier, Dalton McGuinty, were happy to do so and expressed dismay at the prospect of industrializing the Eastern Shore of Lake Superior with Wind Power Generating Stations.

Based on the figures above, it suggests that had LSARC.CA conducted its campaign every day for a year, everywhere people stop along the Eastern Shore, it would have received 1,713,648 signatures from people/tourists who give the scenic features of the Lake Superior coastline drive a high priority and who don't want to see the visual allure of the region damaged by the construction of Industrial Wind Turbines.

The opinion of such a very significant number of tourists is very important to a region which derives 17% of local employment from tourism-related businesses.

	Alona Bay SL	Tourist Ops	Other locations
"P" Codes	133	34	95
Non-"P" Codes	302		12
Canada	435	34	107
USA	69	1	2
Germany	9		
Australia	4		
Austria	2		
India	2		
Spain	2		
UK	2		
France	1		
Sub- Totals	526	35	109
Total	670		

Alona Bay SL International	Alona Bay SL International	Alona Bay SL "P" Codes	Alona Bay SL "P" Codes	Alona Bay SL "P" Codes	Alona Bay SL Non "P" Codes
02554 USA	52722 USA	p0a	p3e	p6a	a0a
02584 USA	53089 USA	p0b	p4n	p6b	b2n
12586 USA	53089 USA	p0g	p4n	p6b	b2n
12586 USA	54136 USA	p0l	p4n	p6b	b6l
13754 USA	54303 USA	p0l	p4r	p6b	c0a
13754 USA	54303 USA	p0l	p5a	p6b	e1c
34479 USA	54853 USA	p0l	p5a	p6b	e2j
34479 USA	54853 USA	p0l	p5c	p6b	e3a
43512 USA	54861 USA	p0m	p5n	p6b	e3b
43512-3318 USA	55304 USA	p0m	p5n	p6b	e4y
43567 USA	55304 USA	p0r	p5n	p6b	e5n
43567 USA	60707 USA	p0r	p5n	p6b	e6j
46514 USA	66213 USA	p0r	p5n	p6b	e6j
46514 USA	67005 USA	p0s	p5n	p6b	e7g
48060USA	67026 USA	p0s	p6a	p6b	e7m
48060USA	67026 USA	p0s	p6a	p6c	g0c
48083 USA	68450 USA	p0s	p6a	p6c	g1b
48104 USA	72653 USA	p0s	p6a	p6c	g1b
48105 USA	77399 USA	p0s	p6a	p6c	g1e
48116 USA	77399 USA	p0s	p6a	p6c	g1e
48230 USA	98607 USA	p0s	p6a	p6c	g5y
48309 USA	06618 Germany	p0s	p6a	p6c	g5y
48313 USA	06618 Germany	p0s	p6a	p6c	g5y
48417 USA	13591 Germany	p0s	p6a	p6c	h1g
48624 USA	13591 Germany	p0s	p6a	p6c	h2v
48624 USA	20153 Germany	p0s	p6a	p6c	h4e
48640 USA	38106 Germany	p0s	p6a	p6l	h7w
48642 USA	46282 Germany	p0s	p6a	p7a	h7w
48642 USA	46282 Germany	p0s	p6a	p7a	j0b
48732 USA	48495 Germany	p0s	p6a	p7b	j0j
48801 USA	4000 Australia	p0s	p6a	p7b	j0k
49045 USA	4000 Australia	p0s	p6a	p7b	j1j
49085 USA	6284 Australia	p0s	p6a	p7g	j1j
49085 USA	6284 Australia	p0s	p6a	p7g	j4j
49224 USA	8020 Austria	p0t	p6a	p7g	j5l
49405 USA	8020 Austria	p0t	p6a	p8n	j5l
49456 USA	74250 France	p0t	p6a	p8n	j6j
49456-9607 USA	700064 India	p0t	p6a		j7a
49684 USA	700064 India	p0t	p6a		j7a
49783 USA	28850 Spain	p0t	p6a		j7m
49829 USA	48890 Spain	p0z	p6a		j7m
49829 USA	r4s9v6 UK	p1b	p6a		j9p
49894 USA	rh14av UK	p1h	p6a		j9x
49894 USA		p1h	p6a		j9x
49930 USA		p3a	p6a		k0e
50208 USA		p3e	p6a		k0e
50208 USA		p3e	p6a		k0g
52722 USA		p3e	p6a		k0k

