

HEARING
BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT
JANUARY 8, 2013 at 6:00 P.M.
First Flight High School
100 Veterans Drive
Kill Devil Hills, North Carolina 27948

North Carolina Offshore Wind Visualizations Forum
Presenters:

Maureen A. Bornholdt, Program Manager
Brian Krevor, Environmental Protection Specialist
William L. Waskes, Oceanographer
Jennifer Golladay, Energy Program Specialist
Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
381 Elden Street
HM-1328
Herndon, Virginia 20170

Reported by:
Pamela S. Barker
Court Reporter

RECEIVED

JAN 25 2013

Office of Renewable
Energy Programs

HEARING
BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT

JANUARY 8, 2013 at 6:00 P.M.

First Flight High School

100 Veterans Drive

Kill Devil Hills, North Carolina 27948

North Carolina Offshore Wind Visualizations Forum

Presenters:

Maureen A. Bornholdt, Program Manager

Brian Krevor, Environmental Protection Specialist

William L. Waskes, Oceanographer

Jennifer Golladay, Energy Program Specialist

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

381 Elden Street

HM-1328

Herndon, Virginia 20170

Reported by:

Pamela S. Barker

Court Reporter

(At 6:00 p.m. Mr. Manny Medeiros put a statement on record.)

Court Reporter: Feel free to speak freely.

Mr. Medeiros: All right, I can make my statement in other words then, is that correct?

Court Reporter: Yes, sir.

Mr. Medeiros: Well then all right, let me do that.

Court Reporter: May I get your name first?

Mr. Medeiros: Yes, my name is Medeiros, Manny Medeiros, M-e-d-e-i-r-o-s. I'm an engineer, a retired engineer and my degree is in electrical engineering. I've prepared some comments because I had understood this was an open session for public comments, and I'll be glad to make these comments right now if you want to hear them.

Now, my comments tonight are brief because I consider government obsession with windmills to be one of the greatest blunders of our time. Recall that wind is an ancient, largely discarded, dead-end technology resurrected by Enron in the United States to sell tax shelters and garner lavish subsidies.

Unfortunately, America's national no-energy policy is mostly a national windmill policy, with billions of dollars committed to subsidies and tax breaks for wind

developers. The wind industry is completely dependent on government subsidies and mandates for its survival. Wind energy lives and dies by its tax credits. That is because there is no money to be made in generating electricity from windmills.

While a windmill might add a bit of energy to the grid when the wind decides to blow, a windmill adds no capacity to a system since it's not dispatchable. In other words, you can never count on wind to blow on demand. Wind simply decides on its own, by itself when it will start to stop producing electricity. It's incredible. Yet we expect our TVs and our stoves and our clothes dryers to operate as soon as we turn them on.

Windmills have to be backed up by dependable, non-intermittent coal, gas, oil or nuclear. There is no such thing as wind energy by itself. It must be augmented by a fast-acting, conventional source, typically natural gas. Thus you end up paying for electricity production twice: first for the high-cost, low-value electricity from windmills, then from reliable hydroelectric, hydrocarbon and nuclear sources.

Therefore, since you have to build conventional plants to insure economical and reliable electricity anyhow, it makes absolutely no sense to build obscenely expensive windmills that produce much less electricity

than conventional, less expensive energy sources such as natural gas.

Now proponents of wind stress that the fuel is free, but again, what they don't tell you is that there is no such thing as wind energy by itself. It must be paired with a conventional source of energy. Thus, wind makes us even more heavily dependent upon natural gas plants which are not free.

I find it incredible that we are squandering state and national treasure to copy failure in Europe, to duplicate what is killing European economies today, especially in Spain where green jobs created by the wind industry has killed off 2.2 real jobs elsewhere in the Spanish economy.

Perhaps you are aware that our country for the past 40 years has been pouring an absurd and alarming amount of money into windmill research and subsidies, the result being just more windmills. For all intents and purposes, wind power is as advanced as it ever will be. In fact, wind will never be a commercially viable source of electricity and will always require massive subsidies. Wind simply can not provide the reliable, concentrated, industrial-strength power that America needs.

