Rittershaus, Alexander (HOU)

From: Keenan, John - Rep. (HOU)
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 10:45 AM
To: Eicher, Christopher, (HOU); Holland, Liam (HOU); Rittershaus, Alexander (HOU)
Subject: FW: industrial wind power

-MG

From: Laura Marshall [mailto:lauraehinsdale@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, December 01, 2013 6:01 PM
To: Keenan, John - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: industrial wind power

Senator John Keenan:

A proposal about wind energy development in Peru, Massachusetts has been submitted to Mass CEC.

I do not believe that industrial wind turbines are a good solution for reducing carbon emissions nor do I want this wind "farm" in our town. As wind energy is intermittent like the wind and requires back-up coal or gas plants, why is the government wasting taxpayer money on these projects? This "solution" keeps gas and coal plants in business and polluting our environment.

Shouldn't we be serving tax credits instead for individuals to put solar panels on their roofs or a small windmill on their property, removing themselves from the grid, storing power on a battery if necessary, and not requiring a gas or coal back-up? If this change took place in the focus of governmental renewable energy policy, what habitats are left for wild life would not be disturbed with these "renewable" projects and carbon emissions reduced by a more significant amount.

New technologies and policies for renewable energy are becoming available and could be considered for a safer, more efficient, and cost effective energy goal for Massachusetts.

Aside from their expense and inefficiency, industrial wind turbines emit low frequency sound waves, something that is used by defense departments as a weapon. This lack of proper study and regulation is causing more expenses and problems to families in communities all over New England. In our town, Lightship Energy plans to install its 500 ft turbines 2000 feet from a three year old boy who has tubes in his ears.

The company and our selectmen say we are "nimbys" and "winers." They claimed at an informational meeting when asked that *they* would install a 495 foot turbine in their back yard. (Yet none of them has.) There is a big difference in the amount of low frequency sound emitted by a large industrial turbine and a smaller residential one for a single home. This fact appears to go unnoticed by regulatory agencies, in fact low frequency sound is ignored entirely as a health risk by industry and governments.

Industrial scale turbines do not belong in residential ares, or near any wildlife (animals are affected even more than humans by low frequency sound as they depend on their senses to survive.) Low frequency sound travels even faster and further through water. Aside from the valuable inland wildlife species killed by wind turbines (birds and bats- bats reduce the need for agricultural pesticides by 30%), I fear to think of what is happening to our water wildlife on the coast, also a food source,and already suffering from population reductions.
The only proper place I can think for location of industrial wind turbines is maybe near factories in the city where the other heavy industrial machinery is.

The project being pursued aggressively by developers in Peru is to be situated on a ridge line in a forested area. This habitat destruction is to be for heating coffee tables at skating rink in New York and not for the community in Peru. The money made on the project (if the developer turns a profit separate from tax credit largess) will go to the developer and not the local community.

Lightship Energy is owned by JUWI, a German multinational. A way for Massachusetts to consider an energy policy which gives taxpayer money back to individuals in the community would be to use these tax credits to make renewable energy more affordable for individuals not multinational corporations.

Please look into this issue.

Sincerely,

Laura Marshall
A citizen of Peru, Massachusetts

References and information:
Evidence from the state of Maine Health Effects of Wind Power study:
Evidence contained in a phrase from the government of Maine study of health effects from wind turbines shows that the state of Maine industry/government officials were at least willing to step away from the storm and acknowledge that more study is needed of LFN's, low frequency noise. "It concludes that there is *insufficient evidence* to determine if low frequency sound from wind turbines is associated with increased annoyance, disturbance or other health effects."

A way forward from the state of Vermont: CEP Public Involvement Report:

"There should be a strong focus on the development of small-scale renewable resources for VT." including a directive to "consider carbon emissions from backup gas plants in measurements of carbon emissions."

http://publicservice.vermont.gov/sites/psd/files/Pubs_Plans_Reports/State_Plans/Comp_Energy_Plan/2011/2011%20CEP%20Public%20Involvement%20Report%20I%20FINAL.pdf

Renewables in general

Summary: **Comments trend towards accelerating development, funding, incentives and investment in long-term, local, regional and community-based distributed renewable energy projects, especially community solar and wind (with limits on ridgelines). Comments also stress that these projects can and must spur the green energy industry in the state, as well as local economies.**

http://publicservice.vermont.gov/sites/psd/files/Pubs_Plans_Reports/State_Plans/Comp_Energy_Plan/2011/2011%20CEP%20Public%20Involvement%20Report%20I%20FINAL.pdf
From Australia a comprehensive study: Summary of Recent Research on the Adverse Health Effects of Wind Turbines 20 October 2009 compiled by Keith Stelling

http://docs.wind-watch.org/ADVERSE-HEALTH-EFFECTS-OF-WIND-TURBINES.pdf