Alona Bay SL Non "P" Codes	Alona Bay SL Non "P" Codes	Alona Bay SL Non "P" Codes	Alona Bay SL Non "P" Codes	Alona Bay SL Non "P" Codes	Alona Bay SL Non "P" Codes
k0k	l1j	l8v	n0b	n9v	v0h
k0l	l1j	l9p	n0b	n9y	v0j
k0l	l1k	l9r	n0b	r0a	v1j
k0m	l1n	l9s	n0g	r0e	v1j
k0m	l1n	l9s	n0g	r0e	v1p
k0m	l1w	l9s	n0g	r0g	v2a
k0z	l1w	l9t	n0g	r0j	v3b
k1g	l2m	l9w	n0g	r0l	v3b
k1g	l2m	l9y	n0g	r0t	v3j
k1l	l2v	l9z	n0h	r0z	v3t
k1m	l3m	l9z	n0h	r2l	v5e
k1t	l3p	l9z	n0h	r2p	v5l
k1v	l3p	l9z	n0j	r2p	v6x
k1z	l3v	m1c	n0l	r2p	y4v
k1z	l3v	m1p	n0m	r2r	
k2c	l3x	m1r	n0p	r2r	
k2g	l3y	m2h	n0r	r2y	
k2g	l3y	m2h	n1b	r3h	
k2g	l4n	m3b	n1g	r3m	
k4a	l4t	m3b	n1g	r3t	
k7h	l4y	m3c	n1t	r3v	
k7r	l5a	m3k	n2a	r3v	
k7s	l5b	m3k	n2a	s0a	
K8A	l5b	m3k	n2c	s0a	
k9h	l5e	m4c	n2l	s4s	
k9h	l5m	m4c	n2n	s6h	
k9k	l5r	m4n	n2z	s6s	
l0a	l5r	m4s	n2z	s7l	
l0a	l6j	m4w	n4k	s7l	
l0b	l6j	m4w	n4k	t0b	
l0c	l6m	m5r	n4k	t0b	
l0c	l6m	m5r	n4s	t0c	
l0c	l6r	m5v	n4s	t0m	
l0e	l6t	m5v	n4s	t0m	
l0e	l6t	m5v	n4s	t1v	
l0g	l6t	m5v	n6h	t1v	
l0k	l6t	m6c	N7M	t2v	
l0k	l6v	m6l	N7M	t3b	
l0k	l6v	m9a	N7M	t6e	
l0l	l6y	m9a	N7M	t7e	
l0l	l7a	m9a	n7t	t7e	
l0l	l7b	m9b	n7v	t7e	
l0l	l7c	m9c	n7v	t7z	
l0r	l7j	m9m	n8n	t7z	
l1a	l7l	m9v	n8n	t8a	
l1g	l7l	n0b	n8s	t8a	
l1g	l7m	n0b	n9j	t8s	
l1g	l8v	n0b	n9v	v0h	

Tourist Ops Non "P" Codes	Tourist Ops "P" Codes	Other locations Non "P" Codes	Other locations "P" Codes	Other locations "P" Codes
48178 USA	p0s	48135 USA	p0b	p6a
	p0s	48135 USA	p0b	p6a
	p0s	k1j	p0s	p6a
	p0s	l0k	p0s	p6a
	p0s	l4n	p0s	p6a
	p0s	l4n	p0s	p6a
	p0s	m4m	p0s	p6a
	p0s	n1g	p0s	p6a
	p0s	n1g	p0s	p6a
	p0s	n2j	p0s	p6a
	p0s	n2k	p0s	p6a
	p0s	n4w	p0s	p6a
	p0s	n4w	p0s	p6a
	p0s	n6c	p0s	p6a
	p0s		p0s	p6a
	p0s		p0s	p6a
	p0s		p0s	p6a
	p0s		p0s	p6a
	p0s		p0s	p6a
	p0s		p0s	p6a
	p0s		p0s	p6a
	p0s		p0s	p6a
	p0s		p0s	p6a
	p6a		p0s	p6a
	p6b		p0s	p6a
	p6b		p0s	p6b
	p6b		p0s	p6b
	p6b		p0s	p6b
	p6b		p0s	p6b
	p6b		p0s	p6b
	p6b		p0s	p6b
	p6b		p0s	p6b
	p6b		p0s	p6b
	p6c		p0s	p6b
			p0s	p6b
			p0s	p6c
			p0s	p6c
			p2a	p6c
			p2a	p6c
			p6a	p6c
			p6a	p6c
			p6a	p6c
			p6a	p6c
			p6a	p6c
			p6a	p6c
			p6a	p7b
			p6a	p7c
			p6a	

Sample of Letter to Premier McGuinty

Date:

Dalton McGuinty, Premier
Legislative Building
Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier McGuinty,

I wish to express my objection to the wanton industrialization of Lake Superior's wilderness allure, it is a Canadian Natural and Cultural Treasure.

This region has inspired artists such as the Group of Seven and continues to evoke pride in residents of Ontario and admiration from foreign visitors. The landscape values which are the basis of the local tourism economy as well as being evidence of an intact and vital ecosystem should be protected from being fragmented and destroyed by industrial wind turbine projects.

In light of the Auditor General 2011 report which revealed that there was NO proper cost/benefit analysis to prove the case for these new renewable energy developments, it is urgent that you act immediately to halt them NOW. I urge you to stop the unconscionable waste of natural biodiversity and water quality protection which is inherent in this minimally impacted and vitally important Great Lakes watershed.

Sincerely,