

Correspondence with Lyra Rakusin, from NC "Clean Energy"

On Fri, Mar 13, 2015 at 10:35 AM, John Droz wrote:

Lyra:

Please see the letter I'm sending to you (immediately below).

Looking forward to your written response.

Sincerely,

john droz, jr.  
physicist  
Morehead City, NC

---

Lyra:

I'd like to followup with you regarding your letter to Chowan County Commissioners and Planning Board members, dated March 10, 2015.

You appear to dispute the fact that your so called NC "Model Wind Ordinance" is actually a wind industry supported effort, with the express purpose of promoting industrial wind energy in North Carolina.

Compare that perspective to the fact that I'm an unpaid, independent scientist who is focused on protecting the health, safety and welfare of Chowan County citizens, businesses and environment.

With that understanding, it should be obvious why we will likely come to very different conclusions as to what a local ordinance should have in it.

I commend you for taking minutes of your 2008 meetings. I've looked these over and have some questions for you:

1 - Since the mission of your organization is to maximize wind proliferation in North Carolina, please explain the scientific basis of that. Specifically, please show the scientific (i.e. comprehensive, independent and empirical) proof you have that industrial wind energy is a net societal benefit.

2 - Please explain why the wind proponents advocated a 55 dBa noise limit, vs 45 dBa, or 35 dBa? In your answer please include studies from independent experts who concluded that 55 dBa protected the health, safety and welfare of nearby citizens, better than 45 dBa or 35 dBa would.

3 - Please explain why the wind proponents don't mention, or have any provisions for infrasound? In your answer please include studies from independent experts who concluded that no infrasound provisions protects the health, safety and welfare of nearby citizens, better than infrasound provisions would.

4 - Please explain why the wind proponents advocated a 2.5x setback from large turbines, vs 5x or 10x? In your answer please include studies from independent experts who concluded that 2.5x setbacks protected the health, safety and welfare of nearby citizens, better than 5x or 10x would.

5 - Please explain why the wind proponents did not address property value losses? In your answer please include studies from independent experts who concluded that no consideration for property values protects the welfare of nearby citizens, better than a property value guarantee would.

6 - Please explain why the wind proponents did not address turbine bat killings? In your answer please include studies from independent experts who concluded that no provisions for bat killings protects the health, safety and welfare of nearby citizens, better than bat oriented provisions would.

Lastly, it would be helpful for you to explain how this so-called "model" ordinance has changed since 2008? As you know there have been many hundreds of studies since that time, by independent experts, on the health and economics of industrial wind energy. Additionally there have been material changes in these industrial turbines – which can now be 600 feet tall.

Looking forward to your answers.

John Droz, jr.  
physicist  
Morehead City, NC  
3/13/15

On Mar 13, 2015, at 11:06 AM, Lyra Rakusin wrote:

Dear Mr Droz,

I think that at this point it is better to agree that we are disagreeing about wind energy. I am respectfully bowing out of this conversation.

Thank you for your letter.

Sincerely,

Lyra Rakusin

On Mar 13, 2015, at 11:18 AM, John Droz wrote:

Lyra:

Thank you for your prompt response.

You chose to inject yourself with these good people — who are simply trying to write a wind ordinance that prioritizes protecting their **health, safety** and **welfare**.

**Why would you go on record to oppose that —  
which is exactly what you did here?**

Unlike some others, I understand full well that you are paid to maximize wind energy in North Carolina — which is in direct conflict with the health, safety and welfare of wind proximate citizens, businesses and environment.

If you choose not to answer all of the reasonable questions I politely posed, we will accept that as your official acknowledgement that the so called "model" wind ordinance you were a party to, is, in fact, actually a marketing tool created by wind proponents — and any genuine protections for local citizens, businesses or the environment are coincidental.

Sincerely,

john droz, jr.  
physicist  
Morehead City, NC

**Note: Despite a further request, Lyra has not answered any of the questions.**