Folks, there is no amount of research money or subsidies that can help a cow win the Kentucky Derby and

except for generating cash for opportunists, windmills are no different from cash cows with obscene amounts of state and national treasure being wasted on them. In fact, taxpayers would save billions of dollars if wind produced no energy at all.

We do get big city newspapers down here in Kitty Hawk and Kill Devil Hills and notice that unfortunately federal politicians seem to lack enlightenment when it comes to knowledge about energy, particularly wind. Often the only familiarity these bureaucrats seem to have with energy production starts and stops with operating a switch on the wall. Yet they're excited about windmills being built with outrageously lavish government subsidies. They complain about foreign oil but they love foreign windmills.

As to jobs, expensive energy creates green jobs in the energy industry only and then primarily in China, while cheap energy creates far more jobs in our country. Yet the way our country is headed with such green folly, we could soon end up with the greenest third-world economy on earth.

So folks, as I mentioned before, wind simply can not provide the robust, reliable, concentrated, industrial strength power that our country needs. Otherwise, for example, oil tankers would be fitted with sails instead

of diesel engines. So finally to sum it up, most of the alternative energy about which you hear and read these days is just that, alternatives to real energy. In fact, no wind power would exist if it had to compete on market terms.

Wind farms produce electricity that is often useless since it is largely not dispatchable. Without any means of storage, wind energy is essentially a nuisance. If government subsidies were to dry up, so would the windmill business. So, so-called sustainable energy is totally reliant upon unsustainable government largess and we shouldn't bring this anti-science mess to Kitty Hawk.

That's the end of my statement. I'm terribly disappointed that the community couldn't hear these comments. They will never know that this was said, will they? They will never know that this was said.

Court Reporter: I'm not sure who the transcript goes to. I think it's something that they use in-house.

Mr. Medeiros: This was the most poorly advertised meeting I've ever seen on the outer banks. We didn't know when it was going to start, what day, what was going to transpire. We saw no agenda. We heard that the public comments were tonight, not last night. Now we understand they were last night.

Court Reporter: Yes, they did have a presentation

with open comments at Jennette's Pier.

Mr. Medeiros: Yes, but would people have been able to get up and make the comments I just made?

Court Reporter: Yes, they made comments and asked questions.

Mr. Medeiros: I don't care about the questions, but would they have been able to make comments like I just made?

Court Reporter: Yes, they were given that opportunity to make comments.

Mr. Medeiros: I wish I had known that, I would have been there last night. Do I need to do anything else?

Court Reporter: That's it.

Mr. Medeiros: I'm just going to go home, I'm terribly disappointed. Thank you.

Court Reporter: Thank you, sir.

* * * * *

(At 7:46 p.m. Ms. Kelly Martin put a statement on record. However, at 8:15 p.m. Ms. Martin came back and asked that her statement "be scratched" from the recording. She indicated that she would like to really collect her thoughts and send a written response to BOEM with a more comprehensive, well-thought out statement rather than the "off the cuff" comments she had made earlier.)

* * * * *

(At 8:45 p.m. Drs. Bradley and Christine Pickens put a statement on record.)

Court Reporter: What are your names if you don't mind me asking first?

Dr. C. Pickens: Dr. and Dr. Pickens. Christine and Brad Pickens. I just wanted to say that, we've just graduated in August, sorry.

Court Reporter: That's all right, you've earned that title then. Christine and what was -

Dr. B. Pickens: Brad, Bradley.

Court Reporter: Spell your last name.

Dr. B. Pickens: Pickens, P-i-c-k-e-n-s.

Court Reporter: You can feel free to go ahead. Sometimes I repeat what I'm hearing but this is pretty clear so you can just go ahead with whatever statement or whatever you would like to say.

Dr. B. Pickens: Let me think about that for a minute.

