

Ms. Rona Ambrose
Minister of Health
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0K9

Cc
Larry Miller, MP
Bruce- Grey-Owen Sound
larry.miller.c1@parl.gc.ca
July 9, 2015

Dear Minister Rona Ambrose,

Re: Please acknowledge receipt of this letter

Thank you very much for your June 24, 2015 response to my letter regarding my grave concern about wind turbine noise emissions, health effects and the authorities outlined in the Radiation Emitting Devices Act (REDA).

I am aware that provinces make decisions about the siting of industrial wind installations. In my opinion the decisions they have made in Ontario have created unlivable conditions for those chronically exposed to these projects.

I am also aware that the Health Canada website states the following:

Health Canada is the Federal department responsible for helping Canadians maintain and improve their health, while respecting individual choices and circumstances.

As a Canadian who has been suffering - not by choice - as a result of the operation of wind turbine projects near my home I was surprised and disturbed to hear that principal investigator David Michaud PhD testified under oath at an Environmental Review tribunal in Ontario, that the Health Canada Wind Turbine Noise and Health Study was administered under the authority of the REDA – a federal law.

ERT Case Nos. 13-084/13-085/13-086/13-087/13-088/13-089

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW TRIBUNAL

IN THE MATTER OF an appeal by Scott and Jennifer Dixon, Thomas and Catherine Ryan, Middlesex-Lambton Wind Action Group Inc. and Harvey Wrightman filed on July 16 and 17, 2013 for a Hearing before the Environmental Review Tribunal pursuant to section 142.1 of the Environmental Protection Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. E.19, as amended with respect to Renewable Energy Approval Number 7042-96FQB7 issued by the Director, Ministry of the Environment on July 2, 2013 to St. Columban Energy Inc., as general partner for and on behalf of St. Columban Energy L.P under section 47.5 of the Environmental Protection Act, regarding the construction, installation, operation, use and retiring of fifteen (15) wind turbine generator, Class 4 wind facility, with a total name plate capacity of 32.982 megawatts, located within Huron East Municipality, County of Huron, Ontario.

EVIDENCE OF DAVID MICHAUD

held at 655 Bay Street
16th Floor, Room 2
Toronto, Ontario
on Friday, October 4, 2013

2 "Concerns have been raised regarding possible
3 health risks to Canadian residents living in close
4 proximity to wind turbine installations." Are
5 these the concerns that you have already expressed
6 in your evidence that have come through phone calls
7 and e-mails and things of that nature?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Is there some type of
10 legislative authority under which Health Canada has
11 undertaken this study?

12 A. Yes, the Radiation Emitting
13 Devices Act.

14 Q. Can you explain to us the
15 Radiation Emitting Devices Act and how that relates
16 to wind turbines?

17 A. The simplest way to explain
18 it is that under that act acoustical energy is
19 defined as non-ionizing radiation. Wind turbines
20 emit acoustical radiation, therefore they are
21 considered a device under that act.

Upon researching the REDA it became clear to me and to others that this law has not been complied with by the wind industry.

The fact that for nearly a decade complaints from people in Canada exposed to the harmful emissions from wind turbines were simply ignored by wind proponents and manufacturers is distressing for me and my family and hundreds of families in Ontario alone. How is it they did not act according to the REDA?

I am sure the Ministry has received requests from wind turbine proponents as to the legal ramifications of the REDA? Do you know what advice was given?

You included the possible conditions in the REDA under which a proponent / importer or manufacturer reports complaints to your Ministry which are:

- **does not perform according to the performance characteristics claimed for it,**
- **does not accomplish its claimed purpose, or**
- **emits radiation that is not necessary in order for it to accomplish its claimed purpose.**

I believe without a doubt that at least one of these conditions has been met.

As Minister of Health you are no doubt well-versed with the explanation of *Community Annoyance* which is on your website that states:

Health Risks of Community Noise

The most common effect of community noise is annoyance, which is considered an adverse health effect by the World Health Organization. But noise may also affect your ability to have an ordinary conversation, enjoy some leisurely activities, get a good night's sleep, or do work that needs thought and concentration.

