

Barnstable Patriot Objections to wind farm are well-grounded
April 21, 2006

Greenpeace has provided their endorsement of Cape Wind while many serious issues presented by this project remain. Leaping before looking as Greenpeace has done ignores the critical issue of appropriate siting. We are embarking on a new frontier, offshore, and wind energy projects must be directed development as we direct land development through measures like zoning.

NIMBY, a term used by Greenpeace and others, characterizes the opposition of Cape Wind as wealthy landowners. This myopic viewpoint seriously undermines the broad and consistent objections to this project proposed for a site selected by the developer. The risks posed to navigation are significant and real, and reflect experience with offshore wind farms in Europe. Cape Wind's consultants assert "no risk" to navigation, not the Coast Guard, or the state of Massachusetts.

It is important that the public understand that there has been no finding that this project is environmentally sound, by either state or federal agencies responsible for such making such determinations. And, that the proponent's draft Environmental Impact Statement was found grossly deficient by federal agencies, and was given a "Category 3 – Inadequate" rating by EPA Region 1.

The state of Massachusetts has not approved this project. Rather, only one of several permitting agencies has given preliminary approval for the cable portion of the project.

The Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs also noted significant shortcomings in the draft Environmental Impact Statement and wrote a 26-page decision outlining additional work areas to be addressed by the applicant.

The Stevens amendment offers a solution that directs the development of wind energy projects and will ensure the safety of the navigators of our waterway. The public safety must be the first of all considerations when siting wind facilities, on shore or offshore.

While we need to focus on alternative energy sources, we must be certain that wind energy projects are located so that the environmental and socioeconomic impacts are outweighed by the benefits of the alternative energy source. We should also have reasonable expectations regarding this nascent technology. Wind energy has little to do with reducing dependence on foreign oil as only 2 percent of imported oil is used in generating electricity.

Cape Wind is opposed by bipartisan leadership of State leaders including Governor Romney, the Massachusetts Attorney General, the Lt. Governor, the senior Senator, Congressional representatives, the state Senator from the

district, and all but one state representative. There is strong opposition to this project voiced by area Chambers of Commerce, major commercial fishing organizations, three local airports, and the public/private ferry operators who navigate this waterway.

Cape Wind has abused the lack of federal regulatory program to govern offshore wind, and wants its project to move ahead in advance of the developing national program for offshore wind.

It is our responsibility to adequately address siting issues that are presented by offshore wind energy projects. Guiding offshore wind energy facility development will ensure that alternative energy sources are viable. We need solutions that do not compromise public safety, our fishing grounds, and our fragile and productive ecosystem.

Barbara Durkin

Northboro