

## **A Carteret News Times Letter to the Editor**

We thank Mr. Scull (Sierra Club) for clarifying his recent public remarks in his Friday [letter](#) to the CNT. These are brief responses to his assertions. The DOD ClearingHouse process is not a true evaluation of the impact on Cherry Point's mission. The DODCH has one criteria for assessing a wind project: is it an unfixable threat to national security? In some 4000 applications, zero have met that arbitrary standard... Additionally, ALL active military have been ordered to stand-down regarding making any negative comments about wind energy. Between those two realities, it is very clear that the DOD process is not designed to be an objective assessment of Mill Pond's impact on Cherry Point, or anything else. It is totally politicized — just what Mr. Scull objects to!

Secondly, we HAVE contacted Texas and other states that have been inflicted with wind. They say that they have only done it for the handouts and mandates arranged by wind lobbyists, like the Sierra Club. None of these were free market choices, so an implication that they “chose” wind energy because of its “merits” is false. No state uses wind energy simply because it is more economical, or more reliable, than conventional energy sources. The Sierra Club is paid to repeat the inaccurate claim about wind replacing coal and oil, which is almost never true.

Additionally when we hear that “20% of some state's electricity” is supplied by wind energy, we naturally believe that this means that 20% of that state's electrical needs are met, 24/7/365 by wind energy. That is totally false, as no state has even 1% of their electricity needs met by wind energy 24/7/365.

Further, this business about fossil fuel subsidies is also a shell game. First, wind energy is in the electrical energy sector, and should only be compared to other electrical energy sources. The Sierra Club does not do that, as it won't look good for wind energy. They throw in transportation sources hoping that consumers won't notice... Also when they say “fossil fuel subsidies” they count tax benefits (like depreciation) that ALL businesses get... To add insult to injury they ignore the fact that the larger “subsidies” provided the fossil fuel sources has produced a few hundred times the amount of energy that wind energy has... Further, fossil fuel electricity is reliable electricity, where wind energy is not. For the government to subsidize reliable electricity makes some sense — to subsidize unreliable electricity does not.

The Sierra Club says that it supports the “environmental and economic benefits of wind energy.” What they hope citizens do not notice is that they never talk about NET benefits. If they have scientific proof that there will be NET environmental and economic benefits to Carteret County, they should come forward with such proof. It does not exist so expect more malarky.

Lastly, we agree that citizens should not listen to one source — particularly when that source is handsomely paid to be a wind energy shill (see [“Bloomberg pays Sierra Club \\$50 Million”](#)). Our [WiseEnergy.org](#) website has many hundreds of studies and reports done by independent, mostly unpaid experts. Please check them out. The inescapable conclusion is that the Mill Pond project will likely be a net economics lose, a net jobs loser, a net environmental loser, and a real threat to Cherry Point’s existence.

John Droz, jr.

Physicist & environmental Advocate

12/28/13