<http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hl-vs/iyh-vsv/life-vie/community-urbain-eng.php>

You are also aware that noise annoyance in the Health Canada Wind Turbine Noise and Health Study was found to be at a very high percentage of the population causing adverse effects at the 35dbA level also confirmed by the Council of Canadian Academies report released this spring which found a causal link of annoyance to harm.

Conclusions about causal relationships are therefore lacking for most of the health effects postulated in a wide variety of sources reviewed by the Panel, mainly as a result of lack of evidence or problems with the quality of evidence. However, research on environmental noise has shown that annoyance can be a contributing factor or precursor to adverse health effects such as sleep disturbance, stress and cardiovascular diseases. <http://www.scienceadvice.ca/>

More detailed research is available here in the CCA Appendix indicating the seriousness of annoyance and its causal link to wind turbine noise emissions:

<http://www.scienceadvice.ca/uploads/eng/assessments%20and%20publications%20and%20news%20releases/wind-turbine-noise/WindTurbineNoiseAppendixEn.pdf>

It is my understanding that Section 6 of the REDA states if a manufacturer or importer of a radiation emitting devices *becomes aware* of a complaint they "shall forthwith notify the Minister." Section 6 does not state that the manufacturer or the importer is to assess the complaint. The law clearly states that it is the role of the Ministry of Health Canada to initiate an investigation of the specific complaint.

The thousands of complaints written or phoned in to proponents and/or manufacturers since 2006 until now are logged in peoples' computers and with the importer/proponent or manufacturer of wind turbines.

How is it possible that not until July 2012 Health Canada had done nothing? Is it because they have received no record of complaints from the operators or manufacturers of wind turbines in Ontario? Do the wind companies know about the REDA?

A Q and A published by Health Canada in 2013 states:



Home > Environmental & Workplace Health > Consultations

Environmental and Workplace Health

Questions and Answers: Health Canada Wind Turbine Noise and Health Study

1. Why is Health Canada conducting research into the possible health effects of wind turbine noise?

Health Canada is aware of health-related complaints from individuals living in close proximity to wind turbine establishments. Globally, wind energy development is an area of expansion, and research is underway to support a broader evidence base on which international jurisdictions can base decisions.

Health Canada has expertise in measuring noise and assessing the health impacts of noise because of its role in administering the *Radiation Emitting Devices Act* (REDA). As defined under REDA, noise is a form of radiation. This expertise can contribute to global efforts to increase knowledge related to wind turbine noise.

I am very pleased to read that Health Canada remains committed to protecting the health and well-being of Canadians. However I am very aware that a randomized epidemiology study is not the same as an individual complaint investigation regarding radiation emitting devices.

Finally you state that:

There are no standards developed under the Act that apply specifically to wind turbines, and currently the weight of evidence does not support an association between the noise (radiation) from wind turbines and effects on human health.

My question is why are there no standards under the Act that apply specifically to wind turbines? The mere fact that a high percentage of the population suffers a number of serious health outcomes as a result of high annoyance as a result of exposure to wind turbines should be enough to give Health Canada pause as it did with tanning beds and formally halt wind turbine development until a proven safe setback distance has been settled.

I have read in documentation that when you were Minister of Labour in 2009 you acknowledged adverse reactions to wind turbines.

Health Canada's examination of the scientific literature on noise from IWTs determined the health effect "conclusively demonstrated" from exposure to wind turbine noise is an increase of self-reported general annoyance and complaints (i.e., headaches, nausea, tinnitus and vertigo).⁴¹

41. Correspondence from the Honourable Rona Ambrose. Obtained through freedom of information request. June 30, 2009. Date of FOI release: May 30, 2011. File # A-2010-03071.

Can J Rural Med 2014;19(1)

At that time did you receive advice about the REDA and if so would you possibly share that with me?

Health complaints submitted to either the manufacturer or importer/operator of wind projects in Canada since 2005 should not be dismissed but treated with the same consideration as an adverse reaction to any environmental pollutant causing harm to a population.

To summarize, I respectfully request that your office provide me with any legal knowledge on the REDA that indicates wind turbine proponents do not have to comply with this law.

I thank you for your assistance with this matter which is very important for me and my family and the growing number of Canadian voters soon to be adversely affected by more wind turbine installations.

Sincerely,

Virginia Stewart-Love
Grey Highlands
Ontario

