

276

P NP

DM28

Projet de parc éolien Massif du Sud

6211-24-023

-----Message d'origine-----

De : Salbright2@aol.com

Envoyé : 6 janvier 2011 17:39

À : BAPE - Communication Web

Objet : [POLLURIEL (Bayes)] - Massif du sud wind project - Bayesian Filter detected spam

Good evening,

I am sending a one page brief I have written regarding my opposition to the wind turbine project proposed for Massif du sud.

I am a U.S. citizen who considers Quebec City and the surrounding area a beautiful, charming place to live and visit. In fact, I have friends living there. I am also committed to protecting our fragile environment, both in Canada and the U.S.

I hope you will publish my brief. I followed the guidelines you outlined on your web site.

Respectfully,
Suzanne Albright

January 6, 2011

Massif du sud Wind Turbine Project

The proposed wind turbine project for Massif du sud is a bad idea for multiple reasons.

First, industrial wind, in general, is enormously expensive and poses a financial burden on citizens. The energy it produces is generally up to three times more than all traditional energy sources. In addition, the projected construction costs have been underestimated worldwide, and end up doubling or more when finally constructed. The maintenance and transmission costs are also underestimated.

Unfortunately, wind turbines also have a short life expectancy, around 20-30 years. At that time, they often rust, collapse, or become abandoned due to extremely high maintenance and repair costs, and because they are not recyclable, are abandoned where they sit.

Second, the energy they produce is unreliable, inefficient, and unpredictable. They produce energy only during a narrow range of wind speed, often less than 30% of capacity. They do not produce energy during peak demand, like hot still summer days which is when air conditioning is needed, and in frigid temperatures. This is currently well documented in UK, where wind turbines are frozen and nuclear power is being transmitted from France. Thus, costs are compounded even more. This generally leaves spring and fall for the little supplemental energy they contribute.

Third, wind turbines are dangerous, and require people to avoid being within a specified range of them. Blades break off, are thrown up to one half mile, and have been known to crash into buildings. Turbine gear boxes have fallen off, leak oil and explode. A park is obviously a place where people congregate to relax, enjoy the beauty, and feel safe and at peace. The noise and flickering lights are harmful to humans and also difficult to be near. There is significant published data available supporting harm to humans. In fact, this past fall, there was a conference in Picton, Ontario to address this issue.

Fourth, environmental damage from wind turbines is well documented. The Wolfe Island project is an excellent example. During the first six months of operation alone, 600 birds and 1,200 bats were slaughtered. The numbers continue at that rate. Can we afford to cause this vicious butchering of our precious wildlife? Can area residents be expected to tolerate witness this violence and suffering day after day forever? The answer is clearly "NO".

Finally, there is no proven benefit from adding wind energy to the energy mix. Nowhere in the world where wind farms are running has there been a documented decrease in carbon emissions. Denmark, with the greatest wind generating capacity of any European nation, has the highest CO2 emission rate of any of these countries. No traditional power plants have been shut down. The wind energy is just supplemental. Further, industrial wind turbines require 200 or more gallons each of oil to operate, with 20,000-60,000 gallons more in their service platforms. How often would you need to change the oil? How would you dispose of used oil in such large amounts?

I hope Quebec City will not become the home of such a filthy, dangerous, costly, and frightening project. The residents and tourists deserve much better.