

2019 fight against wind farms.

Rosemary
Hart

Tourism.

Its main source of income. Montgomeryshire deserves AONB status like the Shropshire hills.. I've travelled through a lot of AONBs with less dramatic scenery!

Surveys. When I see a percentage of surveys that discover the opposite of what the commissioning body was hoping for, I'll start to trust them! Until then – the usual results are suspicious...

Turbines are disproportionately large for the hills they stand on. Movement draws the eye – you want to ignore them but you can't. They do have a certain white slimness, but if this was England, would they be tolerated in the Cotswolds or on the Malvern hills? No! So why blight Montgomeryshire?

Our AM, Russell George, is very trustworthy on the subject, but I suspect the idea is – the majority of people live in industrial South Wales and don't know or care about Montgomeryshire – they vastly outnumber the inhabitants of the green hills – so as a minority we are overlooked. It sounds democratic but is it fair? It makes a LOT more difference to us!

General Welsh
Assembly

Because of the M54, Montgomeryshire is important to visitors from the West Midlands, a major hub of population. Green nature is important to good mental health – plenty of evidence.

What about access roads for transporting turbines? In the hills, single track roads where even small cars have to reverse for each other are the norm. To get turbines to their destinations involves major disruption on all roads, and traffic hold-ups to enrage the tourists. As the Tourism Company's Mid Wales Regional Tourism Strategy stated in 2011, driving in the region is still a pleasure. With little public transport, what will become of tourism if that ceases to be true?

There's enough info on the Internet, both for and against, to keep me talking for hours on end, so I have to base opinions on scientific points.

Technology improves; science stays unchanged.

Industry propaganda.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/energy/windpower/3867232/Promoters-overstated-the-environmental-benefit-of-wind-farms.html>

A Problem With Wind Power – the grid is inefficient – have they improved it?

From 2007 to 2011, accidents involving wind turbines occurred almost daily. How much has the technology improved?

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/8948363/1500-accidents-and-incidents-on-UK->

20
1

[windfarms.html](http://www.aweo.org/windgrid.html)

<http://www.aweo.org/windgrid.html>.

Industry propaganda is very seductively worded – but – normally based on what turbines do when the wind speed is right – 40-50 mph. If the wind speed drops from 40mph to 20mph, the power output does not drop by 50 per cent: it drops by 87.5 per cent. At 10 mph, the wind doesn't have $\frac{1}{4}$ of the power of a 40 mph wind. It has 1.56% of the power. Montgomeryshire is not a windy county. Even in winter I experience day after day of light breezes, or no wind at all. So it appears these things are put on our hills for money or other suspect reasons.

Letters, Daily Telegraph, 4 September 2007. Norman Plaistow, Hon Curator Wimbledon Windmill Museum. (12 years won't have changed the science.)

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/8948363/1500-accidents-and-incidents-on-UK-windfarms>.

[html http://www.aweo.org/windgrid.html](http://www.aweo.org/windgrid.html).

Dead insects can also pile up on the blades and reduce efficiency.

http://www.phschool.com/science/science_news/articles/insects_in_wind.html

Low temperatures negatively affect the materials turbines are made of.

Wind Energy: Cold Weather Issues

Antoine Lacroix

Dr. James F. Manwell

University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Renewable Energy Research Laboratory

From 2007 to 2001, accidents involving wind turbines occurred almost daily

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/8948363/1500-accidents-and-incidents-on-UK-windfarms.html> How much has the technology improved?

They are sited in former bogs that release trapped CO₂. I've read claims they can make up for that in six months or so – I don't believe a word of it without proof that wasn't forthcoming (at the time, anyway) I suspect greenwash...

Flooding has become frequent. So to erect these things, they concrete over much of the headlands???? where major rivers rise, increasing run-off and flooding downstream. Flood defences in one place mean more water going downstream to flood somewhere else. Is the entire course of the Severn protected by flood defences? No!

Some turbines (not all) need $\frac{1}{2}$ ton magnets of neodymium. Mined in Baotou, China in atrocious conditions. The stinking lake of toxic waste poisons the land so crops and livestock die, and the people suffer serious health problems, including cancer, on a much bigger scale than elsewhere. That's not making the world greener, just shifting the problems onto someone else!

2

I searched Greenpeace for info on neodymium – earlier I found nothing! Now I can't locate a search box on their site, but googling “greenpeace neodymium” doesn't produce much. According to <http://www.lenntech.com/periodic/elements/nd.htm> Neodymium gradually accumulates in soils and water soils and this will eventually lead to increasing concentrations in humans, animals and soil particles.

Polluted soil. <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/nvswcd/newsletter/phyto.htm>

Turbines attract bats, but are fatal to them. Bats are worth millions to the economy eating insects we don't like – most are not the pollinators we are trying to save.

<https://www.fort.usgs.gov/science-feature/96> Bat Fatalities at Wind Turbines: Investigating the Causes and Consequences.

<http://electrical-engineering-portal.com/why-bats-are-insanely-attracted-to-wind-turbines> by Edvard Csanyi

Bats Worth Billions to Agriculture: Pest-control Services at Risk

U.S. Department of the Interior,

Catherine Puckett, USGS, Marisa Lubeck, USGS, Justin Boyles, Univ. of Pretoria.

