

To The North Carolina Northeast Commission

As a NC coastal resident, and as a person actively involved with promoting North Carolina, I am supportive of the NC's Northeast Commission's [stated objectives](#): to support the Economic Well-being and Quality of Life of your 16 County members.

I am concerned though, that unbridled enthusiasm for any "opportunity" can sometimes be misdirected. I know that the economies in your region are weak – but does that mean desperation, and an "any port in the storm" perspective?

It seems to me that every proposed business venture should be thoroughly and objectively evaluated. IMO only those that have proven NET societal benefits should be supported by the Commission. Please give that some serious thought...

Let's look at wind energy as an example. Consider the following:

1 - numerous studies by independent financial experts have concluded that wind energy is a NET jobs loser. *Why would the NE Commission support a business that will result in a net jobs loss to the community?*

As an example, over 40 of those reports are listed on [this page](#).

Additionally, as a local example, the NC Department of Commerce did a [study](#) of the proposed Desert Wind project (Elizabeth City), and concluded that "Nearly all of the upfront investment will be with firms located outside NC" and "The employment impacts for a project with this much initial investment is small."

2 - Likewise numerous studies done by independent experts have concluded that wind energy is a NET economics loser. *Why would the NE Commission support a business that will result in the community having a net financial loss?*

For example, four PhD world-class bat experts have written about the substantial [agriculture losses](#) due to bat deaths from wind turbines. Additionally they calculated the actual annual costs of these losses for each [North Carolina county](#). The average annual loss in Chowan County is projected at **\$3.8 million!**

As another example, your website rightly promotes [Travel & Tourism](#), saying that over 8 million visitors come to the Northeast NC area covered by your commission. Numerous studies have been done that have concluded that industrial wind energy will **reduce tourism**. Here is a [sample](#).

3 - [Dozens of studies](#) by independent experts have concluded that property values will decline in the vicinity of industrial wind developments. *Why would the NE Commission support a business that devalues the main investment of some local citizens?*

4 - Your website rightly pitches “[Quality of Life](#).” Over a hundred studies by independent health professionals (e.g. [this](#) and [this](#)) have concluded that industrial wind energy can have serious adverse health effects to citizens living near such projects. *Why would the NE Commission support a business that undermine health?*

5 - The negative environmental impact of industrial wind energy to host communities has also been well documented. Thousands of [bird](#) and [bat](#) kills, plus substantial ecosystem damage ([wetlands disturbance](#), [forest denuding](#), and [habitat destruction](#)) are just the tip of the iceberg. *Why would the NE Commission support a business that has large environmental liabilities?*

6 - The Military is one of the top economic drivers in North Carolina. In several instances (e.g. this [example](#)), NC coastal industrial wind development has not only been a specific peril to the safety of military personnel, but also has threatened to undermine the operational readiness and missions of some NC bases. That could have extraordinarily adverse jobs and economic consequences to our state. *Why would the NE Commission support a business that might impact a NC base elsewhere?*

To try to counter all these proven and substantial negatives, your website has a collection of one-sided sales pitches. For example, the claim of “[500MW of NC onshore wind resources](#)” is simply unscientific, and beneath the quality of the image you are working hard to convey. Simply take a close look at the official wind speed maps for your region (posted on the left in your own [flier](#)), and you’ll see that over 95% of your region has inadequate wind suitability, and the rest only marginal.

It would seem that a more professional approach would be to avoid the marketing material, and support science-based alternative energy solutions. For more such information on wind energy, see [WiseEnergy.org](#).

* * * * *

It seems that the NE Commission has to make a fundamental decision here:

- 1) is it your goal to promote any and all economic opportunities, irrespective of their consequences to host communities? **OR**
- 2) is it your mission to only promote economic opportunities that have proof that they will be a NET benefit to the communities in your region?

I’m sincerely hoping that the answer is #2, but please advise.

john droz, jr.
physicist and environmental advocate
Morehead City, NC
aaprjohn@northnet.org
5/30/14 rev a