Executive Order 2009-49 Charge

- Inform, engage, and solicit feedback from the people of Michigan on the identified most favorable leasing locations
- Provide guidance to the State Wind Outreach Team (SWOT) in the team’s execution of an outreach and education plan related to offshore wind energy
- Provide input on proposed and new Great Lakes wind development legislation and rulemaking as appropriate, including a process for public engagement in the decision-making and development processes
Recent Council Public Engagement Activities

- Hosted public events in three coastal communities (Saginaw Valley, Escanaba, and Muskegon)
- Received ~ 300 individual pieces of correspondence through website, e-mail, and U.S. mail
- Established e-mail distribution list for council updates and offshore wind energy developments
- Provided speakers at various events (Rotary, chamber)
- Provided recommendations on public engagement processes for consideration in the development of legislation and rules

Coastal Community Meetings

- Purpose of meetings:
  - Provide educational materials about wind development
  - Present the most favorable leasing locations as of January 2010
  - Present legislative recommendations
  - Solicit feedback from the public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place and date</th>
<th>Approximate number of attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw (March 25, 2010)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escanaba (April 14, 2010)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon (May 4, 2010)</td>
<td>270+ (exceeded room capacity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Evaluation Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOW Community Meeting Evaluations (Saginaw Valley, Escanaba, Muskegon)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree (94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coastal Community Meetings—Interactive Polling

- 350 people participated in interactive polling related to offshore wind energy (26 questions)
- Purposes:
  - Give everyone equal time and opportunity to record their opinions
  - Give participants a sense of their neighbors’ opinions through instant feedback
  - Provide data for council consideration and for use by social scientists in the future
Caveat - Who did we sample?

- Coastal community venues
  - This is NOT a statewide population sample
- Demographic question could not get zips…
  - “residence with a view”
  - About 30% of these respondents own lakefront
  - This sample represents less than 5% citizens
- Sampling of inland stakeholders proposed

Coastal Community Meetings—Interactive Polling (cont.)

- Four sets of questions:
  - How support for offshore wind energy compared to other power sources to meet the state’s new renewable portfolio standard (RPS)
  - How distances from shore might influence public opinions and perceptions
  - Gauge perceptions on impacts of a wind farm on various issues (fishing, boating, energy prices, tourism, aesthetics, job creation, etc.)
  - Demographic questions to compare respondent groups
Q3. To what extent do you support development of commercial wind farms on land to help utilities meet the Renewable Portfolio Standard?

- Strongly support: 52%
- Support: 26%
- Neutral: 7%
- Oppose: 5%
- Strongly oppose: 8%
- Unsure: 2%

Q4. To what extent do you support development of commercial wind farms offshore to help utilities meet the Renewable Portfolio Standard?

- Strongly support: 47%
- Support: 18%
- Neutral: 7%
- Oppose: 5%
- Strongly oppose: 22%
- Unsure: 1%
Preferences and Location of Residence

- Answers of coastal residents (~1/3 of all respondents) differed significantly from inland resident answers.

Q5. Suppose that instead of an offshore wind project, a natural gas power plant was proposed near the shoreline. Would you be more or less likely to support this than a wind project?

- Support: 21%
- More likely to support: 52%
- Neutral: 22%
- Oppose: 52%
- Unsure: 5%
Q6. Suppose that instead of an offshore wind project, a **nuclear power plant** was proposed near the shoreline. Would you be more or less likely to support this than a wind project?

- Support: 27%
- Neutral: 13%
- Oppose: 56%
- Unsure: 4%

Q7. Suppose that instead of an offshore wind project, a **coal power plant** was proposed near the shoreline. Would you be more or less likely to support this than a wind project?

- Support: 16%
- Neutral: 13%
- Oppose: 69%
- Unsure: 2%
Polling Results—Perceptions of Offshore Wind Farm Visuals

- Percentage of respondents who would support offshore wind development like the one presented in photos shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo (approximate distance from shore)</th>
<th>Percent support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photo A (6 miles)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo B (13 miles)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo C (20 miles)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twelve Questions About Positive and Negative Impacts of Offshore Wind Energy

- On scale of 1 to 5, “How do you think this project [Photo A] would affect ___________?”
  - Michigan job creation
  - U.S. energy independence
  - Air quality
  - Climate change
  - Fishing
  - Tourism related business
  - Aquatic life
  - Electricity rates
  - Recreational boating
  - Property values
  - Aesthetics of lake view
  - Birds and/or bats

Opinions and Perceptions

- Fairly even distribution across benefit-harm scale for fishing, tourism, electricity rates, boating, and aquatic life impacts
- Stronger perception of negative impacts for aesthetics and avian impacts
- Stronger perception of positive impacts for jobs, air quality, climate change, and energy independence
Q27. Compared with how you felt before this meeting, how have your opinions of offshore wind on the Great Lakes changed?

