

March 16-22 Comment to the Electric Generation and Supply Work Group

Page 1 - Daniel W. Hedrich
Page 2 - Judy Parker
Page 2 - Kathryn Corio
Page 2 - Tom Alisankus
Page 3 - Carroll Rudy
Page 5 - Grace Kunz
Page 7 - Dana Backus
Page 7 - Joseph R Brown
Page 8 - Mary Lou Herman
Page 8 - Beth Campbell
Page 8 - Sharon & Dale Muellenbach
Page 9 - Karen Van Asten
Page 10 - Inese Strazdins Epstein
Page 11 - Graceann Toberman
Page 12 - Lynn Korinek
Page 14 - Rose Moehn
Page 15 - Deloras Vind
Page 20 - Deloras Vind
Page 20 - Sarah L. Willett
Page 21 - Gerry Meyer
Page 21 - Jeanne Dimick-Rego
Page 23 - Deloras Vind
Page 23 - Jerry Tallackson
Page 23 - Cindy Carter
Page 23 - Ken and Mary Lehmann
Page 24 - Fred Hansen
Page 25 - Joan Mitchell
Page 25 - Anita Roberts
Page 26 - Connie Gehl
Page 27 - Phil Delfeld
Page 27 - Teresa Hahn

From: Dan.Hedrich@thrivent.com
Sent: Monday, March 17, 2008 12:55 PM
Subject: Wind Turbines and Global warming

Please stop the issue of using wind turbines to reduce global warming.

The impact that the Wind Turbines have on this is only a feel good impact.
From all of the reports i have read and they are numerous Wind Energy has very little use in our electrical generating ability in WI and because we are a Class 2 out of 7 wind state without tax incentives and rebates the Wind Industry would not even be looking at WI.

Please push back on the issue of using Wind Turbines until further studies are done and they are sited properly.

Dan
Daniel W. Hedrich, ChFC, LUTCF, FIC
Financial Consultant

Northeast Wisconsin & Upper Michigan Region Thrivent Financial for
Lutherans®
Chilton, WI

From: JUDY&BRIAN PARKER
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 10:32 AM
Subject: Wind Energy

Dear Sir;

I urge you to please see the attached.
[ATTACHMENT AVAILABLE AT: www.aweo.org/LowBenefit.pdf - EXIT DNR]

We are all looking for ways to make green energy and help our land and future generations, but I really believe that we need to look at all of the information that is available to us.

We have to look past the politics. What about conservation, geothermal energy and solar energy? Germany has already been pushing solar energy, but in a recent world-wide seminar, sites politics as something that is blocking its use.

I really believe that there are better answers to our problems than wind energy. There are so many negatives to wind energy, which are already documented by nations and local residents who have had to deal with them. Some of them are medical issues. We need someone who is going to stand up and protect the public health and welfare.

Thank You!!!
Judy Parker
Hilbert, WI

From: Corio, Kathryn Stiver
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 11:59 AM
Subject: wind turbines plus and minus

As member of The Nature Conservancy and an employee of the Cofrin Center for Biodiversity I urge you to carefully consider the impact of large wind turbine fields on migrating birds and on bats. While wind energy is generally a "green" alternative steps need to be taken to protect wildlife, especially migrating birds that are protected by international treaties. Turbines can be located away from migration routes and/or turned off at night during the spring and fall when birds migrate. They might also be turned off in early evening in areas where endangered bats forage. Careful placement of wind turbine fields can help all of us enjoy clean air without endangering wildlife on the wing.

Kathryn Corio, M.S.
Cofrin Center for Biodiversity
University of Wisconsin - Green Bay
Green Bay, WI

From: Tom Alisankus
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 1:46 PM
Subject: FW: Wind Energy Concerns

PLEASE ENTER THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS INTO THE OFFICIAL RECORD:

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I urge you to modify your current support of wind energy as playing a major role in the reduction of global warming; study after study from the European experience with wind energy--which is vastly greater than ours--continues to show that the *actual* efficiency and carbon reduction from the introduction of wind turbine energy into the power grid falls far short of the *theoretical* expectations, and at a relatively high cost.

Additionally, the Governor's support of SB544 is completely misplaced; his continued support of future, similar bills that give siting authority to the PSC shows that he is not interested in listening to the actual facts and research done on the subject. I would gladly share the results of the Union Twsp. Large Wind Turbine Study Committee's research results and conclusions, arrived at after literally hundreds of hours of investigation, and reviewing thousands of pages of scientific and medical research. Please contact me to arrange for such a meeting.

Thank you.
Thomas J. Alisankus, J.D.
Chair
Union Twsp. Wind Study Committee
Evansville, WI

From: McRudy
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 5:09 PM
Subject: Wind Energy Cost

To The Task Force on Global Warming:

I wish the task force would consider the true costs of using wind energy. It is neither free, reliable nor are the materials, land, communities and people it consumes renewable.

Wind is erratic in Wisconsin. Backup fossil fuel or nuclear plants will have to be on-line all the time to keep the grid running when the wind slows or stops. This will be critical on very hot and very cold days when there is often no wind at all; the same times that strain the grid.

Wind turbines use considerable power from the grid at all times, keeping the enormous amounts of oil in the nacelles warm, for positioning and startup, plus the lights they use. They do not use their own power for those purposes.

Wind Turbines are made of fossil fuel and non-renewable resources: They require hundreds of tons of concrete (non-renewable) and steel (non-renewable) for foundations. Both use great amounts of fossil fuel in their manufacture. They both require quarrying which destroys more environment. Carbon sequestering trees are cut so they won't interfere with the wind. In many cases, Mountain and hilltops are clear-cut; soon followed by severe erosion and ground water contamination. Turbines kill a great many birds and bats. Wind companies say that doesn't matter. They say they are saving the planet by preventing climate change. But none of these things help the environment they pretend they want to save. It's only about money.

Experience in European countries that started using wind two decades ago does not validate any decrease in fossil fuel use. Wind Turbines do not operate at stated capacity much of the time, and in Wisconsin where wind isn't as favorable as elsewhere, they would seldom reach capacity.

Given all the fossil fuel they use and their enormous carbon footprints, how long would a wind turbine have to operate to even erase its own carbon footprint? And it would never erase the backup fossil fuel required to keep the grid operating? Wind being "free, clean and "renewable" is an enormous exaggeration, promoted by wind power companies who want only to cash in on big subsidies and Production Tax Credits which will make them rich. They consistently deny any disadvantages; even going so far as to say that they are being fabricated to prevent wind developments.

A basic ploy is to promote it as an easy income for farmers, which it is: at the expense of our tax dollars and the destruction of the communities where the generators are built. At least a quarter acre of farmland is destroyed for each turbine. The fields are dissected into small parcels making farming more difficult. Drainage patterns are changed, rotor turbulence dries out fields in summer, and the wind companies control what the farmer can and cannot do on his own property from the day he signs the lease until the contract runs out in 20 or 30 years.

It is true that you do not hear any complaints from any of the farmers who signed leases to make this easy money. That is because anyone who signs a lease or settlement of any kind with a wind developer signs a gag-order that does not allow any complaints --ever --to anyone --for any reason. Even if all the cows die, which often happens, the farmer cannot complain. When his promised income is cut: He cannot complain. When fields become useless for crop production: He cannot complain. When the company decides to build a cement plant or big substation on the farm; he cannot stop them or complain. When crops are destroyed by machines taking shortcuts across fields and torn up for underground cables: He cannot complain. If he does, he'll be liable, charged with contract violation, pay penalties, and lose the farm altogether.

Some Business Deal! One-sided advantages for power companies; and no redress of grievances for landowners. The farmers civil-rights have been signed away. This is very un-American!

