

Correspondence with Linda Peterson, Albemarle RC&D Council

On Feb 5, 2015, at 8:28 PM, John Droz, jr wrote:

Linda:

I read with interest the materials you sent to the Chowan County people regarding industrial wind energy.

As you probably know, I've been asked to assist these good people in making a well-informed decision regarding industrial wind energy. BTW, I provide this service for free, and I have no agenda here other than promoting sound scientific energy and environmental decisions. Also note that I've been an aggressive environmental advocate for over 30 years.

I'm pleased that your website says RC&D's positions are based on "sound science" — so clearly this will be a joint effort.

That said, I was a bit surprised that two of the documents you forwarded were propaganda blurbs written by lobbyists — which is contrary to a science-based position. Maybe there was a clerical error that explains how they got sent.

The study on infra-sound at least has the possibility of being a science-based position. I'll have to read it through and check into it.

In any case, even if what it says is 100% true (doubtful), acoustics is not the issue.

Let's back up a bit...

We (evidently like you) believe strongly that we should be exploring alternative energy sources.

We have but one threshold that proposed alternative electrical energy sources must meet:

There needs to be scientific proof that the proposed alternative electrical energy source is a net societal benefit.

Any alternative energy sources that meets that obvious criteria, we will enthusiastically support.

So, my request to you and your RC&D associates is: since your advocacy is based on "sound science" please hold off on sending marketing materials.

Instead please send me the scientific assessment that concluded that industrial wind energy is a net societal benefit.

regards,

john droz, jr.
physicist
Morehead City, NC

On Feb 7, 2015, at 7:32 AM, John Droz wrote:

Linda:

As promised, I checked out the acoustics paper you sent the Chowan County people. When technical matters are outside of my specialty (like this), I defer to independent, objective qualified experts for guidance. I sent that paper to several such experts — and ALL told me the same thing: this is marketing manifesto, disguised as a scientific document. It is actually written by people who have been on the AWEA payroll for quite some time.

For example, one independent acoustical expert (an MD) wrote me:

“McCunney and Colby were among the authors of the discredited AWEA white paper several years back. Colby was a paid consultant for a Canadian wind company, and was also reprimanded by the Ontario College of Physicians (the licensing body in Ontario) for holding himself out as an expert on the subject when he was not. Mundt testifies on behalf of wind energy companies and has done zero research himself. Kaliski is a Vermont sound engineer who generates income by exclusively working for wind companies, and testifying on their behalf. He is the engineer behind the disastrous Lowell Mountain project in Vermont, I believe, which is winding its way through court.”

A second independent acoustical expert (PhD) wrote me:

“This paper is a typical cherry-picked overly critical analysis from well-known wind energy supporters funded by the industry. Recent reviews by Arra, Jefferey and Schmidt came to different conclusions. The latter is particularly interesting as the authors have a record of pro-wind views.”

Another independent medical expert, Dr. Robert McMurtry, sent me the draft version of his eight page rebuttal to that paper. It is going through the review process, and I'll pass it on (if you like) when it is officially published.

Linda, the bottom line here is that Chowan County Representatives need some time to do a scientific evaluation of this matter, to see if it is appropriate for their community. **Such an assessment will be a thorough, objective investigation of the economic and environmental consequences of industrial wind energy to their rural community.**

As a "sound science" based organization RC&D would fully support that type of investigation, wouldn't they?

Please advise, ASAP.

Regards,

John Droz, jr
physicist

On Feb 9, 2015, at 9:51 AM, Linda Peterson wrote:

John,

Thank you for your comments. While the council supports wind energy in general, it does not endorse any specific commercial wind energy project. Please forward to the council any scientific documents that you believe are relevant to the discussion on alternative energy.

Thank you,

Linda Peterson

Program Manager

Albemarle RC&D Council

730 N. Granville Street, Suite B

Edenton, NC 27932

252-482-7437

albemarlercandd@yahoo.com

www.albemarlercd.org

On Feb 9, 2015, at 10:57 AM, John Droz wrote:

Linda:

Good to hear from you.

The position of citizens in our network (AWED — Alliance for Wise Energy Decisions) is:

- 1) we support investigating alternative energy options, *and*
- 2) we endorse alternative energy options that have scientific proof that they are a **net societal benefit**.

Despite its having several well-intentioned promoters, I am aware of no such proof for industrial wind energy.

Our website, WiseEnergy.org, has a lot more information.

I've given free energy talks in over ten states. The most popular one is online at EnergyPresentation.info.

Let me know any questions about any of this.

regards,

john droz, jr.
physicist
Morehead City