

## Merz, Jeff

---

**From:** noreply@hirep-wind.com  
**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2011 11:30 PM  
**To:** Johnston, Douglas; Merz, Jeff  
**Subject:** [HIREP Wind EIS] New Comment

### A New Comment has been Submitted

---

The following concerns are offered in the hope that the PEIS for the HIPEP will fairly explore these concerns. I have no financial interest related to the comments except as related to a fair and through assessment of the long run benefit or detriment of the proposed transmission line to life in Hawaii and the energy big picture for the long run.

Hawaii is centered in the largest ocean on earth and enjoys relatively easy access to deep water and wave action. Yet we seem to be putting primary effort to energy solutions, such as wind and solar, that depend on the availability of open space on land, the one asset that we are quite short on. Further, we are apparently looking at solutions that can supply energy only intermittently, when the wind blows and when the sun shines. This focus is unfortunate in that intermittent power economically assists in keeping Hawaii dependent on existing power plants that must burn petroleum during the times when no other power is generated and as a full time supplement. Even further, we are exploring downgrading the efficiency of wind power by adding significant transmission loss with an interisland cable. And even further, we are looking at spending a \$1,000,000,000 or so just for misdirected infrastructure.

The point being made here is that the PEIS needs to be a fair and open assessment with focus on the best interest of all Hawaii and not to a specific proposal or financial interest. If we spend a \$1,000,000,000 for a poor solution, any proposals for a better long term solution, like power from the ocean, will have an even more difficult time, politically and economically, in becoming operational. Poor solutions keep us at the mercy of the politics of oil, even if only partially.

For the PEIS, in addition to the above, please also consider the following:

- The economic consequences of diminishing the beauty of a tourist destination.
- The risk and consequences of changing wind and cloud cover patterns due to climate change trends.
- HECO is testing the burning of palm oils. If petroleum is too expensive or scarce to burn in the existing power plants that must supply power when there is no wind or sun and as a full time supplement, the logic of "burning food" in fixed power plants in a world that is becoming hungrier by using bio-fuel crops (aside from bio-fuel byproducts) is just as short sighted as burning petroleum. In other words, what is the big picture result of prolonging the existing power generating system and what is the best practical full time solution for the long run? How does the PEIS cable proposal fit? A solution or serious obstruction?

Submitted on Mon, Feb 28, 2011 / 11:29PM HST by Richard Ito

---

Email Address: [r\\_t\\_ito@hotmail.com](mailto:r_t_ito@hotmail.com)

Phone Number: 808-455-8545