Wind developments really do destroy communities. No one wants to live in one. Why? People lives, life savings, physical and emotional health suffer. I know this because I am one of their victims. Their methodology is this. They sneak quietly into a community, like thieves in the night, contacting influential farmers; give them big cash incentives to talk up wind power as easy money with their neighbors, and the game begins. It truly is a "Game" to them, with people as "gaming pieces." They get large landowners who have political influence on town and county boards and planning committees to change ordinances if needed and make the community "Wind-friendly." The farmers are wined and dined and treated with respect to win their trust, and convinced to sign leases as soon as possible before the neighbors know anything is going on. This is because they know the neighbors will not like to have monster industrial generators converting their neighborhoods into factory zones. The neighbors will resent having their property values drop; having the roads ruined by heavy machinery, watching the neighborhood torn apart by heavy noisy machinery building roads for huge cranes to operate; having new quarries blasted into the bedrock for cement and roads, seeing the flicker of turbines, flashing lights, noisy rotors and squeaky gearboxes keeping them awake at night, making their lives a living hell day and night for as long as they continue to live in the dream houses they put their life savings into. So the neighbors protest.

The farmer/landowners (often absentee landowners) are cultivated by the power representatives to believe that their neighbors are being evil and selfish to keep them from making money. They are even taught what nasty names to call us, what to write in newspaper articles and what to say to media types. These Power Company Reps deliberately divide communities with hatred and anger. It's all done in the name of money: Government money: --not for the environment, and not for the farmers.

Formerly happy peaceful communities are destroyed. Where I live the social and political fabric has been demolished. Neighbors don't speak to each other anymore. They won't do business

with each other anymore. They even shun each other in church. This will not be mended in our lifetimes; maybe not for generations. We are not a bunch of yuppies with second homes in the country as the Power Companies claim. These are our homes; lifetime investments, meant to be permanent homes. Most of us were born and raised here, or came here decades ago to live because it was such a nice community. Many are being forced to leave because this is not a nice place to live anymore.

Living in a forest of monster-sized turbines is bad enough, but being hated by our neighbors, alienated by friends and family is even worse. Who would want to live like that? Anyone who doesn't is called a NIMBY of course. Even by elected officials. People we elected to represent us have no right to call us names because we want some respect and protection. And I can guarantee that city people who think Wind Power is so great wouldn't put up with living like this either. And it's a sure bet that no Wind Power Rep will have a 400 ft. turbine in his back yard.

When a Power Company encounters a great deal of resistance in a community, you can bet these are the kind of tactics that were used to divide it; and it means there are too many homes for Wind Developments. Put them where people do not live so close together. Health and safety should come first, and community values need to be protected.

If wind power is so wonderful, then why do they have to sneak into communities, lie to them, pit them against each other, pay hush money to farmers, bribe town boards, make people sign gag-orders, and in general act like mobsters and fly-by-night crooked salesmen? And if Wind developments are so safe, then why not put them in cities where most of the electricity goes? City people say they want wind-energy. And why not pay tax incentives to citizens to put small turbines on our homes to produce energy, instead of giving it to big wealthy investors? I'm sure we all know the answer to that question.

--Carroll Rudy, Calumet County.

From: Grace Kunz

Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2008 11:47 PM

Subject: Governor Doyle's Task Force on Global Warming Public Comments

3-18-08

Re: Governor Doyle's Task Force on Global Warming Public Comments

Dear Members of the Committee on Governor Doyle's Global Warming Task Force,

Oxford University (Centre for the environment - 2005) states under - Characteristics of the UK wind resource – “A diversified wind system is one where wind turbines are located in a range of locations rather than being concentrated in one place. The advantage of a diversified system over a highly concentrated system is that the wind turbines are exposed to a range of wind conditions in different parts of the U.K. Diversification does not imply that wind turbines have to be “everywhere” – the purpose of developing a diversified wind portfolio is to ensure greater reliability and lower variability in the electricity being generated by the overall system by exposing wind turbines to different regional patterns of wind variability and availability.” The map on Renew Wisconsin website shows the proposed wind farms that are everywhere you look in the Calumet County area which they need in order to make up for their inefficiency.

The wind farm in Fond Du Lac and Dodge counties are an example of the invasion of “Everywhere” and we are only rated a zone 2 for wind speeds which is much less than wind speeds in western states. Take a ride and see the results of the project Blue Sky – Green Field for yourself. Drive right next to them and compare a car or person next to the huge turbines lingering over homes. The drive-by highway 41 or 151 doesn’t give the true “Big Picture”. You won’t miss seeing them as they are everywhere. As far as sound you can roll down your window and listen to them. However, sound experts are the sounds you should be listening to pertaining to wind turbines. There is an abundance of factual information from sound experts and medical experts for you to hear what needs to be understood in regards to human health and safety of these wind turbines. We have been told by Eco-Energy that more turbines do make more noise.

Wind turbines are being put up too close to residents and Wisconsin is not a good candidate for wind potential to benefit or reduce CO2 levels because the wind turbines are and will never be anything but a supplement. In “Danish Wind: To Good to be True?” by David J. White, Utilities Journal, July 2004 states: When power is consumed in Denmark fluctuations in wind output have to be managed by the operation of fossil-fired capacity below optimum efficiency in order to stabilize the grid. The Jutland power generator, stated as recently as May 27th at a meeting of the Danish Wind Energy Association with the Danish government that increasing wind power does not decrease CO2 emissions. Ireland has drawn similar conclusions based on its experience that the rate of change of wind speed can drop faster than the rate at which fossil-fuelled capacity can be started up. Innogy made the same observation about the operation of the UK system. (D. Tolley, Presentation to Institute of Mechanical Engineers, Jan. 2003).”

This was taken from "The low benefit of Industrial Wind" compiled by Eric Rosenbloom, founding member of National Wind Watch and Vermonters with Vision. (In 2004 two major German studies investigated the size on contribution that wind farms make towards guaranteed capacity. Both studies separately came to virtually identical conclusions, that wind energy currently contributes to the secure production capacity of the system, by providing 8% of its installed capacity. The increased use of wind power in Germany has resulted in uncontrollable fluctuations occurring on the generation side due to the random character of wind power feed-in. This significantly increases the demands placed on the control balancing process and bringing about rising grid costs. The massive increase in the construction of new wind power plants in recent years has greatly increased the need for wind-related reserve capacity.) That is, wind power construction must be accompanied by almost equal construction of new conventional power plants, which will be used very nearly as much as if the wind turbines were not there.

Weighing in on this very important issue is human health, property rights and values, city/town expansion and the environment.

Many proposed wind turbine projects here in Wisconsin would be all show and no go. It's a waste of time, energy, cost, tax dollars and will not make a difference needed to lower CO2.

Thank You and Best Regards,
Grace Kunz
Chilton, WI

From: Dana Backus
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 6:38 AM
Subject: public input session comment

Hello,

Due to the fact that I cannot attend the public input session due to my work schedule today, I would appreciate a moment of your time to read my e-mail comment.

I am not against renewable resources, and I do what I can to be more "green" with each passing day. I make sure I keep my power bill to a minimum and try to increase the efficiency of my home when possible.

Wisconsin really needs to consider if placing turbines in rural, populated communities is the answer to fight global warming. Wind turbine siting has been proven to cause health problems. There are environmental effects, including our wildlife.

Wind power varies according to the wind, requires corresponding maintenance and eventually addition of back-up conventional power, along with expansion of transmission capacity.

The accommodation of wind power causes thermal plants to run less efficiently, adding to the financial costs and increasing emissions.

Spinning standby power must be kept burning to cover the short-term fluctuations of wind power. While wind power may displace generation of power from thermal plants, it does not displace the burning of fuel in them. Rather, the heat is diverted.

Wind turbines can not provide base load power and are unreliable providers of peak load power; they do provide the marketable appearance of green energy, though not actual relief from other sources of power.

