

Example Letter and Responses - Mohave County Wind Farm Draft EIS

June 11, 2012

Mohave County Wind Farm
Renewable Energy Coordination Office
Attn: Jackie Neckels
One North Central Avenue, Suite 800
Phoenix, AZ 85004-4427

Re: Mohave County Wind Farm
Comments on the DEIS

My comments regarding the proposed project are presented in this letter.

My husband and I own land at White Hills, which is nearby the proposed project. We purchased the property in 2005, and did not receive any information about the proposed wind farm. Had we known, we most certainly **WOULD NOT** have purchased the property. The area is currently beautiful desert. It should not be converted to a heavy industrial zone by 500-foot tall wind turbines.

The property has already lost value due to the downturn in the national economy, and now, if the project is built, will never be worth anything. I have researched wind farms extensively, and property values in the vicinity typically decline as much as 40 percent. Oftentimes, it is impossible to sell property near wind farms. Will BP Wind Energy North America agree to purchase at pre-project valuations the real estate where their project has destroyed the value? This is the only “mitigation” that can be acceptable to property owners in the vicinity of the project.

Furthermore, studies have shown that under certain atmospheric conditions, wind turbines can be heard for nine miles. This means many homeowners will be negatively impacted due to loss of sleep and stress resulting from the infra-sound created by the turbines. Will BP Wind mitigate by turning the turbines off at night?

The number and size of the turbines will totally destroy the view shed, thus further contributing to property devaluation. It will also negatively impact the rural nature of the area. There is no way to ever mitigate for the loss of the view, both for people who live in the area and for those tourists who choose to recreate in the nearby mountains and at the Lake Mead National Recreation Area (LMNRA).

The turbines will be visible from many parts of the LMNRA, and even from Gold Butte in Nevada. Gold Butte has been nominated for National Conservation Area status. Part of the experience of visiting LMNRA and Gold Butte is the undeveloped aspect. This area should not be industrialized for the benefit of BP Wind.

The LMNRA is home to both golden and bald eagles. Raptors and turbines do not mix. One needs only check the history of turbines killing many raptors every year at both Livermore and Tehachapi, California. Wind farms should not be built in the prime habitat of raptors.

Letter Continued

The California Condor has been reintroduced to an area not far from the wind turbines, at Vermillion Cliffs. These magnificent birds have a huge range, and have been seen at Gold Butte. This is less than 30 miles from the proposed project site. What mitigation measures will be taken to ensure that no condors are killed by the wind farm?

In other areas of the country, bat populations have been decimated by wind turbines. What mitigation measures will be taken to prevent this from happening? Will the turbines be turned off from dusk to dawn? Bats are an integral part of the environment. It is environmentally irresponsible to build turbines near bat habitat.

The “need” for this project in this location has not been established. An arbitrarily mandated Renewable Energy Standard does not constitute a “need”. If the mandate is legislated away, the need disappears. Locating an industrial wind project in this location is environmentally irresponsible.

The project data presented on P. ES-30 and ES-31 is interesting. The range of workers is shown as from 90 to 275, a difference of three times; the number of estimated trips to the site is shown to range from 28,231 to 68,228, a difference of 40,000. Is this BP Wind’s first project? Why cannot they estimate more closely the numbers of employees and roundtrips?

How “green” can a project be that requires as many as 68,228 roundtrips?

Yet, it is stated with confidence in hard numbers what the tax revenues and payroll will be! How can these be given as “hard” numbers when the estimated employee numbers and round trip numbers vary so greatly? Perhaps the data should be recalculated, and a supplemental DEIS issued.

Also, the project is described as generating “up to 500 MW”. Unfortunately, experience has shown, world wide, that the average amount of electricity produced by wind turbines is between 20 and 30 percent of the name plate rating. This project destroys far too much public lands for the generation of a minimal amount of expensive, intermittent electricity.

In conclusion, the “No action alternative” should be the only choice for this project.

Sincerely,

Judy Bundorf



Emailed to KFO_WindEnergy@blm.gov

**** Please note that comment letters need to be as specific as possible in citing weaknesses or inadequacies of the EIS materials. Rather than using the phrase "studies have shown," in your letter's text, it is much more effective to cite a report, book, article, person, etc., to support your statements and facts.**