

Bill Cundiff

From: Robert Anders
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2011 4:41 PM
To: Bill Cundiff; SZisk@douglasma.org; Mlajoie@douglasma.org
Subject: truth about wind

[Wind Watch: Salesmen still can't make pigs fly](#)



August 2, 2011
Letters, New York

Salesmen still can't make pigs fly

thedailynewsonline.com | Tuesday, August 2, 2011

I am writing in regard to Invenergy salesperson Eric Miller's July 12 letter, "More misinformation about Stony Creek Wind Farm." The only misinformation I've seen in regard to industrial wind projects comes from wind salespeople like Miller. Let's see how:

Mr. Miller evidently thinks that the Stony Creek project has not significantly changed in its scope. But here's the rub: Although the number of turbines proposed remains the same (59), and the (inadequate, unsafe) setbacks remain the same as before — 700 feet from property lines and only 1,320 feet from the foundation of peoples' homes — the turbines now proposed are substantially larger.

Furthermore, Miller claims they've held six "public workshops," for "a combined 12 hours of public examination." That's an interesting take on what constitutes "public" since no comments or questions from the "public" were allowed, nor was the "public" allowed to view documents supplied to town officials. The town attorney directed citizens to submit written comments and questions to the Town Board, and they would be addressed at these work sessions. Dozens were submitted, but not a single one was addressed.

As Paul Jensen correctly pointed out in his June 18 letter, "A bait and switch in Orangeville," Invenergy's new proposal calls for a completely different, new model turbine, which is three stories taller and has a 47 percent larger blade sweep area (larger than two football fields), than the original turbine cited in the DEIS. The generator has been up-sized from 1.5 MW to 1.6 MW. Moreover, the turbines are much larger and noisier, and well over a dozen — along with their associated transmission lines — have been moved. This has created an altogether different site plan, with correspondingly different environmental impact areas, than was in the original plan proposed by Invenergy. Mr. Jensen's determination that "it's not the same project," is completely accurate!

When Horizon Wind LLC made significant changes like this in their proposed Dairy Hills project in Perry, Horizon was required by state law to do a Supplemental DEIS. Why should the rules be any different for Invenergy? What possible reason could the Orangeville Town Board have to allow Invenergy to bypass correct procedure? Most importantly, why have all local elected officials not first demanded proof of the wind industry's claims before selling out their entire township and its citizens to a multi-national mega-corporation?

The wind industry's very existence is based on their claim that it can reduce CO2 emissions and thereby reduce global warming. With approximately 140,000