



AMERICAN COUNCIL ON RENEWABLE ENERGY (ACORE)

February 18, 2005

Secretary Ellen Roy Herzfelder
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
Environmental Policy Act Office
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Karen Kirk-Adams
Cape Wind Energy EIS Project
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
New England District
696 Virginia Road, Concord, MA 01742

Dear Secretary Herzfelder and Director Kirk-Adams:

On behalf of the American Council On Renewable Energy (ACORE), I am writing to you to voice support for the Cape Wind project.

Our current energy situation is untenable. For instance:

- Oil imports are increasing yearly, leaving our country exposed increasingly to the need for war to keep the lifeline open.
- Natural gas supplies have peaked and we are now planning billions of dollars of investment in LNG import facilities, again leaving us open to international instabilities and disruptions.
- Coal is our mainstay energy source, but we are coming to grips with the fact that coal combustion dirties our air by particulate, SO_x, and NO_x emissions; causes global warming through CO₂ emissions; acidifies our lands and waters; and damages human health through mercury emissions.
- Nuclear power is a promised solution, but the fact is that the nuclear power industry has not developed a fuel reprocessing or waste disposal solution that the public has accepted, and hence there has not been a new order for a nuclear power plant for 26 years, fully a generation.

Secretary Ellen Roy Herzfelder
Karen Kirk-Adams
February 18, 2005
Page two

ACORE is not politically against those options, indeed ACORE is simply for renewable energy. We believe that, if we do not turn to renewable energy solutions, we will be digging deeper into the hole we have dug – more imported energy, more environmental destruction, and more risk to our economic stability. It is time to stop digging that hole. Renewable energy offers a way out.

Wind power offers naturally-occurring energy in return for our investment of capital. It is pollution-free energy. It is economical after accounting for the lack of environmental degradation. The installation of the equipment brings local jobs and economic prosperity – these are not dollars that flow overseas. It is a winning scenario.

In addition to the technical points made in the preceding paragraphs, I would like to add some perspective, because I feel especially strong about Cape Wind. I was born in Chelsea, Massachusetts, went to school in Cambridge, have had business offices in Boston, Waltham and Sterling, and have vacationed on Cape Cod (South Harwich and Hyannis – the Cape Wind view-shed) since 1966, Nantucket since 1980, and Martha's Vineyard since 1990. I am a sailor, a member of the Maryland Waterman's Association (the professional fisherman of the Chesapeake Bay), and an admirer of what is beautiful about the sea. I have known Jim Gordon for about 15 years, when I encountered him as a competitor in the non-utility power generation business. We are professional friends. So, all is not just detached analytical objectivity. It rarely is.

For these reasons, I, too, am concerned about the permanent installation of manufactured structures in a natural place of beauty like Nantucket Sound. I am concerned that we are gradually giving up nature to support our economic demands. We know that this is being debated in the case of Cape Wind.

However, as described in the draft EIS, it is a matter of balance. The wind towers are not natural, but they are less unnatural, I respectfully submit, than combustion-based power plants and smoke stacks, supported by the environmental degradation that is occurring, attendant to the mining and drilling and transportation of their fossil fuel supplies.

Indeed, I would submit that the installation of wind turbine towers is itself a demonstration of the public's desire to have less environmental degradation with economic growth. To place the towers in the playground of the Wall Street elite who are developing and financing the environmentally destructive oil, gas, and coal projects around the world is, I would say, perfectly fair and appropriate. It will be a yearly reminder, when they look out from their porches and from their yachts, that they could have done better, indeed, much better.

Secretary Ellen Roy Herzfelder
Karen Kirk-Adams
February 18, 2005
Page three

Just think of the massive amount of intellectual financial and legal talent that Wall Street is devoting to oil drilling in Africa and Asia, oil pipeline development across Russia and the FSU, coal mine expansions in West Virginia and China, and nuclear power development in France, Japan, and China. And then they want to summer on pristine Nantucket Sound.

No, Nantucket Sound is not the home of the poor nor the meek; it is not the haven of the regular people. It is in fact the playground of the rich, and, specifically, the Wall Street rich.

Therefore, as much as I love Nantucket Sound, I can envision no place on earth where it will be, for all of the reasons discussed here, more appropriate to build a wind farm – a clean source of energy for the surrounding community – and a demonstration that the wealthy might rethink what they are doing with their capital resources.

We believe that Cape Wind must be built because it will deliver clean, carbon-free electricity. It is where we, as a society, must go. There is no arguing this point. It is the fundamental, inescapable fact, that we as a society must gather the strength to do the right thing.

We endorse Cape Wind, and respectfully request that you approve it.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,



Michael T. Eckhart
ACORE President

Cc: Board of Directors