

Merz, Jeff

From: noreply@hirep-wind.com
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2011 4:47 PM
To: Johnston, Douglas; Merz, Jeff
Subject: [HIREP Wind EIS] New Comment

A New Comment has been Submitted

Few comments.

1. I think your EIS should have a lot more illustrations and strive to be more reader friendly than the EISPN, which sticks 3 figures at the end.
 2. Want to see a discussion in the Draft EIS regarding actual carbon savings and reduction in oil or other resource consumed should the wind projects operate as anticipated. This should include an examination of if the existing power plants that supply electricity today can actually be turned off to achieve such a reduction - not just a statement that the wind power will provide #MW power, but that as a result of the wind projects X power plant can be turned off provided the wind plants provide Y for Z hours. If some sort of new technology power plant is needed to provide this savings in carbon emissions and oil use then state so and evaluate its impacts.
 3. Concerning your alternatives, I'm sure you will get lots of comments on only having the build and no build. I can understand it, but believe you should address people's comments concerning the lack of alternatives in the Draft EIS with more than quick dismissal. Consider having a section of the Draft EIS that addresses scoping comments that ask for information that is beyond the scope of your EIS according to your lawyers. The TMT project did this in a section of their EIS that addressed a project site in another country in a separate section. Myself and others want information about the bigger range of alternatives that you may think is outside your scope, please provide them somehow.
- Thanks.

Submitted on Mon, Feb 28, 2011 / 04:46PM HST by Jim Hayes

Email Address: jimhinhi@hotmail.com

Phone Number: 808-988-0701