Basically, I like living in Wisconsin. We have a lot of tourism, which is great for our economy. I would hate to see Wisconsin be a less desirable state to live in and visit. I think there is more to this picture than scattering our country side with skyscraper sized wind turbines. There are more renewable sources than the wind turbine industry is leading us to believe. Let's explore all the possibilities renewables offer to us.

Dana Backus
Chilton, WI

From: joseph brown
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 7:12 AM
Subject: Wind power on great lakes

Our modern society needs clean non-carbon power, we have a great source next to a high demand areas
We need windpower in the great lakes

thanks,
Joseph R Brown CCA
Milton, WI

From: Mary Lou Herman
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 9:00 AM
Subject:

I am in favor of adopting a (minimum) 25% Renewable electric standard by 2025.

It will reduce CO2 production substantially, create jobs in Wisconsin, & benefit both farmers and the state financially.

We should switch to burning clean fuels first for energy rather than coal.

We can't wait to reduce greenhouse gases and cleaner power is available now. It would reduce global warming emissions and other toxic pollutants. It will reduce negative health impacts from burning coal.

Thank you,
Mary Lou Herman
Member Sierra Club

From: Beth Campbell
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 12:13 PM
Subject: Proposed Wisconsin Geologic Carbon Sequestration Study

A study and ongoing tracking of possible carbon sequestration seems appropriate but is this a "commission"? The bulk of this type of research is being done under U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Fossil Energy research projects through regional sequestration partnerships. For example, DOE awarded \$66.7 million on Dec. 18, 2007 for the Midwest partnership (see press release at DOE site) and work through that group is underway http://fossil.energy.gov/news/techlines/2008/08005-CO2_Injection_Begins_in_Michigan.html
[EXIT DNR]

I do not understand what there is for a commission to find and recommend in the time frame of July 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008. Maybe this is of more use in 5-10 years?

Beth Campbell

From: Sharon Muellenbach
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 12:34 PM
Subject: HONOR 1800 FT SETBACK ORDINANCE IN CALUMET COUNTY

As residence of the State of Wisconsin, and landowners in Calumet County we request the State to honor the recently passed Ordinance in Calumet County to enforce a 1800 Ft. Setback & Noise Ordinance the Calumet County board has recently passed.

The concerns of all property owners should be considered & honored - not just the opinions of the wind turbine companies & the landowners hosting or hoping to host future sites of wind turbines.

- Please do not override this decision if the wind turbine companies request the state to override this decision.

Sincerely,
Sharon & Dale Muellenbach
Chilton WI

- Residents of Calumet County in Town of Brothertown

From: KAREN DENNIS

Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 12:52 PM

Subject: FW: Governor's Task Force on Global Warming Public Input Session This Wednesday!

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing with grave concerns that not enough time, effort & scientific & peer-reviewed research has been done to have come up with either the 1st or 2nd "Wisconsin State Model Ordinance" for siting Wind Turbines.

Both my husband and myself have put in almost 2 years of private research ourselves.

The reason for this research is that almost 2 years ago we were almost ready to start building our new home on 6 acres of land that we purchase from my in-laws on their farm. As they are elderly and in ailing health they were looking forward to family being right "next door" for "emergencies & extra help".

We currently live in the city of Fond du Lac and when we first heard of the proposed turbines proposed in Calumet County (where our land is), we went to our first County Board Meeting there to find out information. We were thinking that this was a very good thing to be doing.

We had always been enthusiastic & admiring of the two turbines along HWY 41 & had wondered why more was'nt being done like this. WE WERE NAIVE!!!

When we heard people at the County Board Meeting speak up on the NEGATIVE HEALTH & SAFETY problems associated with siting turbines too close to people, we found it hard to believe.

We HAD to check into this for ourselves to determine whether or not it would be SAFE and/or HEALTHY for us to build on our land & live there.

We put our building plans on hold. Calumet County yesterday passed an ordinance with 1800 ft. from residences (it had been 1,000).

While that protects the residents much more than the previous 1,000 ft., it is not enough protection

for us. You see, I am one of the "chronically ill" group whose immune system is greatly challenged and am much more susceptible than the average person. I have visited "3" wind farms. And at 2 of them I had no problems, but at one of them I had a "reaction" to something that was felt in my body. This (Montford) was the only wind farm that I visited at night (late in the evening) on a cloudy, overcast day. While I don't know what the "reaction" in my body was caused from, we cannot build while there is a possibility that my body could be made even more ill by living too close to turbines. My experience led me to track down a number of people from different parts of the world who are suffering lack of sleep & ill health because wind turbines were placed too close to their homes.

For example, in the Alleghaney Mountains in Pennsylvania a Dr. Todd Stull & family are having a horrendous problem with noise that he(the Dr.) can feel in his body & has much lack of sleep because of the noise(not 24/7 but a good portion of time). His home is 2200 ft. from the closest turbine. Another neighbor of the wind farm lives only 900 ft., he explained, & has no problem with noise. He said that their two homes have a different topography of land in regards to siting of the wind turbines.

THEREFORE, it is NOT a "one-size-fits-all" scenario.

1,000 ft. is not enough.

1,800 ft. is not enough.

The National Research Council in their Report that came out in May of 2007 basically said that at 1/2 mile away many problems cease to be of concern.

Health & Safety problems are being documented "all over the world". In February a 200 ft.+ turbine in the Country of DENMARK a wind turbine (during a storm), the brakes failed, the turbine spun out of control & basically exploded & there is documentation that some of the smaller pieces were thrown over 1600 ft.!

Please read the attachment for more information!

[ATTACHMENT AVAILABLE AT: www.aweo.org/LowBenefit.pdf - EXIT DNR]

I BELIEVE THAT WIND TURBINES CAN BE PLACED MORE SAFELY!!!
PLEASE TAKE T-I-M-E AND DO MORE RESEARCH!!!

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Karen Van Asten
Fond du Lac, WI

From: Inese and Eric Epstein
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 1:30 PM
Subject: comments for public input session 3/19/08

Task Force on Global Warming

Now that SB 544/ AB 899 was not passed, you really must ask yourselves why. Several very obvious reasons come to mind immediately: lack of input from counties, municipalities and towns, looking at an issue from only an electric company/wind developer perspective and lack of what this bill would have meant locally.

This was not a benign bill, but rather a direct route for electric companies and wind developers to install wind factories regardless of the opinions of the people at the local level.

Whenever a business plans to spend millions of dollars on a project, it gathers all of the facts, including the existing efficiency of the proposed activity. This is a glaring omission in the Interim Report. There is no data from existing wind factories. The Report does not indicate what the "overall reduction of greenhouse gases" will be (none according to Denmark and Germany). The Report does not mention that the actual output from a wind factory is between 2% and 32% of installed capacity (Denmark, Germany and Texas). What the Interim Report does say is that we (the State via the PSC) must be in charge now because we are no longer winning the game.

Before another bill such as SB 544/ AB 899 is proposed, the residents of Wisconsin need to know the actual output from wind factories, not just the installed capacity ratings. Show me the data. If I were to run my business at a 98% to 68% loss, I wouldn't have a business for very long (unless I received subsidies, green credits and double depreciation just like the electric companies and wind developers).

Inese Strazdins Epstein
Norwalk, WI
Conservation is the key to the future

From: Kurt Toberman
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 1:29 PM
Subject: Letter about Wind Turbine Siting

I cannot attend Gov. Doyle's Task Force on Global Warming public input session scheduled for Wednesday March 19, 2008. I would like my comments to be considered and read into the minutes.

