

**DOCKETED**

<b>Docket Number:</b>	23-OPT-01
<b>Project Title:</b>	Fountain Wind Project
<b>TN #:</b>	253311
<b>Document Title:</b>	Jim Wiegand Comments - Climate Change and Fountain Wind - comment #2
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Jim Wiegand
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	11/26/2023 3:53:43 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	11/27/2023

*Comment Received From: Jim Wiegand*  
*Submitted On: 11/26/2023*  
*Docket Number: 23-OPT-01*

**Climate Change and Fountain Wind - comment #2**

*Additional submitted attachment is included below.*

## Climate Change and Fountain Wind

A thousand wind turbines could be built in the Fountain Wind project and will have no positive impact on climate. In fact, when all manufacturing, infrastructure, forest clearing and maintenance are all added up with a net wind energy/grid performance audit, any positive impacts by wind turbines on climate are impossible.

Even BOEM when considering thousands of 10 MW offshore turbines along the East Coast, has this to say about wind turbine impacts on climate.

*“The Proposed Action would produce GHG emissions as stated above; however, the contributions would be minuscule compared to aggregate global emissions. The additional GHG emissions anticipated from the Proposed Action over the 30-year period would have a **negligible** incremental contribution on existing GHG emissions. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have **negligible** impacts on climate change during these activities and an overall **minor beneficial** impact on GHG emissions compared to the generation of the same amount of energy by the existing grids. Because GHG emissions spread out and mix within the troposphere, the climatic impact of GHG emissions does not depend on the source location. Therefore, regional climatic impacts are a function of global emissions. Development of offshore wind projects and the construction, implementation, operation, maintenance, and the eventual decommissioning activities would cause some GHG emissions increases primarily through emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>. However, these contributions would be minuscule compared to aggregate global emissions. In context of reasonably foreseeable environmental trends, the combined GHG emissions on air quality from ongoing and planned actions, including the Proposed Action, would likely result in a **minor beneficial** impact from the net decrease in both GHG emissions and criteria pollutants, including ozone precursors such as NO<sub>x</sub>, as fossil-fuel-type facilities reduce operations as a result of increased energy generation from offshore wind projects. **Overall, it is anticipated that there would be no collective impact on global warming as a result of offshore wind projects, including the Proposed Action alone, though they may beneficially contribute to a broader combination of actions to reduce future impacts from climate change.**”*

BOEM states the Proposed Action, would likely result in a “minor beneficial impact, but this statement was made without giving any consideration the net grid energy actually provided to consumers from wind projects.” Wind is only useful in climate change discussions or to consumers, if enough energy is being created to lower baseload energy at primary power plants. When baseload energy is lowered due to the addition of wind energy, this is the net benefit from wind. **This seldom happens and these net numbers have never been released to the public, making reported wind energy a massive exercise in deception and consumer fraud because net grid energy to consumers from turbines, is a fraction of this industry's and EIA's reported numbers.**

Appendix A—Planned Action Offshore Wind Scenario and  
Assessment of Resources with Minor Impacts

Conclusion
<p>The Proposed Action would produce GHG emissions as stated above; however, the contributions would be minuscule compared to aggregate global emissions. The additional GHG emissions anticipated from the Proposed Action over the 30-year period would have a <b>negligible</b> incremental contribution on existing GHG emissions. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have <b>negligible</b> impacts on climate change during these activities and an overall <b>minor beneficial</b> impact on GHG emissions compared to the generation of the same amount of energy by the existing grids. Because GHG emissions spread out and mix within the troposphere, the climatic impact of GHG emissions does not depend on the source location. Therefore, regional climatic impacts are a function of global emissions. Development of offshore wind projects and the construction, implementation, operation, maintenance, and the eventual decommissioning activities would cause some GHG emissions increases primarily through emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>. However, these contributions would be minuscule compared to aggregate global emissions. In context of reasonably foreseeable environmental trends, the combined GHG emissions on air quality from ongoing and planned actions, including the Proposed Action, would likely result in a <b>minor beneficial</b> impact from the net decrease in both GHG emissions and criteria pollutants, including ozone precursors such as NO<sub>x</sub>, as fossil-fuel-type facilities reduce operations as a result of increased energy generation from offshore wind projects. Overall, it is anticipated that there would be no collective impact on global warming as a result of offshore wind projects, including the Proposed Action alone, though they may beneficially contribute to a broader combination of actions to reduce future impacts from climate change.</p>

Jim Wiegand - Wildlife Biologist