

Letter from M. A Maks to DNREC, dated August 13, 2024 DNREC Administrative Proposal to US Wind off DE beaches

I object to the Windfarm proposals for the DE shores for the following reasons:

1-Evidence that the electrical energy from the transmitters disables/disorients the gps of whales, horseshoe crabs, and other aquatic mammals. WindFarm said in a public forum that they (assuming anybody, not necessarily them) have studied the effects of wind farms on marine life for years and that there were none. When I cited MERR's study, they acquiesced their claim. See attached paper from MERR¹. " Furthermore, according to Suzanne Thurman in a personal email to Marie Maks, dated July 23, 2024, there is currently a lack of empirical data showing the effects of ocean based wind farms on marine mammals and other wildlife, so for anyone to state that there are no known effects would be erroneous.²" It also reinforces the challenges of making such a claim to allay the public's concern.

2-Delaware Bay is major migratory area for birds, monarch butterflies, geese, hawks, etc. The windmills when they destroy the migratory area will result in a biological desert. In addition, these tall steel towers in the air will create a lot of heat and hot spot to literally fry the fish in the area. Damage will be permanent.

3-Costs for maintenance not figured into the proposal; no competitive bidding for wind mills; only proposal by US Wind was accepted by DNREC. Costs do not reflect damage and repair by specialized scuba divers. The one windmill in Lewes, DE on most days is not operating; it was down for several months in 2023 while a repair part was ordered and repairs made-on the ground. What a challenge for breakdown of windmills in the water. Debris from windmills found in Newport, RI ocean, which resulted in discontinuation of the project, as of July 2024. The technology is not ready for wind farms in DE; too many breakdowns and too costly.

4-Process not transparent for US Wind Farm obtaining the job. Despite reminders, the DE legislation never considered a competitive bid. The absence of a competitive bidding process, a fundamental aspect of fair procurement, is particularly concerning given that offshore wind is at least three to four times as expensive as other available options. The legislation did not consider maintenance costs over times; the costs for electricity will become excessive in the future.

5-Verbal public quote from WindMill Farm employee: "Wind mills can withstand 100 mph for hurricanes, and based on 1 in 1000 years of hurricanes reaching this force in DE we won't see hurricanes greater than this." Not true; Fact: October 15, 1954 – [Hurricane Hazel](#) passes to the west of the state, bringing wind gusts of over 100 mph (160 km/h). The hurricane caused at least one death in the state of DE. I object to the marketing comment from US Wind. Also, what is the impact of lower levels of wind? Debris, etc. See next point.

¹Suzanne Thurman Executive Director, MERR Institute, Inc.
801 Pilottown Rd. Lewes, DE 19958; merrinstitute@gmail.com; www.merrinstitute.org

² Suzanne Thurman in email to Marie Maks, dated July 23, 2024

6- Construction of the nation's first major offshore wind project, *Vineyard Wind 1*, located 14 miles off the coast of Nantucket, MA, has been halted. A [General Electric Halide-X \(12-megawatt\)](#), with a 351-foot-long fiberglass blade, collapsed during its commissioning test on July 13, 2024. At the time of the incident, the [Nantucket Current](#) reported that ten turbines were operational out of the 62 planned. Nantucket South beaches were closed because of possible injuries from sharp debris. This event further supports my position that windmills are not ready for electricity production for the Delmarva.

7-Noise to the public from transmitters, etc. I researched the BOEM report, BOEM-2024-03 and could not find a single reference for noise to humans. I am providing a citation from

Rand's Acoustic Study Findings:

In 2023, Robert Rand, an acoustic consultant, conducted a study of the sonar noise generated by the Miss Emma McCall survey vessel off the coast of New Jersey. He discovered that the sound at the source was 224 decibels. As sound waves travel away from the source, their strength decreases. But half a nautical mile away, Rand recorded peak sound levels at 151.6 decibels.

These findings are alarming and have significant implications for marine life, particularly whales. The *National Marine Fisheries Service* (NMFS), a division of the *National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration* (NOAA), states that whales and other marine mammals can **temporarily lose hearing at 152 decibels of continuous sound** (or root-mean-square levels) and permanently lose hearing at 173 decibels ([NOAA Fisheries, 2018](#); [NOAA Fisheries, 2020](#)). Loss of hearing leads to death as whales travel, communicate, and find prey through echolocation.

NOTE: Each 10-decibel increase is ten times louder, so 130-decibels is ten times louder than a music concert (120-decibels), and 152-decibels is over 1,000 times louder than a concert."

8- BOEM HAS NOT CONSIDERED IMPACT for tower installation-ignored in BOEM report, BOEM-2024-03 nor noise to nearby population

Resources eliminated from further consideration- Appendix B-2, B-1

‘NEPA requires issues (resource areas) that are significant to the action be the focus of the analysis...Although the analysis presented in previous EAs (e.g., Commercial Wind Lease Issuance and Site Assessment Activities on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Offshore New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, Final Environmental Assessment and Commercial Wind Lease Issuance and Site Assessment Activities on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Offshore North Carolina, Revised Environmental Assessment) included met tower installation, this potential source of impact has been removed from the present analysis and may account for a reduced impact rating relative to prior assessments. The evaluations and conclusions in those documents are consistent with BOEM’s determination that the resource areas outlined below will not be carried forward for analysis in this Draft EA because impacts on these resources are **anticipated to be negligible**. However, the resources listed here would be within the scope of analysis for future actions (i.e., development of a wind lease area).”

I believe US Wind should be denied the request for the windmill project, since I believe the BOEM risk assessment is not complete. See points 7 and 8. Furthermore, There are endangered species in the wetlands where the transmitters are being installed and there has not been an extensive review by US Fisheries, NYMPHS, and the EPA for the impact on the environment. DNREC has abused its legislative purposes, AND is motivated by personal benefits from the ultra-liberal government administrations.

DNREC should be focused on the expansion of solar panels which many homes in Sussex County have and do a good job at this, which they are not, before they embark on the US Wind proposal. How foolish that DNREC is most interested in supplying energy to Maryland residents, where there is no footprint of environmental intrusion on their 3000 miles of Chesapeake coastline while Delaware residents may never obtain energy for the project, and where DE land and ocean resources are permanently destroyed by being the handmaiden of the state of MD and DNREC.

Marie Maks
Resident of Wilmington, DE
Co-Owner of Beach property Lewes, DE