My name is Graceann Toberman and I am the clerk/treasurer and a resident of the Town of Magnolia in Rock County. I would like to ask that you please consider all of the impacts industrial size wind turbines (400' tall) have on people who are forced to live near them. My family and many residents of our town and neighboring towns have done extensive research and visited existing wind farms. While we are supportive of renewable resources we are most concerned about human health and safety. This can be addressed by using safe setbacks. It is proven and documented by medical research that a safe setback distance from an occupied residence is 1 – 1 ½ miles. The state model wind ordinance has a 1000' set -back. Through an open records request, it was discovered that the state actually did NOT have any documentation that a 1000' setback is safe. In fact there were no studies or reliable facts used while drafting this ordinance. We also discovered that a wind energy company helped write the model ordinance as did the Public Service Commission (PSC). This is very troubling and shows the residents of Wisconsin that the state and the PSC do NOT have human health and safety in mind. This is why the job of regulating the siting of wind turbines should NOT be given to the wind energy companies, PSC or Michael Vickerman. The towns and local governments actually work with local residents who will be most affected. The local governments also understand the unique landscapes of their areas and should have control of the siting. **Wind energy is NOT feasible everywhere.** It seems to me this is being rushed just because of money and government subsidies – two very poor reasons.

I testified on March 4 and 5 at the State Assembly and State Senate hearings begging for this to be studied and proposed in a safe and reasonable manner. Bills AB899 and SB544 were put on the fast track without concern for our citizen's health.

At the hearings, some assembly members and senators were very concerned that some other states are ahead of Wisconsin in wind energy production. I didn't know it was a race and don't feel it should be. Many years from now – if these are permitted without proper setbacks – it will show the HUGE mistake Wisconsin made.

I believe all of us are worried about global warming and climate change but more wind energy development does nothing to reduce carbon emissions and will do nothing to prevent global warming or climate changes.

Wisconsin could be a leader in other forms of renewable resources, ones that are feasible, safe for residents, reliable and efficient. Let's do this right! **We are counting on the Wisconsin government to protect us and I have faith it will.**

Graceann Toberman
Brodhead, WI

From: Lynn Korinek
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 1:58 PM
Subject: task force comments

Task force members:
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

I have read the Interim Report to Governor Doyle and while I was pleased to see the emphasis on energy efficiency and conservation, I was disturbed that the state continues to promote wind as the only renewable energy source for Wisconsin. **While we all are working toward the same significant goal of healthier air and water, we cannot continue to let the tax dollars of our hard working citizens blow away with the wind.**

Wisconsin can and must do better to **promote all forms of renewable energy**, including manure digesters, solar power, and biomass, that don't put power company profits first. **And, lets not forget nuclear energy.**

We **must stop** treating **heavily subsidized industrial wind** as though it is the ultimate and only solution? The report comments that "There is no silver bullet solution to renewable energy". Yet we are treating industrial wind as just that.

This approach is disrespectful to the complexity of the issue, and to the people of our state who are directly affected. It is time we broaden our horizons.

We, as citizens demand a renewable energy plan that serves us better.

Another disturbing thing in the interim report, is how the power company's interests are placed above serious environmental concerns. In the section on Energy Conservation and Efficiency, we are told conservation and efficiency should be a **high priority** because it will have the most **immediate effect** on reducing greenhouse gasses. It's something that we can all do right now.

Then, we are told that the downside of conservation and efficiency, is that it will harm the profits of the power companies. I can't believe this. In other words, corporate profits take priority over the financial burdens of our citizens. So I guess using less electricity and using it more efficiently is seen as a good thing if you are a consumer, but not to a power company's bottom line.

I believe the reason the states only renewable energy option in this **report is wind, is because it is the only type of renewable energy investment that will turn a profit for the power companies**, even if other options -- in the very words of this report--- "would be less costly to customers and to society. **If Wisconsin wants to be leader, this is not right way.**

We must transfer the financial benefit associated with renewable energy that is coming from our tax dollars and utility rates, away from large corporations and put it directly into the pockets of the struggling taxpayers that really need it.

Millions of dollars annually are being transferred from the pockets of ordinary taxpayers and electric customers, to the pockets of a few large organizations that own “wind farms” – many of which are foreign owned, **on wind farms that produce very little electricity.**

It is well established that tax breaks and subsidies – not energy or environmental benefits – are the principal reason that “wind farms” are being rushed to be built. Wind industry officials have admitted publicly, that about 2/3rds of the economic value of “wind farms” comes from two of the federal tax breaks, Production Tax Credits and Accelerated Depreciation).

It has become obvious how far government officials and wind energy contractors -- using their positions and our tax dollars -- will go in imposing their views and biases on ordinary citizens, taxpayers and electric customers. **They continually present only one side of this important public policy issue and totally ignore opposing views and evidence. Apparently, there is no effort made by the state, to assure that the groups have balanced representation.**

There are big questions now being raised about how much wind farms actually reduce the gasses that contribute to global warming. As that is not my expertise, I have included a report from Glen Schleede, which addresses this issue.

[ATTACHMENT AVAILABLE AT:

<http://dnr.wi.gov/environmentprotect/gtfgw/comments/PDF/Schleede.pdf>]

Ordinary citizens who are trying desperately to protect themselves and their property from the adverse impacts of “wind farms” are unlikely to be represented in the groups. In fact, citizens who oppose the building of “wind farms” in the areas where they live, are forced to pay from their own pockets for their opposition efforts, while wind energy developers are able to enjoy the support of wind energy “work groups” at taxpayer expense.

As I mentioned earlier, I was pleased to see that the majority of the Global Warming Task Force recommendations are actually **focused on energy conservation and efficiency, something all of us can contribute to every single day that will directly reduce our energy costs, unlike high cost wind turbines that only contribute when the wind blows.**

I am a strong believer that if we would strive to make homes and businesses more energy efficient and to encourage conservation, the benefits would greatly exceed anything the turbines can promise, and would not violate our rights as property owners.

Another thing that concerns me is the recommendation for Legislation to create uniform standards for siting wind systems.

Members of the wind industry, intolerant of local citizen efforts, and alarmed with the negative facts that the exposed, yet legitimate scientific and medical data would have on their agenda, lobbied and moved quickly to encourage the State to take away local control of wind turbine siting.

Through the **combined effort** of citizens across this state, it was exposed to our State Senator's and Representative's that their constituents have great concerns, and that the Draft Model

Ordinance was fundamentally written for the wind industries benefit alone, **primarily** by those who would benefit financially from the end product.

Also, facts about wind energy have begun showing up in national and local media, particularly in areas where “wind farms” have been proposed or built. Hopefully, more media representatives and government officials will soon catch up with the facts about wind energy and help overcome the false “popular wisdom” that is now so prevalent.

As you know, SB 544, was stopped in the State Senate. Fortunately, some of our local political leaders have begun to recognize the true costs and benefits of wind energy and have begun questioning existing and proposed wind energy policies. Many Senators agreed with their constituents who informed them of their concerns, that this **was** the appropriate action, as the wind industry lobbied to fast track this bill for approval

Now that the facts about the true costs and benefits of wind energy are becoming better known, citizens, taxpayers and electric customers have a right to demand that their federal, state, and local political leaders reconsider the policies, mandates, tax breaks and subsidies that have been adopted during the past few years, which have so unfairly benefited “wind farm” developers and owners and others in the wind industry.

It is local citizens, from many professions, in many communities across this state, who worked closely with their local officials, volunteered there time, and did excellent research that **did not** cost this state a nickel (a practice you should not discourage). Those citizens, worked side-by-side, in a democratic way, with their local officials, and substantiated that representatives of the wind industry were providing false information and making false claims to get the regulations they wanted.

Through their combined efforts, many false claims by those in the wind industry were revealed, and many localities, found it necessary to create new local ordinances pertaining to turbine placement, which were more restrictive than the States “Draft Model Ordinance”.

