

This is a set of correspondences with the *Daily Advance* (Elizabeth City, NC) about my objection to numerous errors in their article (2/16/15) about the local education event that I was involved with (2/10/15)...

On Feb 20, 2015, at 7:26 PM, Jon Hawley wrote:

Mr. Droz,

The correction text as published on Friday (2/20/15) is below. Thank you,

Jon Hawley

An article in Monday's edition of The Daily Advance about wind energy skeptic John Droz Jr.'s recent talk about Iberdrola Renewables' proposed Desert Wind project in Pasquotank County contained several errors.

The article incorrectly stated that Droz "made waves several years ago pushing the General Assembly to adopt legislation effectively banning the use of computer modeling in the prediction of climate change and repealing the state's renewable energy mandates on utilities." Droz did not advocate against modeling. He did support legislation restricting the state to only using historical data, rather than accelerated projections some argued accounted for climate change, in projecting sea level rise and requiring the N.C. Division of Coastal Management to handle sea level projections rather than a Coastal Resources Commission advisory body whose findings Droz argued weren't accurate.

The same article incorrectly described Droz as a part-time resident of Morehead City and a Realtor. Droz is a full-time resident of Morehead City and is not a Realtor.

Also, the article incorrectly attributed a report on the agricultural value of bats to the American Association of the Advancement of Science. The report is available through the association but its authors are Justin Boyles, Paul Cryan, Gary McCracken and Thomas Kunz, scientists based at various universities.

My response to the *Daily Advance* reporter, Jon Hawley, is on the next page...

On Feb 20, 2015, at 7:41 PM, John Droz wrote:

Jon Hawley:

Thank you for taking the time to correct some of the errors in the initial article about our Elizabeth City Education Event.

FYI, my objection to the CRC advisory Panel's 2010 NC Sea Level Rise report was **not** that it was inaccurate — but rather that it was not done in a scientific manner. That also was the belief of the state legislators (including several Democrats) when they voted to outlaw it.

Interestingly, just today, we heard from two independent PhD Oceanographers who had agreed to do a peer review of this same Panel's 2015 version of this SLR report...

These two PhDs wrote the CRC chairman that they were terminating their peer review, because the Panel was acting in an unscientific manner...

They, like me, are NOT disputing the results, but rather the methodology. BIG DIFFERENCE!

Regards,

john droz, jr.

Note: *since not all of the errors were corrected, I again attempted to have the Daily Advance newspaper publish an op-ed/LTE....*

2/21/15 [to Michael Goodman (Publisher of the *Daily Advance*)]:

Michael:

I am updating my submission for an op-ed.

Please let me know any questions.

Since I am not a paid subscriber I'd appreciate being informed when this is published.

john droz, jr.

physicist

Morehead City, NC

I appreciate that a *DA* reporter attended the Elizabeth City wind energy educational meeting on 2/10/15. An article appeared in the *DA* on 2/16, followed by some corrections on 2/20. I'm writing this as there are still several issues that need clarification. For example:

1 - This gathering was not a "Republican Party meeting." Rather, this was a free educational event, open to the public. Politically speaking I am an independent (not a registered Conservative as was implied). This technical matter has nothing to do with politics anyway.

2 - Since there seemed to be an interest to list my past associations, I was also a very active Sierra Club member — for longer than my informal unpaid association with ATI.

3 - Yes bat deaths can be reduced by shutting off turbines — but then what's the point? Despite the article's implication, no turbine-bat solution has been proven to be: helpful, 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 message.

4 - 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 they simply sent the *DA* a canned marketing pitch.

5 - Iberdrola's 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 fooling the public, and they are counting on the fact that the media does not understand this matter.

6 - My main point was that there is no scientific proof that industrial wind energy is a **net societal benefit**. Iberdrola's response provided no such proof.

See WiseEnergy.org/desert_wind for much more information.