Dr. C. Pickens: I, just from a personal, this is just a personal opinion, I think that the project will be more successful with less visualization. I understand that there might be places and people that are interested in seeing the wind turbines offshore, but I don't know if that attitude would necessarily be prevalent here. I

think tourism and natural beauty is such an important part of the culture here that the visualization of the turbines is going to be a difficult hurdle to overcome. That being said, I think the presentation here was done very well and very good.

Dr. B. Pickens: I would like to see more signs around town or even the school just to make sure people knew where to come.

Dr. C. Pickens: For this meeting.

Dr. B. Pickens: For the meeting, this meeting.

Dr. C. Pickens: Like the public meetings weren't advertised very well.

Dr. B. Pickens: Personally I think, too, that it would be ideal to be greater than fifteen nautical miles from the shore. I think that nighttime will be a bigger problem, but I don't think there's that much of a difference.

Dr. C. Pickens: We couldn't - They weren't able to show us the lights at 20 nautical miles because of the lack of resolution in the projector, but that's also going to be a big problem I agree. The closer to 20 and difficulty in visualization from the shore you are the better I think the success will be for the project, just from an aesthetics point of view.

Dr. B. Pickens: Yes. It's hard to say what's

economically feasible to get a project in there, but I think the project end that causes the least amount of aesthetic issues.

Court Reporter: This is the same paper that was out there where you can write your answers, but these are the kinds of things that they are -

Dr. C. Pickens: That you want?

Court Reporter: Yes, that's why they gave me that. Those are the kinds of things they are looking for opinions from.

Dr. C. Pickens: I think the large-curved panoramic pictures were the best daytime visualizations for me, not the flat or the video.

Dr. B. Pickens: Yes, I guess going along with that, with the panoramas, I think it would be beneficial to be able to put those in a public place, maybe at the post office or something like that and just have them there for two weeks or three weeks instead of, you know, cornering away this three-hour segment. I think that would be helpful. It doesn't seem like there is, just using the panoramas, would be terribly difficult to do in a public area.

Dr. C. Pickens: I also, this is tough because I've never been to Wilmington but my understanding is that there is more infrastructure there with the port.

And so I don't know if that would make opinions a little more kinder to seeing even more infrastructure out from shore, whereas I know definitely up here, yes we have buildings and cell towers, but it seems pretty difficult to put anything that's high up or highly visible up on the outer banks. There's a lot of resistance against that so I think if there's more, if you had more of the public aware of the meeting there might have been a better response here, too. Maybe unfortunately not a positive one.

Dr. B. Pickens: There's more questions on the back, too, if you didn't see them.

Dr. C. Pickens: I guess it's a little - I guess my only concern is that they're going to do this environmental assessment but they can't - they can only take it so far, but they wouldn't do an environmental impact statement until they have an actual construction plan, which I understand that makes sense. But I hope that they make that publicly accessible for that end of it.

Dr. B. Pickens: (Reading a question from the questionnaire) "Would your views for a national park compared to a local community?" I don't think I have anything to say about that. I guess I would just say on Number 6 there, I would be very supportive of wind

energy. I think it's just important to do it the
smartest way possible and the smartest place possible.

Dr. C. Pickens: I would rather see a wind turbine
than an oil rig because they make a lot of noise

Dr. B. Pickens: And they're much brighter.

Dr. C. Pickens: -- and they don't blink in
synchronization and they're closer to shore. We've seen
a lot of oil rigs. Yes, I'm glad it's being explored.

Dr. B. Pickens: Yes, it's a good idea. I think
it's just important to do it the right way.

Dr. C. Pickens: Definitely.

* * * Ended at 9:00 p.m. * * *

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF BEAUFORT

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Pamela S. Barker, a Notary Public in and for the State of North Carolina, duly commissioned and authorized to administer oaths and to take and certify depositions, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are, to the best of my ability, an accurate transcript, which was taken by me.

I further certify that I am not financially interested in the outcome of this action, a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel.



Pamela S. Barker
Notary Public
Certificate No.: 19940770005
Expires: February 9, 2015