These municipalities found it necessary to protect public health and safety by creating comprehensive [sound-level limits](#) [EXIT DNR] and larger setbacks, some as far back as ½ mile from homes. Local leaders around this state should applaud those who volunteered and dedicated long hours researching the facts, **scientific and medical facts, not here say, that allowed them to enact justifiable ordinances within the bounds of their authority.**

State Senators and Representatives from our area and many areas around the state, agree that Wisconsin must not disenfranchise local governments and taxpaying citizens from having input and control over what happens in their communities. Local government is just that, LOCAL.

It is what allows taxpayers to participate with their government.

Lynn Korinek
Mishicot, WI

From: Keith & Rose Moehn
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 2:07 PM
Subject: Public Input for Governor's Task Force on Global Warming

Global Warming Task Force:

First, there are other renewable energy sources for Wisconsin other than wind. Why does this report state the only renewable energy source for Wisconsin is wind energy? I am an organic dairy farmer and would love to produce electricity via a manure digester, solar, and geothermal. Where are the tax incentives for me and every other Tom, Dick and Harry who are willing to be responsible and do their part for renewable energy?! I have just as much right to my tax dollars as the wind companies do!!!

It is time Sen. Plale and Rep. Montgomery to look at other alternatives, as well as, siting wind turbines properly. Once again, you all need to look at the medical and scientific studies from other countries, as well as the ones that have been started in the US. That would be 1/2 mile to 1 mile from residents with proper noise restrictions. By the way, Mr. Donahue never created or found his scientific information for Rep. Davis. (That would be because it DOESN'T exist) You've been through this a few weeks ago and now it is time to form committees with people who have been involved on wind advisory committees around the state, NOT wind companies who are benefitting financially. I do agree with creating a **STANDARD and a RESPONSIBLE** wind siting law. However, the final say should remain with LOCAL GOVERNMENT and not the PSC. Another question needs to be answered before moving forward. How effective are wind turbines on reducing carbon emissions? Questions are being raised in Europe about how much wind turbines actually reduce the gasses that contribute to global warming. Have you all read the National Academies of Science Study regarding wind turbines? Even this study questions the impact of industrial wind facilities on reduction of green house gasses.

There is no mention of protection of wildlife and natural areas. This is a concern because reports show the impacts of industrial wind turbines on birds, bats and natural habitat are more severe than previously thought. Once again, I must ask, WHY is NOTHING being done to protect the Niagara Escarpment? Gov. Doyle signed the Wisconsin Land Legacy Report which identifies the **Niagara Escarpment as 1 of 16 most important ecological landscapes in the state**. This ancient legacy needs to remain as that, and not be blasted apart for wind development.

Why is this so difficult for everyone to figure out? Common sense would tell us that you choose adjacent landowners, all who are willing to participate and develop a wind facility. All who agree to participate also agree not to complain, while any non-participating landowner or homeowner is not affected. Does this ring a bell? MONFORT would be the answer!

Wisconsin should be a leader in a renewable energy plan and at the same time keep the rights of citizens and local governments, as well as protecting wildlife, farmlands, and rural communities!

Thank you for allowing me to submit my comments.
Rose Moehn
Hilbert, WI

From: Dave V
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 2:25 PM
Subject: comments on GWTF

Dear Governor Doyle and Global Warming Task Force –

The Governors Global Task Force is biased toward wind energy - Seventeen people and the company's they represent are members of the Governors Global Task Force - Electric Generation and Supply Work Group. These individuals are responsible for recommending the amount of wind energy "needed" in the future and the siting criteria of industrial wind facilities in Wisconsin. Of these companies, all have involvement either directly or as lobbyists in the wind power sector.

The average landowner, taxpayer, and electric customer's health, safety and welfare has been ignored and trivialized by the wind industry and its advocates.

Wind produces only a trickle of unreliable, volatile and intermittent electricity.

According to U.S. Energy Information Administration's Annual Energy Outlook 2007, the capacity factor for wind was 21% in 2005.

In Germany 18 % is the average installed capacity of wind power.

Would you buy anything with such an abysmal record?

Wind energy is unreliable, volatile and intermittent.

In 2005, the maximum wind power feed-in in the E.ON Netz control area was 6,234 MW, which was achieved at 9 a.m. on 15 December. In contrast, generation capacity at 12.15 p.m. on 27 May 2005 was only 8 MW, the lowest value of the year. The average feed-in power of the wind farms in the control area totaled 1,327 MW, 18 % of the average installed capacity over the course of the year. (Data and facts relating to wind power in Germany E.ON Netz 2006)

A drop in wind generation late on Tuesday, coupled with colder weather, triggered an electric emergency that caused the Texas grid operator to cut service to some large customers, the grid agency said on Wednesday. ERCOT said the grid's frequency dropped suddenly when wind production fell from more than 1,700 megawatts, before the event, to 300 MW when the emergency was declared. (Loss of wind causes Texas power grid emergency – Feb 27, 2008)

Wind energy will not reduce CO2 because base load plants must be kept running at all times. The accommodation of wind power causes thermal plants to run less efficiently, adding to financial costs and increasing emissions. Spinning standby power must be kept burning to cover the short-term fluctuations of wind power, therefore increase CO2; wind energy is unreliable, volatile and intermittent.

There is no CO2 saving in Danish exchange with Norway and Sweden because wind power only displaces CO2-free generated power. When the power is consumed in Denmark itself, fluctuations in wind output have to be managed by the operation of fossil-fired capacity below optimum efficiency in order to stabilize the grid (i.e., spinning reserve). Elsam, the Jutland power generator, stated as recently as May 27th at a meeting of the Danish Wind Energy Association with the Danish government that increasing wind power does not decrease CO2 emissions. Ireland has drawn similar conclusions based on its experience that the rate of change of wind speed can drop faster than the rate at which fossil-fuelled capacity can be started up. Hence spinning reserve is essential, although it leads to a minimal CO2 saving on the system.⁸ Innogy made the same observation about the operation of the UK system.⁹ The result is that, while wind-generated power itself is CO2-free, the saving to the whole power system is not proportional to the amount of fossil-fuelled power that it displaces. The operation of fossil-fired capacity as spinning reserve emits more CO2/kWh than if the use of that plant were optimized, thus offsets much of the benefit of wind.

Experience of wind power in Western Europe demonstrates that it is an unpredictable, unreliable and variable source of electricity for this most critical commodity for which continuity and stability are essential. The production statistics over the past five years illustrate a very low annual load factor, which represents a massive

underutilization of high-cost assets. Windmills do not reduce the CO2 to the degree most people imagine when the emissions from the complete power supply system are taken into consideration. Indeed, Elsam has given a clear message about the folly of installing more windmills to reduce CO2.

It makes no economic sense to progress an expensive and unpredictable power-generating technology in order to achieve a parallel CO2 reduction goal when the evidence clearly indicates that the objective will not be met.

Electric power is too vital a commodity to be used as a job-creation programmed for the wind turbine industry. Other low-carbon technologies for power generation have to be considered if electric power is to be supplied at costs that enable European countries to compete. (Danish wind: too good to be true? – White)
(Please read: Getting up to speed on wind power – Droz)

Wind plants use electricity from the grid, which does not appear to be accounted for in their output figures.

Yaw mechanism ,blade-pitch control ,lights, controllers, communication, sensors, metering, data collection, etc, heating the blades -- this may require 10%-20% of the turbine's nominal (rated) power, heating and dehumidifying the nacelle ,oil heater, pump, cooler, and filtering system in gearbox, hydraulic brake , thyristors, magnetizing the stator -- in the rated wind speeds, the stator may use power equal to 10% of the turbine's rated capacity, in slower winds possibly much more, using the generator as a motor (to help the blades start to turn when the wind speed is low or, as many suspect, to maintain the illusion that the facility is producing electricity when it is not, particularly during important site tours).

