

Merz, Jeff

From: noreply@hirep-wind.com
Sent: Friday, February 11, 2011 11:19 AM
To: Johnston, Douglas; Merz, Jeff
Subject: [HIREP Wind EIS] New Comment

A New Comment has been Submitted

Excerpts of my 2/5/11 Scoping Meeting testimony:

1. Fire protection

AECOM needs to return to Lanai to meet with CCR and the Maui Fire Department to insure fire protection concerns are addressed and noted in the EIS.

2. Water access

AECOM needs to return to Lanai to consult with the Lanai Water Company, CCR and Lanai Water Advisory Committee. By doing so, issues such as water source(s), water allocation and Lanai's Water Use and Development Plan compliance can be addressed.

3. Decommissioning issues

Since the lifespan of the project ranges from 10-20 years, many residents will still be around for its decommissioning if the project actually goes through. Therefore, AECOM must include in the EIS decommissioning issues such as, but not limited to; coordination, responsible entity, funding and protocol.

4. View Planes

Since the elevation of parts of the Ka`a ahupua`a is higher than the city's elevation, CCR was inaccurate in stating that we would not see any of the turbines, or at the very least just some or the tops of the turbines. The EIS needs to do a cross section of the island looking East-Northeast showing how many turbines will be visible from the city. The EIS needs to show an aerial view, preferably a fly over, similar to the one of Friends of Lanai's website. Lastly, the EIS must show from a minimum of four viewer orientations (E, N, W & S) the view plane of the project.

5. Impact of Polihua inverter station

As telling as the Friends of Lanai model is, AECOM must visit the project site and especially Polihua to appreciate the impact an inverter station will have on the beach, coastline and ultimately the overall environment.

We've learned that the station could be huge-couple of stories high on a 1 acre footprint of a one story facility on a multi-acre footprint. Totally unacceptable, even for those who may support the project.

6. Community splitting

AECOM needs to interview community members on how this proposed project is already leading to splitting of the community. There have been other projects/CCR endeavors that have also led to splitting. Some I believe are a natural progression of change whereas some feel there's a subtle attempt to, in fact, pit one faction of the community against the other, or at the very least employ a "divide and conquer" strategy.

7. Harbor & road construction impacts

AECOM needs to interview residents, business owners and CCR as to the impact harbor & road reconfiguration/construction will have on the community and businesses. Please remember that we get one barge a week that probably brings in ~80% of all of our goods and perishables.

8. Noise study

The EIS needs a noise study that shows the decibel levels of the project. The levels must be measured at different turbine speeds, from different vantage points or orientation (under the turbine, 500', ½ mile etc. radii) and cumulative vs. one turbine levels.

9. Causal relationships between project and fossil fuel use, and project and electricity rates

Since CCR's initial rationale for the project included claims that the project will eliminate the need for fossil fuels on Lanai, that it will make Lanai 100% renewable and ultimately lower electric rates on Lanai, the EIS must include the causal relationship between the project and CCR claims and how this will be accomplished.

10. Flicker rates

It's imperative that AECOM include in the EIS, a study with accompanying recommendations re: flicker. The study must include seasonal/sun declination, viewer orientation and turbine speed considerations.

11. Conflict with intent of Conservation zoning

The EIS needs to address if the placement of up 170 wind turbines in the State Land Use Conservation district is consistent with the intent of that type of zoning. I believe 1 or 2 turbines would be appropriate in seeking a Special Use permit, but not a project this size.

(LSG has and will continue to advocate that the Maui County Planning Department formally zone the project area Open Space I and Open Space II. By doing so, this will give Lanai "home rule" in that our Lanai Planning Commission will have jurisdiction over projects in the OS I and OS II zones.)

12. Community relationship dynamics with CCR

Research and interviews must be conducted to identify the impact this project will have on the tenuous relationship between the community and CCR. The power imbalance within the community is striking; some of which you heard of on Saturday.

(I distinctly remember my uncle who used to work for Dole as a supervisor telling me he had to instruct he workers to attend public hearings, tally who attended and report back the next morning. Most recently, a resident was "made an offer they couldn't refuse" by CCR regarding the hanging of a 4'x8', "No Windmills on Lanai" banner on their fence. They subsequently took it down and it is now hanging on my fence. These are but just two examples of the relationship dynamics I ask you to address in the EIS.)

13. Significance of utilizing firm vs. intermittent power

The EIS needs to address the rationale for this project since the utilities and policy makers prefer “firm” power as opposed to wind’s intermittent or unreliable power characterization.

“No-go” criteria:

There needs to be “no-go” criteria for this process or else all of the information obtained and/or searched for will be made to fit your paradigm, namely that this project is a “go”. This is especially significant when there are no alternatives identified.

Submitted on Fri, Feb 11, 2011 / 11:18AM HST by Butch Gima

Email Address: bg325@hotmail.com

Phone Number: 808-559-9566