Since the 1960s, with the exception of kites and feral pigeons, the bird population has dropped by 40 million! I'm a lifelong ornithologist. It's claimed that birds are not attracted to turbines. Bird perch on the highest thing they can find – the higher they are, the safer they feel. Just as pheasants haven't evolved to beware of predators that zoom up to them at ground level from the side (like cars) so other birds haven't evolved to beware of predators that descend from above like the tip of a turbine blade. Also very few birds look straight ahead as we do. Their eyes are on the sides of their heads – they are looking to the side.

<http://raptorpolitics.org.uk/2011/03/17/why-birds-crash-into-wind-turbines/>

Professor Graham Martin, University of Birmingham

So birds are at risk, yet deaths are covered up by the industry.

<http://www.windbyte.co.uk/birds.html>

<http://windfarmaction.wordpress.com/birds/>

<https://www.wind-watch.org/documents/does-fatal-attraction-of-hirundines-to-wind-turbines-threaten-populations-and-species/> World Council for Nature.

According to Mark Duchamp of Save the Eagles International, a prolific writer who has dedicated his life to this project. birds of prey are at serious risk.

Windfarms: bird mortality cover-up in the UK

Ornithologists employed to “find” that turbines don't endanger birds are employed by the industry, so not impartial. Finding bodies? Birds have many air spaces in their bones to make them light enough to fly. That means dead birds disappear quickly – it doesn't take as long for them to get eaten/decompose as it does for a mammal.

3/

The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds comes out shamefully, taking money from wind farm promoters, so denying the harm done to birds.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2305197/RSPB-makes-killing-windfarmgiants-turbines-accused-destroying-rare-birds.html>

Open letter to the RSPB. Co-signed: Professor David Bellamy – Mark Duchamp

As actual today as it was in 2009, perhaps even more!

RSPB executives are causing severe harm to bird life.

DE FACTO HELPING WINDFARM DEVELOPERS GET AWAY WITH THE SLAUGHTER OF RARE BIRDS. Mark Duchamp



I found this photo published as “proof” that kites avoid turbines! Really? The tail shape tell you they are kites. If you watch them, they fly in circles, looking downwards for carrion, not upwards for something capable of banging them on the head, and they glide on the rising air currents produced by hills. This photo proves conclusively that kites do NOT avoid turbines, in fact, they are in harm's way!

At the time I was writing a paper for the Public Enquiry, Germany apparently ran into trouble because of excessive reliance on wind and solar power without enough wind and sun.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/9559656/Germanys-wind-power-chaos=should-be-a-warning-to-the-UK.html> Germany has gone further down the 'renewables' path than any country in the world, and now it's paying the price.

Afterwards I had to catch up on other things I'd put aside to study energy, but this issue seems to have been hushed up. I'd like to know what became of it.

Finally Nobel Prizewinner Jack Steinberger now studies renewable energy. He said: “Wind is not the future. It represents an illusory technology — a cul-de-sac that would prove uneconomic and a waste of resources in the battle against climate change.” If a Nobel Prizewinner states something to do with his studies, he knows

4/

more than the rest of us. So surely it's wrong to ignore him as though we know better – we don't!

Solar.

Panels can take up good agricultural land. Two forms Photovoltaic and thermal. Although efficient, the latter attracts insects, pursued by swallows. Both, including some of our pollinating insects, are killed by the heat.

“Thermal solar, also known as concentrating solar, generates electricity by focusing solar rays to transform a fluid into steam. That steam then turns a turbine to power a generator. These installations can kill birds. Some concentrated solar installations arrange a huge number of mirrors that point to a central tower, and the concentrated solar towers create an incredibly high-heat area that's dangerous for anything to touch. What's worse, the light beam and surrounding mirrors actually *attract* birds and the insects they like to eat.”

↑
Audubon, the American equivalent of the RSPB. (Have they gone down the same path?) However they point out that systems can be developed to make them safe (or safer) for birds.

What should we do instead? I know this is a little off-topic so I'll be very brief. Tidal Power! We have lots of it, if we sunk the money spent on wind into it! Only one thing to watch – barrages over estuaries of international importance to migrating fish and birds..

“disruption of fish migrations and the movement of large marine animals. Estuaries also help to filter out the sediments and pollutants from rivers and other water bodies prior to the water reaching the ocean.”

<https://greentumble.com/advantages-and-disadvantages-of-tidal-power/>

Naive people say: “the birds will go somewhere else.” Ornithologists know they've reached the end of their tether when they find their ancestral feeding and resting spots have vanished; also a given area of habitat can only produce enough food for a given number of birds and is already fully occupied by all the birds it can support. Result – death. On a big scale – extinction.

On migration

<http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2010/mar/07/extinction-species-evolve>
Humans driving extinction faster than species can evolve, say experts. By Juliette Jowit,

I found mention of a wonderful scheme - underwater turbines off headlands and rocky coasts with nets to keep out wildlife. Why don't we hear more about it?

5