How much? The wind industry does not say, but unless a wind turbine is connected to the grid it can not run. (Energy consumption in wind facilities - Rosenbloom)

True costs associated with wind power are: property rights lost, “takings” of land, loss of individual rights, decreased property values, increase in tax burden and electric rate burden, rural ghettos, loss of wildlife, loss of wildlife habitat and negative environmental costs and most importantly are negative health and safety impacts on people if industrial wind facilities are sited too close to homes.

Why the Wisconsin Model Wind Ordinance does not protect citizens.

It does not protect property rights of nonparticipating neighboring landowners.

1. Uses the neighbors' property as a buffer zone and blights their property. (see WMWO setbacks)
2. Taking of neighbors' right to freely build or plant vegetation on their own property. (s.s. 66.0403(f))
3. Taking of neighbors' wind rights - 5-12 rotor diameters.(US Dept. of Interior, Bureau of Land Management)
4. Reduces the property values of homes and enjoyment of property.(Excerpt from the final report of the township of Lincoln wind turbine moratorium)

It does not protect health and safety of citizens.

1. Blade throw (parts) has been documented. (Caithness wind farm information forum-accidents)
2. Potential for ice throw or blade throw of ½ mile. (Icing-Safety – Mollica), Wind farms don't make good neighbors. (Zimmerman)

3. Noise is a health issue. The EPA outside sound measurements for valley farms is ~40dBA daytime and ~33dBA nighttime. In home level should not exceed 30 dBA. WMWO is 45dBA, a 3 times increase in night time noise levels. A change of 5dB will result in noticeable community response. There is a need for preconstruction ambient sound levels. (Community Noise – US EPA, Wind turbine noise issues-A. Rogers, National Research Council 2007 Report)
4. The sound level measurements do not adequately measure wind turbine noise levels and limits are too high.(Review of draft noise ordinance for Trempealeau County, WI – R. James, E-Acoustic Solutions)
5. Noise at night is much higher than expected, it is caused by strong winds at hub height but not at ground level or in secluded coulees, the noise cascades down the surrounding valleys and can be heard over a mile away, causing disturbed sleep time. The worst case situation may not be the closest receiver to the turbine site; topography must be taken into account. Taller turbines increase annoyance. (Wind turbines at night: acoustical practice and sound research – Frits G.P. van den Berg and Wind turbines, noise and health – Harry, Location, location, location - Stewart)
6. Vibroacoustic disease has been associated with the low frequency noise (dBC) of wind turbines, which penetrates walls and from which only distance protects people. LFN causes irreversible damage with increased exposure.(In home wind turbine noise is conducive to Vibroacoustic disease - Alves-Pereira, Branco)
7. The noise and light flicker from wind turbines may increase headaches, migraines, vertigo, disturb concentration, and in those prone, flicker provokes epileptic seizures.(Wind turbine syndrome – Pierpont)

Other health and safety issues: well and ground water contamination, fire hazard, pollution from hazardous fluids, erosion run off, electrical pollution, and telecommunication interference.

Industrial Wind Leads to Higher Electric Costs

The latest monthly news letter from our energy provider, Riverland Energy Cooperative, warned that renewables would mean higher electric bills for customers. So I decided to research how wind turbine facilities affected other community's electric rates.

In Wendy Todd's Sept 26, 2007 Testimony to the Main Wind Energy Task Force her electric bill increased 40% in 2007 and will increase again next year due to the wind farm built in her community.

In the News Journal of Wilmington the Delaware Public Service Commission states the wind project slated for their area could add as much as \$55 to monthly electric bills - \$55 would be a 40% increase in my electric bill.

In the article "Waymart Facility Troubles Residents" Rose Marie Derk says their electric bill went up after the wind facility went on line.

In our area Excel Energy has asked for a rate increase - 15% is due to new high power transmission lines and updates for wind power.

WE Energy in central Wisconsin is asking for 7.5% increase in both 2008 and 2009 partly due to wind facilities going into their area. They plan on spending and the electric customer will pay for 1.5 billion in wind power projects.

In “Alberta turns to natural gas after wind lessons reliability” where new wind facilities are going online they are building a new natural gas power station because they “need to fall back on reliable sources of power.” And electric rates rise.

So we pay way more for an intermittent power source that does not close a single fossil fuel power plant because of times in the day or days without wind, therefore does not reduce CO2 emissions and does not save foreign oil importation since wind power “supposedly” produces electricity not oil.(Calculating the real cost of Industrial wind power -Stelling)

Wendy Todd states that though an amount of tax benefit was promised to the town, 50% of that amount was lost in school funding. Ditto for other communities in Minnesota, “Lawmakers take away school money generated by wind farms”.

We also pay for wind industry’s 5 year double declining depreciation used as income tax shelters, \$0.019/kw federal production tax , monthly “ public benefit fund”, wind turbines are not subject to local property tax so the rest of us pay more, mandate for polluters to buy pricy ‘green credits’ - that are really just a license to pollute, etc, etc...

Is wind power really free? NO!

Why not advance conservation to reduce electrical consumption, like incentives to reduce our electric bills from the previous year; this would bring responsibility and accountability to energy usage not expensive waste.

The European experience and Professional recommendations for setbacks from residences

Retexo – RISP Marketing (wind turbine developers) - 1.25 miles setbacks.

Germany – 1600 meters - 1 mile from residences.

Frances National Academy of Medicine - .93 mile from residences.

Holland - .62 miles from homes.

Dr. Amanda Harry - 1.5 miles from homes.

British Noise Association – 1miles from residences recommended.

National Research Council USA - at least ½ miles from residences.

Dr. Nina Pierpont – 1.5 – 3 miles from residences, schools, places of work.

Dr Gordon Whitehead audiologist – 1.5 miles from homes.

Clearly Trempealeau County did not reinvent the wheel but responsibly acted to protect the health and safety of rural people in passing the Chapter 21 wind generator ordinance.

The GWTF recommendations are to:

- Increase wind turbines to 2500MW new installation(trivializing negative health, safety and welfare impacts of Wisconsin citizens and promoting rural ghettos and the most expensive form of electricity because it is redundant, nor will it reduce CO2 emissions)
- Increase natural gas plants (encouraging foreign dependence)
- Reduce cheap, efficient coal plants (ignoring clean burning coal applications).

Governor Doyle, as well as our Legislators, your duty is to protect the citizens of this state not throw them under the bus and at the mercy of the greedy wind industry, for something that is unreliable, expensive, unhealthy and does not reduce CO2, nor to the PSC which has shown itself to be wind industry advocates and negligent in protecting the health, safety and welfare of the people of this great state of Wisconsin.

Sincerely, Deloras Vind, Arcadia, WI

Also please read the following – Is all this really necessary?

<http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.SenateReport> [EXIT DNR]

From: Dave V

Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 2:33 PM

Subject: droz-windpowersummary.pdf

Dear Sirs - Attached is some information I would like to submit to the Task force .

[ATTACHMENT AVAILABLE AT:

<http://dnr.wi.gov/environmentprotect/gtfgw/comments/PDF/Droz.pdf>]

Thank you,
Deloras Vind
Arcadia,WI

From: Sarah Willett

Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 2:41 PM

Subject: comments on wind energy

Good Afternoon:

I am a citizen of Calumet County and have many concerns regarding wind energy in our area.

The collective evidence suggests that wind energy has some very serious drawbacks for our area. As a mother, my first concern is my children and family. When I learned of the unhealthy noise levels and the reluctance of government to allow proper setbacks as proven by experts in the field, I became concerned about our children. What if a windmill was close to their place of learning or play? How would that affect their development?

