

2/17/15

Jon Hawley:

Thank you for attending the Elizabeth City Educational Event last Tuesday (2/10/15). It was unfortunate that you didn't have the time to speak to me, or email me, to fact-check information. A few minutes doing that would have resulted in fewer errors and misunderstandings. For example:

1 - I'm not a "part time" resident of Morehead City, as that has been our permanent, legal home address, for several years now. (*In any case, what relevance does this have to wind energy?*)

2 - I'm not a "Realtor" (which is a legal name for broker members of the National Association of Realtors). Furthermore, I have no real estate broker's license in NC. (*Again, what relevance does this have to wind energy?*)

3 - This gathering was not a "Republican Party meeting." Rather, this was a free educational event, open to the public. As you noted the developer was in attendance, and he is not a member of the local Republican party.

4 - Politically speaking I am an independent (not a registered Conservative as was implied). This technical matter has nothing to do with politics anyway, so once again, I'm not sure why this is relevant.

5 - I never "pushed the General Assembly to adopt legislation effectively banning the use of computer modeling in the prediction of climate change." Not sure what inaccurate internet source you came across, but that is **totally false**.

6 - I am unaware of any "American Association for the Advancement of Science" information I referenced regarding agricultural losses. Instead (as is clearly identified on WiseEnergy.org) the bat related [agricultural study](#) was authored by four of the world's leading bat experts, all PhDs.

7 - Not sure what "2014 Scientific American" article you are referring to, or your scientific qualifications to research and evaluate Chiropterology. Yes bat deaths can be reduced by shutting off turbines — but then what's the point?

8 - Despite the article's implication, no turbine-bat solution has been proven to be: effective, or cost effective. Further, neither the Pasquotank nor

Perquimans wind ordinance requires bat remediation — and (not surprisingly) Iberdrola has not agreed to do any. That was the point.

9 - Yes, years ago I was an unpaid fellow for ATI. *What relevance does this have to wind energy or that meeting?* If your objective was to list my past associations, I was also a very active Sierra Club member — for longer than my informal ATI association. Why wasn't that mentioned?

10-It's interesting that Iberdrola's response focused on some things I never said. For example I never mentioned the words "intermittency" or "shadow flicker." Evidently you were not aware that you were sent a canned marketing pitch.

11-My main point was that there is no scientific proof that industrial wind energy is a **net societal benefit**. I hope you noted that Iberdrola provided no such proof.

12-Their comment regarding noise was humorous, but this is a very serious health matter. The primary acoustical problem is **not** the sounds that are heard, but infrasound (which is felt, not heard). Studies by independent acoustical experts (e.g. [here](#)) have concluded that the best way to minimize these harmful infrasounds is to use a proxy regulation of 35 DBa. Of course, Iberdrola knows all this — but this is about deceiving the public, and they are counting on the fact that the media does not understand this matter.

Again, I'm sorry you didn't have the time to speak to me after the meeting, or to correspond with me via email, as we could have cleared all this up beforehand. I took the time to write out all this as I'm still assuming that your objective is to write a factually accurate piece, and to provide information that is helpful for your community.

Please let me know any questions.

Sincerely,

john droz, jr.  
physicist  
Morehead City, NC

cc Michael Goodman (Publisher)