



Top 10 Myths About the Cape Wind Project

Myth	Response
1	<p>“Land Grab” – Cape Wind will occupy public lands for free.</p> <p>The passage of the 2005 energy bill authorized the Minerals Management Service (MMS) of the Department of the Interior to take over the permitting process for offshore wind projects because of their expertise in permitting offshore oil and gas drilling. The energy bill gives MMS authority to require offshore wind developers to lease public lands for use with 27% of this revenue coming to Massachusetts.</p>
2	<p>“Paying a Developer to Make Money” – The Cape Wind project relies heavily on public subsidies.</p> <p>Unlike fossil fuel-based power plants, Cape Wind will <u>not</u> be subsidized to build this project. The developer must fund the project with their own or borrowed money and pay taxes on any profit.</p> <p>However, because of the project’s environmental benefits, Cape Wind may be able to defray 1.8 cents from their annual tax bill <u>for each kilowatt-hour of energy produced in the first 10 years</u> of operation through the Production Tax Credit (PTC). The PTC is available to all renewable energy projects, however, it must be renewed by Congress every two years.</p>
3	<p>“Project Abandonment” – If the project fails, abandoned wind turbines will litter the Sound.</p> <p>Before construction begins, the developer will be <u>required</u> by the federal government to post a bond to ensure that sufficient funds are available for removing the turbines & associated materials and equipment at the end of the project’s lifespan.</p>
4	<p>“Bird Deaths” –Cape Wind could pose a threat to migratory birds in Nantucket Sound.</p> <p>After completing a 4-year study of Nantucket Sound, the Massachusetts Audubon Society has given conditional support for the Cape Wind project. The study concludes that the endangered Roseate Terns and Piping Plovers completely avoid Horseshoe Shoal, the proposed wind farm site.</p> <p>Radar studies conducted in Denmark indicate that wind farms have no adverse impact on bird populations, concluding that most bird species exhibit an avoidance reaction to wind turbines, thereby reducing the probability of a collision to less than 1 percent.</p>
5	<p>“Deep Water is the answer” – Deep water technology will be viable within 5 years and is a better solution to our energy needs.</p> <p>While Deep water offshore technology is the hope for the future, it is unlikely to be feasible within the next decade. Deep water wind farms are not economically viable. Currently, only one small scale experimental version is in operation.</p> <p>Near shore experience in shallow waters is necessary for deep water technology to advance. All of the countries proposing experimental deep-water projects have already mastered near-shore wind farms. The near-shore Cape Wind project will lay the foundation for U.S. deepwater technology in the future.</p>

Myth

Response

6	<p>“Economic Impacts” – The project poses calculable economic losses to business, taxes, and property values for Cape Cod. From an economic perspective, the costs of the project exceed the benefits.</p>	<p>There is not a single example of a wind farm anywhere in the world hurting tourism, property values or local economy.</p> <p>According to the 2004 Army Corps Draft EIS, impacts on Cape tourism and the local economy will be favorable and the wind farm development will not harm property values. This has been the case for offshore wind farms in Sweden and Denmark. Residents who were initially opposed to the Nysted wind farm in Denmark say their opinions changed once the wind turbines were built. Several years later, tourism, property values nor local economy have been impacted by the wind farm.</p>
7	<p>“Commercial Fishing Impacts” – Cape Wind would severely disrupt the commercial fishing on Horseshoe Shoal</p>	<p>The 2004 Army Corps DEIS predicted <u>no</u> negative impact on current commercial fishing activity occurring on Horseshoe Shoal. The Shoal is not used by large-scale commercial fisherman since the larger vessels could potentially run aground in the shallow area.</p> <p>The turbines will most likely <u>enhance recreational fishing</u>. As barnacles and other mollusks begin to attach to the turbine piles, more fish will be drawn to the area due to the increase in food supply.</p>
8	<p>“Boating Dangers” – The wind turbines would crowd navigation channels and create collision risks for ships, ferries, and fishing boats.</p>	<p>The wind turbines would be located in shallow waters <u>outside</u> of shipping and ferry channels.</p> <p>The 2004 Army Corps DEIS found the wind turbines would be “aids-to-navigation” and that the risk of a vessel colliding with a turbine is “low.” The turbines will be spaced 6-9 football fields apart allowing for easy navigation within the wind farm.</p> <p>Vessels needing assistance within the wind farm will be able to safely tie up to any of the turbines which are individually numbered for easy location identification.</p>
9	<p>“Oil Spill Hazard” – Nantucket Sound will be exposed to the environmental impact of a possible oil spill.</p>	<p>The oil required for the Electrical Service Platform (ESP), is low-toxicity mineral oil, much lighter - and less hazardous - than the exhaust of boats presently using the Sound. Furthermore, the oil is triple-contained for further safety unlike the millions of gallons of fuel that pass through Nantucket Sound each year. The platform itself will be built to the standards set forth by the American Petroleum Institute to withstand hurricane winds and waves.</p>
10	<p>“Radar Interference” – Wind turbines produce blind areas where vessels and aircraft cannot be detected by radar.</p>	<p>In 2007, after reviewing the Cape Wind proposal, the US Air Force, operator of the Pave Paws radar station at the Mass Military Reservation, announced that wind farms within a 30km radius would not adversely impact the radar system and that the Cape Wind project in particular would pose no threat to radar operations. The FAA has also given Cape Wind a “no hazard” determination for aviation.</p> <p>In addition, the British government determined wind farms can be sited within 500 meters of a shipping lane based on extensive radar studies. The Middlegrunden wind farm in Copenhagen harbor is within 500 meters of a major international shipping channel, with no collisions indicating that radar interference is not an issue.</p>