As a citizen, I worry about the rural poor and their property values, as towers in many areas are placed in their back yards. Their home, likely their largest asset, is now worth much less, if they can sell it. I know some are trying in Fond du Lac County. Who will want to own or build a home in a forest of windmills? I personally can't imagine it. I believe that a great many people will attempt to move from our area should wind mills be improperly placed.

I also worry as to the upkeep of these windmills. Who will enforce that they be repaired when broken? What will our beautiful countryside look like? A vast waste land? How sad.

I am also concerned about our tourism dollars. When I drive through Fond du Lac County, it is jarring. A once lovely, pastoral backdrop is now punctuated by sharp, out-of- place mills that certainly won't be a draw for those who love our county most for its natural beauty.

And finally, does our area really provide the proper return on investment for wind turbines? It bothers me that we are spending large amounts of tax dollars to produce a small amount of

energy, when wind energy could be purchased from other areas of the country that are able to produce more energy per turbine. I believe it is 1 million dollars per wind mill. I believe there are 88 mills scheduled for Fond du Lac county. That's 88 million dollars that could be used in resident incentives to get us to use less energy OR in other alternative energy options.

There are so many questions about wind energy in Calumet County. It is unfortunate that the wind companies can't seem to come up with good answers for most of them. And they have been asked time and time again. Wind companies must be held accountable for what they propose to do which affects us all in Calumet County and the entire State, whether or not we live directly near a wind mill. If we do not, we ourselves are foolishly throwing caution to the wind.

Sarah L. Willett
Chilton, WI (resident of the Village of Stockbridge)

From: Gerry Meyer
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 4:14 PM
Subject: Wind Energy

I would like to give a few of my comments on wind energy.

If wind was a viable energy source private industry would be spear heading building the turbines and not government intervention by creating laws telling how much electricity needs to be produced by alternative sources.

Has consideration gone into how much energy and other recourses that go into the 55,000 pounds of re-bar in the base, the almost 300 yards of concrete in the base, the energy to produce the steel cylinders and other components, the fuel to deliver the components, the cranes that assemble the components that run sometimes 24 hours a day and the tremendous tax credits to the energy companies putting up the turbines.

I live 1560 feet from one of the turbines in the Forward energy project in Fond du Lac County. It sounds like a jet flying overhead. There is one more that just began operation that is about 3/4 of a mile from my home and I can hear that one as well. There are several others that are still not operation. I feel we will never have peace at our house again:(

I feel if the politicians are serious about energy concerns we would be building nuclear power plants and drilling for oil in ANWAR and the Gulf Of Mexico.

I believe the global warming fiasco is a hoax. I remember in 1972 it was a global cooling scare. I am sure you have recently read that over the past 100 years the earths temperature has risen one degree Celsius. I'm sure you have also read that this past winter has wiped out that one degree that took 100 years to increase.

I feel the percentages of electricity that are required in the future that need to be produced by alternative energy need to be reduced if not dropped and let private industry move forward on their own with out government tax credits.

Thank you,
Gerry Meyer
Brownsville WI

From: Jeanne Dimick-Rego
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 3:27 PM
Subject: Public Input Session - Wed. 3/19/08

To: DNR & Governor's Task Force on Global Warming,

I am very concerned regarding the direction the State of Wisconsin, DNR and PSC is taking in their tact to mitigate green house gases and develop renewable energy - especially commercial wind energy.

I reside in Clay Banks, Door County, WI where several 400'+ wind turbines are being proposed. In following the process the Clay Banks Town Board has gone through appointing a Wind Energy Committee, attending all Wind Energy Committee meetings and learning first hand of the reports and resources used to craft their ordinance (from WHO, EPA, National Academy of Sciences, and other commissioned wind studies), I am convinced that "commercial wind" is not the magic green bullet we would all like to hope it would be.

With having initial concerns and before the Clay Banks Wind Energy Committee was even formed, I took part in a petition effort for full and part time residents in Clay Banks opposing large commercial wind turbines based on the adverse impacts they would bring to our community. We are rural, zoned agricultural and there are transmission lines running through the township. Over 220 signatures were collected in opposition to these commercial turbines, a majority of these the first weekend of our outreach effort. Clay Banks is located just minutes north of Kewaunee County's Lincoln Township and we are well aware the wind farms there have not met and continue to decline in efficiency, plus negatively impact many of the individuals that must reside next to them with noise and light pollution.

Regardless of the "green spin" placed on wind energy, the fact remains it is indeterminate and therefore not reliable. Because it is not reliable, it cannot conceivably end or significantly reduce green house emissions. As demands for energy grow, coal and nuclear plants will continue to be proposed and built because power will need to be consistent and reliable.

I would propose instead the state and federal government make take credits and subsidies available to individuals and businesses to put in their own individual renewable energy systems where appropriate, instead of affording tax credits and subsidies to wind developers and power/utility companies. This way we literally stop taking energy from the grid and free up demand to enable power companies to better meet overall energy demands with power plants already in place. Not only that, just think of the miles of transmission lines that will not need to be constructed and the environmental damage caused by transmission line installations will be avoided. Also, large commercial turbines require large footings that also disrupt large segments of top soil, and depending upon how deep the footings need to go to ensure turbine safety, the groundwater. It is a very well established fact here in Door County because of our geological make up, we have had and will continue to have serious ground water quality issues. Why create and look for additional ways to ruin our ground water tables? I also believe the State of Wisconsin if it continues to seriously consider wind development, so do as off shore installations in Lake Michigan.

I have attached a paper written by a science editor, Eric Rosenbloom of Vermont from January of 2006. He has done much research and the attached recaps his research with website links where you can access and study in depth the documents he has listed. I quote the final sentence of his report "Wind turbines cannot provide base load power and are unreliable providers of peak load power; they do provide however, the very marketable appearance of green energy, though not actual relief from other sources."

[ATTACHMENT AVAILABLE AT: www.aweo.org/LowBenefit.pdf - EXIT DNR]

Respectfully,
Jeanne Dimick-Rego
Sturgeon Bay WI

From: Dave V
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 3:32 PM
Subject: Glen_Schleede-Implications_of_Wisconsin_Renewable_Energy[1]

Dear Sirs - I would like to include this paper in my comment to the GWTF.
Thank you, Deloras VInd Arcadia WI

[ATTACHMENT AVAILABLE AT:
<http://dnr.wi.gov/environmentprotect/gtfgw/comments/PDF/Schleede.pdf>]

From: Jerry Tallackson
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 4:32 PM
Subject: Wind Turbine: Review All The Facts

We are for alternate energy

We are not for alternate energy by the avoidance of reviewing the facts with all alternate energy authorities. There is a need to have open discussions with all the communities. The power companies, investors and some potential land owners are pushing an accelerated agenda to the detriment of the health, safety and general well-being of the communities involved.

This is important----take the time to study the whole picture and not just take input from those that are voting their pocketbook. A lot of damage can be done by rushing into a decision.

In Calif. there are wind farms of 7-8,000 turbines, but they are not interspersed where people live--for good reason. Also there is a maximum of 300' on the turbines.

Jerry Tallackson
Sturgeon Bay WI

From: Cindy Carter
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 8:01 PM
Subject: comments for Task Force

TO WHOM IT CONCERNS:
I would like to comment to the Task Force:

We need to upgrade the Wisconsin Clean Energy standard to 25% by the year 2025, if not sooner: with wind, solar and biofuels, which will create 1000's of jobs for Wisconsin, which will in turn lead to economic benefits in the way of new capital investments and tax revenues. 25 other states have a more aggressive Renewable Electricity Standard and we need to follow suit and reduce our global warming pollution today. I would like to see a coal plant moratorium put in place and have better land use policies initiated.

