

## Paul Foley

---

**From:** Marie Stamos [jstamos1@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 12, 2019 4:30 PM  
**To:** Paul Foley  
**Cc:** jstamos1@aol.com  
**Subject:** PUBLIC RECORD DRI 688 Vineyard Wind Undersea Cable

March 12, 2019

**COMMENT TO:** Mr. Paul Foley, MVC DRI Coordinator  
**FROM:** Marie J. Stamos  
**REGARDING:** Proposed Offshore Industrial Wind Farm Vineyard Wind Cable, more

(NOTE: BEFORE I START MY COMMENT WHICH IS DIRECTED PRIMARILY TO CABLE AND SECONDARY, IF NOT MORE IMPORTANT, CONCERNS, I note the height of the MHI V164 - 9.5 M quoted in MVC Staff Report 2/21/2019 to be 613.5 feet. Can that be verified and confirmed? Thank you.)

**COMMENT:**

My interest in the Vineyard Wind project was piqued further by the insistence that the public hearing be held to “specifically discuss the undersea cables” and it appears the meeting was continued because someone dared speak about “noise”.

**I know nothing about undersea cable, do you?**

Hoping to know more, and knowing about the issues at Block Island, I checked specs and comments about the MHI Vestas/Japanese Mitsubishi Heavy Industry V164-9.5 MW industrial wind turbine (dubbed the world’s most powerful industrial wind turbine). There were few details about “cable”.

And after all, what does the average citizen attending a Public Hearing about a significant industrial wind turbine project of eighty-four 750 (+-) foot tall Vestas wind turbines know about undersea cable and what does cable mean to them?

In my opinion, not a lot. Other, perhaps, than, “Oh, it is just the cable”; not a lot to be concerned about there, so they speak positively for the cable aspect of the project. For Vineyard Wind project and its supporters, it is probably much more. It is a “one down”. It is a topic that does not need to be addressed again, will not become a subject used to block a controversial wind project. And, at some point the industry/”project” can say, we talked about cable and only one person had a problem. The MVTimes summed it up this way “[a named resident] was the *lone* dissenter.”

Cable. We know high voltage cable can present problems; cable can be torn up by equipment and either damage the equipment or damage the high voltage cable (causing future harm); movement and displacement by waves and currents can undermine its stability; exposure can cause human and wildlife harm or necessitate “detours”.

Only AFTER that ‘Public Hearing’ did anyone speak publicly to the fact that the Block Island wind farm is experiencing high voltage cable exposure placing humans (not to mention tourism) in harm’s way. It would be best to place concerns about the cable aspect of the Vineyard Wind project high on the list of concerns.

Yet despite the fact that Dr. Parker (the "named" resident and lone dissenter referred to earlier) shared evidence of those concerns with the MVC and your two local papers on Tuesday, 2-26-19, a few days after the "Public Hearing" and now almost two weeks later, there has been no mention of the undersea cable issue in either of your local papers which typically keep up with the news daily on their online versions and have published twice since that time.

The regional press has picked up on the undersea cable problem to some extent. The fact that burial of the BI cable "failed to follow permitting guidelines.... after encountering unplowable material which prevented the cable from being buried to the targeted depth," was reported by the Providence Business News | January 18, 2017 | [pbn.com](http://pbn.com).

\*The Block Island Times articles submitted by Dr. Parker are dated August and December 2018, and note that the cable has never yet been buried as permitted. More recently (1-17-19) The BIT reports they are still "analyzing the soil and terrain surrounding the two electric cables at the Town Beach, which have become exposed."

Although there they sit on the MVC Correspondence page for this DRI (surely one of the most if not THE most significant DRI the Commission will ever consider or adjudicate), one has to wonder whether a single MV Commissioner has chosen even to read the 1-page news reports.

In reality, the whole matter is about the Vineyard Wind project in its entirety as a finished product. Whether it is addressed piece by piece or in total, a built-out Vineyard Wind project is the problem. The problems inherent with all industrial wind turbines remain. Noise issues MUST be addressed; latest reports and studies indicate that infrasound travels greater distances than thought. One can only imagine what that means when eighty-four 9.5 MW wind turbines are generating sound and vibration across the ocean. Fourteen miles is an insignificant distance from that annoyance to determine one is "safe". The following recent infrasound findings:

<https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/2014JD022821>

I share the following with you from 2011, a forewarning of sorts:

YOUR VIEW: Problems with offshore wind farms not worth it  
<http://wickedlocal.com/x1225331874/YOUR-VIEW-Problems-with-offshore-wind-farms-not-worth-it>

EXCERPT: "Fortunately, the Cape Wind Project has been held at bay by intelligent citizens and legislators, but now all valuable fishing grounds are being besieged by bureaucrats who for some unknown reason, about which I care not to speculate, dangle leases aimed at speculators for acres in fishing grounds wherein wind farms have no business and should never be located." (NOTE: This "opinion" is from 2011).

In 2019 industrial turbine wind farms still have no business in nor should they be located in fishing grounds, recreational boating grounds, areas considered significant natural resources or having significant viewsapes.

We have time and need time to rethink the impacts, the real costs of renewable energy mandates, in this case tragically proximal to Martha's Vineyard, Nantucket, and the entirety of Cape Cod, all of which will have these monstrosities in their \*view shed. When the truth of their absurdity finally strikes home, the industrialized Atlantic, your "new" view of choice, will serve as a reminder to all who supported an ill-conceived BUT mandated Renewable Energy experiment which failed and that it was put there by your choice because you supported it.

As described by the 2012 BOEM-sponsored Offshore Wind Turbine Visibility study, “small to moderately sized facilities were visible to the unaided eye at distances greater than 26 mi (42 km), with turbine blade movement visible up to 24 mi (39 km). At night, aerial hazard navigation lighting was visible at distances greater than 24 mi (39 km).” Back then, 3MW offshore turbines were considered HUGE. See the Thanet wind farm visit documented in:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6wLaCE7p5kU&feature=youtu.be>

Even though there seems urgency on the part of the wind industry and wind farm developers, climate change approaches as it always does, always has, slowly. Wind turbines will not change the fact or cause climate change to be stalled or stopped. Those who believe otherwise must not be aware that regardless of how many wind farms are generated, wind farms will always need fossil fuel backup which defeats their purpose.

Had we paid attention to the human health consequences documented by NASA, DOE, and DOD studies in the late 1970s rather than allowing the industry to hide their results by manipulating their measurements, while placing larger and larger ineffectual towers around the world..., had we glanced at the 5th grade science lesson that shows why “Wind Won’t Work,” and re-directed our resources to R&D into what might be a scientifically reasonable approach to providing abundant, reliable, affordable energy for all on the planet....

...we would not have wasted these last 40 years trailing ignorantly behind the Wind Emperor who truly has no clothes. Perhaps Martha’s Vineyard is where the truth will finally be heard and we can get down to the business at hand.

The time has come to decide how much natural resource destruction, wildlife death, human health harm, economic turmoil, all supported by energy politicians and environmental groups, is going to be tolerated before finally admitting that destructive industrial wind turbines are not energy resources for the future.

We need only to look at Australia, Denmark, Europe generally to know that the industrial wind turbine agenda has been a failure onshore and offshore. Why are we not learning from their reality?

Marie J. Stamos  
22 Sonoma Road  
Quincy, MA 02171

XXX