Local Government Comments

- Received comments from 27 local governments
  - Two from Region 1 (Allegan)
  - Three from Region 2 (Antrim and Charlevoix)
  - Thirteen from Region 3 (Benzie, Leelanau, and Manistee)
  - Nine from Region 4 (Thumb)
- Comments from local governments outside of the four regions not included
## Comments from Local Governments in Each Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore Township</td>
<td>Charlevoix County</td>
<td>Benzie County</td>
<td>Fairgrove Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganges Township</td>
<td>Hayes Township</td>
<td>Bingham Township</td>
<td>Hampton Chartered Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Township</td>
<td>Cleveland Township</td>
<td>Empire Township</td>
<td>Lake Township, Huron County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frankfort City Council</td>
<td>Merritt Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glen Arbor Township</td>
<td>Paris Township, Huron County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Township, Benzie County</td>
<td>Saginaw County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leelanau County</td>
<td>Township of Caseville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Planning Commission)</td>
<td>Township of Forester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leelanau Heritage Route(M-22) Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leelanau Township</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leland Township</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Platte Township</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Village of Northport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Impressions

- Most positive in Thumb area
  - Economic opportunity
  - Not uniform position (e.g., Lake Township)

- Least positive in Leelanau/Sleeping Bear Dunes area
  - Commercial-scale wind development incompatible with existing or future uses
  - Treatment of Sleeping Bear Dunes and inland lakes

- Setbacks for homes a concern for some
Executive Summary

Information is clearly presented

Information is accurate

Conclusions seem appropriate

Legend:
- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree
- No position

Percentages: 0% to 100%
Key Concerns – Exclusion Criteria

- Airports – accuracy of data
- Home setbacks
- Shoreline/USFWS guidelines
- Inland lakes – treat like shoreline
- Additional exclusion areas proposed
  - Mineral extraction zones
  - National parks (Sleeping Bear Dunes)
  - Private roads
  - State parks
- Not clear which exclusion areas actually excluded; need better maps
Selection of Regions

- Limited suitability of land and existing uses for wind development
- Community opposition to wind projects
- Limited amount of land under proposed leases by wind developers
- Quality of wind resources not as good as other areas

- Good quality wind
- Suitability of land and existing uses for wind development
- Potential positive local economic impacts (e.g., leases, tax payments, jobs)
- Community acceptance of or support for wind projects
Public Sentiment in Community

**Question 5:** Public sentiment may affect the viability of wind as a commercial source of energy generation. How would you generally describe public sentiment related to wind energy development on land in your county, city, town, or village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentiment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided or neutral</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas Zoned Residential

Approximate percentage of land that is zoned for residential use only:

- 0–25%: 74%
- 26–50%: 16%
- 51–75%: 5%
- 76–100%: 0%
- Do not know: 5%
Local Ordinances

**Question 7:** Does your local unit of government have ordinances or requirements that may affect the land available for potential use by wind energy systems and the estimates of wind energy production potential in your area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Yes (please explain):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Concerns

- Impacts on tourism, views, property values, etc., from utility-scale development
- Wildlife impact not considered
- Lack of electric transmission
- Development expectations for four regions too high
  - Spread out development among nine regions
- Zone designation – need standards and more information and analysis
Additional Comments

- Need better maps
  - Scale and resolution
  - Application of exclusion criteria
- Wind energy systems in service – update for Huron County
- Capacity vs. energy; TCL&P operates 10 percent of time
- Change meters to feet
Process-Related Concerns

- Board representation limited
- Comment period too short
- Request for hearing in Region 2/Charlevoix
  - Requested by Norwood Township
- Different deadlines for comments
  - August 4 vs. September 8
Next Steps

- Draft new section for final report
  - Describe comment and hearing process
  - Update “in region” local government data, if needed
  - Include public hearing comments
  - Summarize “all other” comments, including other local governments
- Work with board on other revisions to report
- Final report due October 15