April 26 2018

Dr. Doug Ramsey

*Journal of Rural and*

*Community Development*

RE: Article re-submission

Dear Dr. Ramsey:

It is a pleasure to re-submit our article for review in an upcoming issue of the Journal of Rural and Community Development. On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you for all your help so far and are grateful for the insightful comments that were given during the first round of review. We agree the one review was comprehensive and changes made as a result have made the paper a great fit for JRCD. As requested, we outline the major changes to the paper below. They correspond to the reviewer’s four major concerns. All other minor changes that were suggested, including adherence to APA guidelines, were completed. We sincerely hope you find this version of the paper a pleasure to read and hope it contributes to the journal and the discussion surrounding environmental injustice and rural communities in Canada more generally.

1. We have now gone through the introduction, identified places where topics were not well defined or explained, and made the appropriate changes (e.g. see the move to post-productive countryside(s), declining rural populations, and rurality). Attention has also been paid to better explain the “urban-based policy interests and governance system” (see new discussion around McAllister’s (2004) work) and the ideological distinction piece (added two sentences, plus cited the work by Bittner, 2007).

In adding to the context given in Section 2, we now more show evidence of how these developments were built in line with the province’s goals. Indeed, we cite these reasons along with those from industry as well regarding the promoted benefits of such developments. Evidence is now provided to show how the two developments were built largely to “benefit the provinces largest urban areas” (i.e. see the discussion around IESO, 2018 and Lystek, 2018).

1. Much more detail (see start of Section 2) is now included for why we chose the use of the multiple case study (MCS) approach. We explain that because of the theoretical compatibility — largely related to the environmental justice framework applied to an urban-rural divide — between the cases, MCS was a good choice and that this provided a unique window for collaboration. More detail is now given regarding variables like capacity of the wind farms, layout, etc. though we feel extensive comparisons between the two are not necessary for the qualitative nature of this research. Further to this, the key comparable variable is the development or urban governance processes in rural space. A direct comparison between such processes will typically be thwarted by the idiosyncrasies of each development type. Our concern was the progress of these developments and their comparable spatial lineage from urban ideals to rural landscapes.
2. We now reference the NIMBY myth early on in the paper just to acknowledge how far the literature has come in recent years as well as to set the stage for the NOPIMPY (No Outside Problems In My Backyard) we find throughout our results and speak to in the discussion. We have now better developed this concept and set it out as a stand-alone paragraph in the introduction, rather than mentioning it in passing in one of the case descriptions as previously done.

A deeper reading within the literature that was mentioned was done and the additions have been made to the Introduction and Methods (research context) sections with regard to your suggestions to speak more to acceptance/rejection factors. Indeed, in this way the suggestion to read the recent work from Walker and Fast have proven to be very important to give the reader the latest in this area

1. More literature is cited on ideas of procedural and distributive justice related to sustainable developments in the rural landscape; yet we do not elaborate further because that research was not set within the emerging environmental justice framework related to rurality and/or the urban-rural stance we take. This issue emerged from our qualitative findings.

We resist the suggestion to create testable ideas through this qualitative research. While further theorization on rural bias will rely on increased empirical research, our intent is not to influence or hamper future researchers in their design to interrogate the idea. Our goal is to provide evidence for the concept based on existing case study research which organically produced a conceptual vision of urban/rural divide that was grounded in our robust data sets from the respective case studies.

With specific reference to Section 3, our key engagement with environment justice is the distinction between policy development as a spatial process in the urban and policy implementation as a process on the rural landscape. We argue then that the rurality of a site can be a driving condition of environmental injustice akin to other factors that are marginalized in environmental policy making. We talk about these other groups in the introduction (see “race, class or income”) and argue for this “broadening definition of environmental justice” via rurality within the discussion

While the discussion around the term ‘escape’ is not easily connected to the environmental justice literature, we include it in this manuscript as it further amplifies residents’ conceptions of urban byproducts and resource production in the rural landscape as out of place and unfairly distributed. As residents’ move to ‘escape’ urban centres, they are set to resist the risks of urban resource and waste management demands perceived to be inequitably distributed.

Sincerely,



Dr. Chad J.R. Walker

Postdoctoral Fellow

Queen’s University