- More supportive: 40%
- Less supportive: 1%
- More opposed: 15%
- Less opposed: 2%
- No change: 41%
Q28. Do you agree or disagree with this statement? The Great Lakes Offshore Wind Council is acting openly and transparently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Top Discussion and Additional Input at Coastal Meetings

- Handout question: You just learned about the council’s exclusion areas and buffering criteria. Do they seem reasonable and comprehensive for new statewide policy and planning?
- Responses:
  - YES (count = 76)
  - NO (count = 21)
  - INDISCERNIBLE (count = 26)
  - NO RESPONSE (count = 24)
Unique ideas and questions (not addressed in the council’s presentations)

Excerpted from table top discussion sheets:

- “Are you aware there is an important butterfly migration in northern Lake Michigan, perhaps near the Delta [WRA] area?”
- “Small boats do not have radar to avoid towers in a dense fog.”
- “Will counties with affected viewsheds be allocated an extra portion of revenues?”
- “The people that live on the shores of the Great Lakes do not own the lake.”
- “Get rid of fossil fuel and nuclear subsidies.”
- “GLOW should consider cost.”
- “No mention was made of offshore ice…”

Excerpted from table top discussion sheets:

- “I was worried about a company coming into an area and bulldozing a project through that doesn’t meet official goals.”
- “200 rusting hulks would not be conducive to tourism.”
- “No permitting for foreign, inexperienced companies.”
- “Shoreline counties need veto power.”
- “Why are we not requiring the new gearless [low oil, low maintenance] turbines?”
- “Interior of farm would produce higher fish populations because of reef effect, could boaters go inside?”
- “Need a realistic future cost of various electrical energy options.”
Correspondence Received by Council

- ~300 individual pieces of correspondence received through website, e-mail, and U.S. mail
- Scandia Aegir project impetus for most comments
- Majority of correspondence expressed concerns/opposition but increasing number of favorable comments more recently
- Common issues or questions raised in correspondence related to:
  - Distance from shore
  - Role of local governments and the public in siting and permitting decisions
  - Effects on tourism, wildlife, fisheries (including access issues), property values
  - Public trust
  - Economic growth/job creation
  - Accuracy/completeness of mapping data used by council

---

Sent: Tuesday, March 09, 2010 3:22 PM  
To: DeBeaussaert, Ken (DNRE)  
Subject: A message from David Klooster  
Follow Up Flag: Follow up  
Flag Status: Flagged

You have received the following message through the Contact Us form on your Microsoft Office Live Small Business Web site:

From: David Klooster  
E-mail: klooster@hope.edu  
Message:  
Please do not allow the Scandia Off-Shore Wind Project to go forward. The exploitation of Michigan natural resources by foreign companies is unacceptable. The project will produce no significant jobs for Michigan residents and it will destroy our best natural resource—the Lake Michigan tourist attraction. And if we begin selling off our natural resources, where will we stop? Will it be possible later on to block additional wind factories like this one? Will we be able to stop efforts to divert our fresh water to other states or countries? I think the project is a terrible idea, and I hope you will fulfill your duties to the people of Michigan by doing all that you can to block this project.

David Klooster  
~property owner in Mason and Ottawa counties.
**EXHIBIT 4**
Major Themes from Public Correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Reasons Stated</th>
<th>Example Excerpt from Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for offshore wind energy</strong></td>
<td>job creation/economic opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was born and raised in Muskegon, Michigan. We have the highest unemployment rate in the nation. Not only do we want wind power... we need it. Muskegon is a wonderful place to live, and it can't exist the way that we might go under. We NEED this in our area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clean, renewable energy</strong></td>
<td>The lakefront is an ideal location for producing needed energy and SHOULD BE USED. Periodically, I would like to look out offshore and see windmills, knowing that they are producing clean energy rather than adding more coal/gas plants. Everywhere we look these days we hear the NIMBY cry. Well, it is time to get over it if it means not getting another ugly and polluting coal, gas, or nuclear plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinion on offshore wind project</strong></td>
<td>I am writing to voice my opposition and request your consideration in denying development of wind-energy projects currently being targeted for Lake Michigan. Your support in keeping Lake Michigan pristine and undisturbed is greatly appreciated and needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism impacts</strong></td>
<td>Long-term negative impact on tourism. Tourism, currently a primary source of jobs, will undoubtedly be negatively impacted. Families come to Western Michigan for its natural beauty—nothing is beautiful about large wind turbines next to the shores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Habitat impacts</strong></td>
<td>The rapidly spinning blades would kill much of the avian life in the area, including bald eagles, ospreys, geese, ducks, monarchs, and other birds and wildlife.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other comments and questions**

**Public access for fishing and boating near turbines**

**Question:** Would any area built be off limits to people or could fishing still be done in the area?
Hello Mr. Graft, I'll be brief.

I support wind turbines on land and in the water. We need the jobs.

I have been building the big turbines for two years now.

Enjoy my pics from work. I took them last August in Wolcott, Indiana.

I'm an electrician in Lansing Local 665.
For More Information

- Go to: www.michiganglowcouncil.org for summary report from Public Engagement Work Group (click on Meeting Information, June 28 meeting)