

## John Droz Mill Pond Talk ([MAC LAC](#) - 12/19/13)

Good Afternoon.

I appreciate the opportunity to very briefly talk today about the proposed Carteret County [Mill Pond](#) wind project, plus a bit about wind energy in general... I want to thank Senator Brown and his energetic aide Darryl Black, for the invite.

This isn't about me, but I'm a physicist (w energy expertise), who has worked for over 30 years on environmental issues, all on my own dime... I've given free energy and science presentations in some ten states now. For example, in October I was sponsored by the House Science & Technology Committee to speak for an hour to Congress.

This energy business is complicated stuff, so I often get asked "*Can you condense the situation with wind energy down to a soundbite?*" Yes, here it is:

**Wind Energy is High Cost, with Very Low Benefits.**

*My* basic position is also simple:

"We do have environmental & energy issues — *and* they need to be solved using **genuine** Science." That's it.

But as logical as that sounds, it's not happening — as our energy & environmental policies are **not based on science**. Instead our policies (like [Senate Bill 3](#)) are being dictated by lobbyists who are representing those with financial interests, or political agendas. That's how we end up with problematic situations like the proposed Mill Pond facility.

I **strongly** favor exploring alternative energy options, **but**, no alternatives should be allowed on the *public* grid until there is *scientific proof*, that they are a **net societal benefit**...

That scientific proof would consist of an objective, transparent and empirical assessment of the **technical**, **economic**, and **environmental** consequences of the proposed energy source.

Those that passed such screening would join the quality ranks of “All of the Sensible” — as compared to the rogues gallery that results from the “All of the Above” self-serving energy policy, promoted by lobbyist.

No such scientific proof exists for wind energy in general, and certainly no such proof exists for Mill Pond.

In fact, the evidence available indicates that Mill Pond:

- will be a **net** technical loser,
- will be a **net** economics loser,
- will be a **net** jobs loser, *and*
- will be a **net** environmental loser to our community.

I don't have the time today to explain the details, but all of this is well-documented on our website: [WiseEnergy.org](http://WiseEnergy.org) — just go to the NC menu.

Note that these conclusions are **before** taking into account anything to do with Cherry Point MCAS! Unfortunately, the Mill Pond project is also a *substantial* threat to the operation of that major \$2+ Billion a year base.

Briefly this is due to two issues: **obstructions**, and **radar interference**.

The numerous 500± foot turbine obstacles are directly on Cherry Point's main flight-landing glide-path: Runway 32, left approach. Despite the developer's perfunctory assurances, during adverse weather, **or** when an aircraft has mechanical problems, these obstacles represent a **serious peril**. We have a good [diagram](#) showing this, on our website. And BTW, for a variety of technical reasons, the right-hand approach to Runway 32 is not an acceptable alternative.

Regarding the radar impact, here are two telling statements. The **first** is from the Airspace Coordinator of Marine Corps Installation East:

“Wind turbine blades can distort the radar image for both ground control **and pilots**. That distortion can make it difficult for Marine training exercises, as well as make it more dangerous to fly.” [Note that any radar retrofitting would have to be done to ground control **and** all aircraft.]

Second, consider this Canadian Air Force [report](#), released just last month. (*Note that those people are not burdened by the same political correctness constraints, as our military currently is.*) Their official conclusion was:

“A wind facility will create areas where **we can not reliably observe or control, military or civilian air traffic.**”

So, in addition to Mill Pond being a net technical loser, a net economics loser, a net jobs loser, *and* a net environmental loser, we can also add to its resume that it has maybe put Cherry Point in [BRAC](#) jeopardy. *Isn't Senate Bill 3 great?*

But, some may ask: “*What about H484?*” Good question.

As most of you probably know, [H484](#) mainly came about due to the Seymour-Johnson affair. H484 started out with lofty objectives, but it's a classic example of how a lobbyist-influenced political process can undermine even the best of intentions. The politest way I can say it, is that H484 ended up being little more than a shell of what it should have been. On our website is a [document](#) that has a line-by-line explanation of its deficiencies.

*I'll wrap up here by giving just one example of a H484 defect:*

- 1 - A significant problem with industrial wind energy facilities is the scientifically proven adverse health consequences to some nearby citizens.
- 2 - In the eight pages of 484 there is but one single sentence {§143-215.119. (a)(8)} that addresses any human health concern, which is a requirement that there be:  
“A study of the noise impacts of the turbines associated with the proposed wind energy facility...”
- 3 - The first problem with this should be obvious: *this is an **undefined** permitting condition.*
- 4 - Then 484 was written so that it's up to the *developer* to determine what noise tests are done for *his* project!
- 5 - It's then eroded further because the developer is allowed to employ his favorite hired-gun to conduct such tests.
- 6 - If that wasn't enough, the permit approval part of H484 {§143-215.120. (a)} lists all the reasons that an application may be denied — like, if the wind project has an adverse impact on fish, or wildlife, or cultural sites, or state park views. But, there is not a *single word* that allows a denial due to health and safety impacts on nearby citizens!

In my view this is woefully inadequate. Hopefully the H484 deficiencies will be fixed in the next session. In any case I appeal to this committee to take a firm position **against this detrimental project**. I'll be glad to try to answer any questions you have, or you can email me later. Thank you.