Cindy Carter, Appleton, WI

From: Ken Lehmann
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 6:15 PM
Subject: comments for March Public Input session

We have been following the progress of your task force activities and have done some research of our own, especially with respect to wind generated electrical production. We welcome the opportunity to comment.

There is a great potential for financial profit from the wind generation of electricity but from our investigation, most of that financial gain seems to be in the form of tax credits and incentives for speculators. It seems to us that the point of view of your task force has been biased towards the wind speculator groups who will profit from tax credits and government grants, with little regard to the actual cost of producing “green” electricity from wind power. Wind powered electrical generation does not seem to be able to stand on its own merits without big federal and state financial crutches. Even the carbon free claims of wind powered electrical generation don’t hold up when a thorough investigation is conducted.

The Electrical Generation Sub Group wants the PSC to handle all commercial wind siting aspects, removing that control from the local town level. Have you noticed that opposition groups form where wind speculators want to place huge turbines? The siting parameters of the pseudo-legal “State Model” are a joke; 50dbs and 1000 foot set backs from neighbors of giant wind turbines are not acceptable. “NIMBY” says your group, the speculators and unaffected citizens. How about some concern for rural Wisconsin residents who are affected? Again, your group has shown little concern for the human aspect of living near and with giant wind turbines.

We truly believe that the place for huge wind development sites is out in lakes Michigan, Superior and Winnebago and if we all will benefit from having big wind development like your group advocates, how about starting with siting them in Wisconsin state parks and other state owned land. Then all of Wisconsin residents can have the responsibility and gains of ownership.

Your present goal of removing local control of industrial wind siting is hurtful. Not only will we in rural Wisconsin have to be concerned with our physical, mental, and financial health by living near and with giant wind turbines, we will also have to pay with our state and federal taxes to subsidize over exaggerated, environmentally friendly claims of green electricity.

The only thing green about industrial wind development is the money the speculators will make from tax credits and grants. Ken and Mary Lehmann, Forestville, WI

From: Hansen, Amy
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 6:44 PM
Subject: clean energy-gov Doyles task force global warming - my statement

To the Global Warming Task Force

I am certainly interested in clean energy, and consider myself to be well read and interested in environmental issues. However, I am most concerned that the great things proposed about wind turbines, are a gross hoax.

The truth is that back up power has to be immediately ready from other sources for periods when the wind is not adequate to run a turbine. Those back up facilities run by coal or nuclear, will still be running all the time. Where do we save our emissions and really solve the environmental problems?

Denmark has a reputation for developing these turbines. When the wind blows there, back up unused power from Sweden and Norway is wasted, waiting for the wind to stop producing.

Where are the savings of emissions and clean objectives really achieved, while the back up power must always be running?

I hope your task force will really take time to study the issues required to do something about global warming and the environment. I think the wind energy idea will prove to be a waste of time and energy.

Sincerely,
Fred Hansen
Algoma, WI

From: Joanie
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 7:02 PM
Subject: comments for March Public Input session

Governor Doyle and DNR

I am very concerned about having a 400 foot wind turbine 1000 feet from my home. I have been supportive of our Magnolia Township writing an ordinance to place the wind turbines at 1/2 mile from our farm. Your plan is hasty and not considering the homeowners but the big business in energy. We live in the free country and the energy companies who stand to profit from this is taking away our local power to govern. The most important thing is to promote freedom for people in Wisconsin. It is to allow the local government to protect its citizens and provide a health place to live.

The large wind turbines need to be place at distances that protect the health and safety of the residents. As retired life long citizens of Wisconsin, please do not press siting reform for these large wind turbines and look in to other forms of energy.

Sincerely
Joan Mitchell
Brodhead WI

From: Jeff & Anita Roberts
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 11:35 PM

Subject: comments to global warming task force

Hello,

I would like to e-mail my comments on the interim report to the global warming task force. I tried to get to UWGB but I work on a farm and was unable to get done in time. Please accept these comments into the record.

I believe wind power is not the way to go for renewable energy. It is inefficient and a waste of my taxpayer money and many other taxpayers in this state and the nation. If windpower is so great, why does it need so many subsidies and why won't the wind developers answer my questions. I would like to know why the PSC is looking at a model ordinance that measures from the center of a person's house and not the lot line. Using another's property as a safety zone is not right. What about the rights of the neighboring property to put up a wind turbine.

With the proposal given to the PSC, an adjacent landowner's wind rights are not protected. All of the turbine's negative effects such as shadow flicker, debris throw including ice and blade debris should be kept on land where the turbine is located.

Placing turbines 1.1 x height from the roads is asking for trouble. Does this committee have any data from RENEW, Clean Wisconsin, or an industrial turbine developer that states evidence or shows calculations to support the model ordinance proposed that their setbacks will protect the public on all of their property and on the roads? Do you have blade throw calculations from turbine manufacturers? I would like to see proof of such analysis provided.

Does anyone on this committee have 500 foot turbines with a rotor diameter the size of a football field which have been sited 360 degrees around their home like what has happened to me? It is sickening to have people pushing these turbines that say it is for the green energy when I feel the only green they are concerned with is the green that goes in their pocket.

I have attached a paper on the Implications of Wisconsin Renewable Energy Mandates written by Glen Schleede to further express my views. I hope you take the time to read it.

[ATTACHMENT AVAILABLE AT:

<http://dnr.wi.gov/environmentprotect/gtfgw/comments/PDF/Schleede.pdf>]

Thank you,
Anita Roberts
Mishicot, WI

From: Connie Gehl
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 6:45 AM
Subject: WIND TURBINE SITING

To who it may concern,

I would like to take a moment to comment on proper wind turbine placement in Wisconsin. Yes, I agree we need to do something to protect us all from global warming and to decrease our reliance on oil. However, we still need to protect the Wisconsin citizens first with proper setbacks

and noise ordinance. As shown last week at the State assembly and Senate the Wisconsin model ordinance lacks proper protection not to mention proper input from experts. Other countries with a history of wind turbines are proving that lack of proper setbacks and noise ordinance are causing health and safety concerns. Lets stay on the side of caution until proven otherwise and put into place good guidelines to protect us and future generations. Thank You!!

Sincerely,
Connie Gehl
Chilton, WI

From: Margaret Delfeld
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 12:41 PM
Subject: wind factories

With 86 turbines erected in Invenergy's Brownsville area, we have heard nothing but negative comments about them. Typically, "I didn't know they would be that big or that close."
Try solar. Phil Delfeld

From: thehahn
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2008 8:32 AM
Subject: comments for March Public Input session

Hello,
I am commenting on the installation of wind turbines and the process currently used in making determinations regarding such installations in the state of Wisconsin. I live in a community that has plans for installing such "wind farms" in my community so this issue is close to home.

Our township formed a committee to study and draft an ordinance on such projects. Research led our ordinance proposals. It was no small endeavor that took hundreds of hours reading and dissecting thousands of papers published by world-renowned scientists and medical professionals who felt compelled to study and write about the impact of a seemingly harmless source of renewable energy.

These reports are not biased; the authors have no vested interest in the development of these industrial complexes. Proponents continue to point out information provided by organizations that push forward the wind energy agenda such as AWEA, the major government funded source of such information. One or two sources do not make a good research paper.

While we live in rural America, we are not country bumpkins though the stereotype continues to exist. This is our community; this is where we live and work and raise our families. We believe in the democratic process and are working through the democratic process to put forth our concerns regarding what happens in our communities.

We want to maintain the right of control regardless of the issue put before us. Therefore, I strongly support the rights of the local towns and counties in maintaining control of and establishing ordinances that impact future development of any kind within the local communities.

Taking this right out of the hands of local municipalities and giving it to the Public Service Commission is tantamount to subjecting the people this effects to dictatorial rule. This is not in the best interest of our towns, counties, state or nation.

Sincerely,
Teresa Hahn, Chilton, WI