

4.16 ALTERNATIVES

Written Comment 5B:

There are more efficient and less invasive forms of green energy. Let's get rid of the landfill issues as well and adopt a waste energy mentality. I've read that a "garbage-to-energy" power plant is considered green energy due to the modern advances in filtering the emissions. Consider Denmark's examples of this technology. Walt Disney's vision of the future (EPCOT Center) includes a working model of this. A 1979 article mentions a Buffalo company that created the incinerators for this plant. How ironic that New York hasn't caught on to this.

Response to Written Comment 5B:

New York has both garbage to energy plants (i.e., incinerators) and landfill gas to energy plants, but neither are relevant to the Project Sponsor's applications. SEQRA requires evaluation of a "range of reasonable alternatives to the action that are feasible, considering the objectives and capabilities of the project sponsor." 6 N.Y.C.R.R. § 617.9(b)(5)(v) To the extent the Project Sponsor has obtained easements or leases, these are strictly limited to a wind power project, and do not allow for the siting of other energy production facilities. Consequently, other power generation technologies (e.g., solar, hydro, biomass, fossil fuel, "garbage-to-energy") are not feasible or reasonable alternatives that warrant consideration. Further, the Project Sponsor has expertise in developing wind power projects. As to Denmark, it receives approximately 20% of its energy from wind farms.

Written Comment 22A:

One other point, we currently have an electric generation plant in Olean, NY. This plant is owned by Indeck and sets on about three to four acres of land, that's about as much as one wind turbine. In total the turbines will use over 200 acres of beautiful timbered ridge line, at a cost of about **\$87 million dollars (basically all our tax money)**. The Indeck plant also produces a lot of noise, but the noise of this plant has been mitigated by the way the building was constructed and noise is not an issue with any of the neighbors.

Response to Written Comment 22A:

Comment noted. The turbines in this Project would not be all (or mostly) paid for by tax dollars.

Written Comment 22B:

As you know we have a huge supply of natural gas in this area and North America. And Indeck uses clean burning natural gas to power its electric generating turbines that have a capacity of 79 MW. In contrast the 29 turbines in the proposed Chipmonk wind farm have a total of 72.5 MW capacities.

But also unlike wind turbines these generators burning clean nature gas operate at an efficiency level much higher than that of a wind farm. When considering the real output, the turbines working at 20% (a high average) will produce about 15 MW. While the Indeck plant working at 50% will produce around 40 MW.

Indeck generators unlike wind power allow the operators to increase or decrease the amount of electricity needed by the grid very quickly.

Response to Written Comment 22B:

The Indeck plant to which the commenter is referring is what is also known as a “Peaker Plant” – a plant that comes online only when the power is needed at peak times. The commenter is correct about this plant’s ability to come online quickly and change its output quickly; however, other portions of the comment should be put into context:

- Natural gas may be “cleaner” than other fossil fuels; however, it is still a fossil fuel and the burning of fossil fuels causes the release of CO₂. It is well documented that the release of CO₂ causes a number of environmental and health problems (see Section 2.2 of the DEIS).
- Capacity factor is one element in measuring the productivity of a wind turbine or any other power production facility. It compares the plant's actual production over a given period of time with the amount of power the plant would have produced if it had run at full capacity for the same amount of time. A conventional utility power plant uses fuel, so it will normally run much of the time unless it is idled by equipment problems or for maintenance. A capacity factor of 40% to 80% is typical for conventional plants. A wind plant is "fueled" by the wind, which blows steadily at times and not at all at other times. Although modern utility-scale wind turbines typically operate 65% to 90% of the time, they often run at less than full capacity. Therefore, a capacity factor of 25% to 40% is common, although they may achieve higher capacity factors during windy weeks or months. It is important to note that while capacity factor is almost entirely a matter of reliability for a fueled power plant, it is not for a wind plant—for a wind plant, it is a matter of economical turbine design. With a very large rotor and a very small generator, a wind turbine would run at full capacity whenever the wind blew and would have a 60-80% capacity factor—but it would produce very little electricity. The most electricity per dollar of investment is gained by using a larger generator and accepting the fact that the capacity factor will be lower as a result. Wind turbines are fundamentally different from fueled power plants in this respect.

Oral Comment 2B:

But in my view there is even larger issues and that is what are the other energy options that are evolving and will mature over the next 10 years? As these other options develop and mature, and they will, the people who have today's wind turbine technology standing in their yard will be unable to make the shift and will be locked into the huge, noisy and unsightly wind turbines as the rest of the nation, very probably, is moving onto new, possibly even cheaper and more convenient energy technology. Therefore the reasons I would be personally opposed to this project and urge the Town of Allegany to be extremely cautious in its evaluation of it. Thank you.

Response to Oral Comment 2B:

Comment noted. An evaluation of alternate technologies is set forth in Section 5.5 (Alternate Technologies) of the DEIS.

Oral Comment 15D:

There are better places to put these turbines. Saying NO to this wind turbine project does not make you Un-American or against our nation goals for clean energy. The reality is that there are better locations that provide more cost effective solutions for the placement of wind turbines with reduced visual environmental impact. The landscape and transmission of power in areas such as Roscoe TX, the home of the largest wind farm in the world, with 627 turbines is far more efficient than in our area. Our federal government is focused on achieving 20% of our electrical generation coming from wind power by the year 2030. There is no regulation on where that generating capacity needs to be located. The current and future ridge plans for turbines in Allegany and Olean is the not the right place and we can all live with that decision.

Response to Oral Comment 15D:

Please see Section 5.2 of the DEIS, which specifically addresses alternate Project Site locations. It is respectfully noted that there is no legal authority to deny a project on a subjective belief that other locations across the country, which are not controlled by the applicant, are better suited for this Project.

Oral Comment 33A:

My name is Robin Porterfield. We have been in Allegany for about 13 years now. My husband and I, we're originally from Pennsylvania. And when he finished school, we had many places we could have chosen. We came here and fell in the love with the landscape. I mean, it is the beauty of the place. So we're very sad to hear that these wind turbines may go up. Again, I want to stress, you know, I think green is good. We recycle. And there are places for these turbines. Allegany is not

the place, not with the residences right next to it. There are many places that would be better appropriate. And the fact that, you know, we're conveniently located next to lines that would make it easier for this company is not a good reason to do it. It really isn't.

Response to Oral Comment 33A:

Comment Noted. Please see the alternatives analysis presented in Section 5.0 of the DEIS.