

NC Scientific Advisory Panel — MHC 3/10/11

Good afternoon. Thank you for taking the time to hear the inputs of North Carolina citizens about energy matters.

My name is John Droz, and my wife and I are residents of Morehead City.

I am a physicist (with energy expertise), and I also have been actively involved in environmental matters (like water quality) for **over 30 years**.

My position on this topic is very easy to understand:

#1 - we **do** have energy and environmental issues, and

#2 - these technical matters should be solved by using **real** science.... *That's it!*

Although most citizens would agree that this makes sense, it is **not** what is happening. Our energy and environmental policies are being written by lobbyists, and are not burdened by real science. Some people may ask the good question: OK, so *what is **real** science?* Well here's the answer.

Science is **not** a collection of theorems and theories, but is a PROCESS. The *core* process is the **Scientific Method**.

The layman's version is that the Scientific Method consists of a proposal (for instance, *does it make sense to try to replace our fossil fuel sources with wind energy*) being subjected to a:

- 1) comprehensive,
- 2) objective,
- 3) independent,
- 4) transparent, and
- 5) empirical-based assessment.

The surprising fact is that this has NOT been done for wind energy. Anywhere!

Since we are in agreement that we have energy and environmental issues, why don't we look at this situation from another perspective... Let's say that some entrepreneurs step forward and present us with a **black box**. They claim that what's in the box holds an important part of a solution for our energy and environmental issues. They say for "confidentiality reasons" they can't tell us what's in this box, until we've bought it. They **assure** us though, that it will work.

So, would we **just** say "Great, who do we make the Hundred Billion dollar check out to?" *I would hope not!*

Thoughtful people would say something like: "Thanks for coming forward. What you say about your product sounds great. *However*, before we have taxpayers and ratepayers pay for this, we need to see a thorough **cost-benefits analysis** done, in a true scientific manner.

Due to aggressive lobbyists pushing for their multi-national conglomerate clients, **none of this has been done for wind energy** — offshore or onshore. Are citizens being unreasonable to ask for genuine scientific proof that something really works? And BTW (and I'm sure you as the Scientific Advisory Panel know this) but we are **not** looking for *reports by scientists*, but rather *scientific reports*. BIG DIFFERENCE!

Some may ask the good question: "exactly what needs to be proven?" Any new alternative source of energy needs to have a thorough a) **technical**, b) **economic**, and c) **environmental** assessment. And the way science works, this proof must be provided *by the proponents*.

When done properly we can then objectively know whether this new source is at least equal to our current sources of power, or not. If it isn't, then we shouldn't be wasting citizens' resources on it.

The key part of the UNC “Coastal Wind Energy for North Carolina’s Future” document is Section 8 which is supposed to be about carbon reduction. I have been in contact with the author of that chapter. It pains me to say this, but what’s there is **not** a scientific assessment of this critical matter. **There is zero empirical evidence provided that proves that wind energy saves *any* consequential amount of CO2.**

Personally I prefer to focus on the positive, so here’s the good news. You CAN recommend options to the governor that will create **more jobs** than wind energy, provide **more local economic benefits** than wind energy, are **more sustainable** than wind energy, will provide **lower electricity costs to ratepayers** than wind energy, and will **save much more CO2** than wind energy. What’s just one example? *Geothermal*.

I’d **strongly** recommend that you read the MIT report* on geothermal which concluded that a geothermal facility can be located almost anywhere, and would provide cost competitive electricity, 24/7. And no CO2! Let’s have NC be a leader in something like that, where there is **real value** to its citizens.

I could go on quite a bit here, but I’ve run out of time. My bottom line request is that you pass on to the Governor that NC should insist on **real science**, *prior* to the state endorsing or mandating any possible energy or environmental solutions — like offshore wind. *That **would** make us a leader!*

You might be interested in knowing that I’ve given free energy presentations to citizens in some ten states now, and I’ve posted it all online. Please go to **EnergyPresentation.Info** for the whole thing. If there are some genuinely interested people there, I’d also be glad to do this in Raleigh.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak. If you have any questions on my remarks please contact me.

John Droz, jr.
physicist & environmental advocate

1722 River Drive Morehead City, NC 28557
252-247-4969 "aaprjohn@northnet.org"

* For the MIT report see:

<<<http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2007/geothermal.html>>>

To see the direction that this non-scientific foolishness is heading, see the stunning acknowledgment last week about wind energy, by the chief executive of National Grid:

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 2011

THE DAILY TELEGRAPH

Era of constant electricity at home is ending, says power chief

● The days of permanently available electricity may be coming to an end, the head of the power network said yesterday.

Families would have to get used to only using power when it was available, rather than constantly, said Steve Holliday, chief executive of National Grid. Mr Holliday was challenged over how the country would "keep the lights on" when it relied more on wind turbines as supplies of gas dwindled. Electricity provided by wind farms will increase six-fold by 2020 but critics complain they only generate on windy days.

Mr Holliday told Radio 4's *Today* programme that people would have to "change their behaviour". "The grid is going to be a very different system in 2020, 2030," he said. "We keep

thinking that we want it to be there and provide power when we need it. It is going to be much smarter than that.

"We are going to change our own behaviour and consume it when it is available and available cheaply."

Mr Holliday was speaking ahead of a speech last night to the Royal Academy of Engineering, in which he warned that the government was "looking more to communities and individuals to take power into their hands".

He also warned that pylons would still be used to carry power cables across the countryside because it was 10 times more expensive to bury them.

"As a society, we all need to be clear about what we can and cannot afford," he said.