Camden Select Board Chair Bob Falciani,

Alison McKellar, Marc Ratner, Jenna Lookner, Taylor Benzie

Town Manager Audra Caler-Bell

Planning and Development Director Jeremy Martin

29 Elm Street, POB 1207

Camden, Maine 04843

January 28, 2020

RE: Your request of Friends of Ragged Mountain for Wind History information

Dear Select Board members, Town Manager Audra Caler-Bell and Planning and Development Direct Jeremy Martin;

The Select Board asked the Friends of Ragged Mountain for assistance in compiling information on energy issues, in particular for information about the wind power proposal from a decade ago in Camden. We hope you find these documents helpful as several were critical in coming to a conclusion regarding Ragged Mountain in 2010, and are vital still. Use them to guide you, if you consider industrial wind atop Ragged Mountain.

Specifically, this notebook contains Camden's Land Use Ordinance, Article X, Part 1, Section 2.(1), p. X-26 & 27, III-6 and VIII-11-13, (updated 8/6/2019) with Camden Attorney Bill Kelly's Advisory Opinion from 1/24/2011, indicating the current zoning (then and now) in Camden prohibits the installation of wind turbines on Ragged Mountain or on any mountain 500' above sea level. This document is very important.

Since Rockport and Hope citizens also own considerable acreage on Ragged Mountain, included here are their updated and current versions of (Rockport's 6/12/2018 and Hope's 6/13/2019) Land Use Ordinances as they pertain to Wind. You will also find the

official vote tallies counted in both Rockport and Hope, demonstrating their support for their Ordinances.

Looking back in time, *"At the polls on June 14, 2011, Rockport citizens voted **396-94** to support an amendment to the Land Use Ordinance as it pertains to wind development. This Ordinance* includes *a 100' turbine height limit, allows only one turbine per parcel of land and requires the electricity produced to be used at that parcel."* Rockport's Ordinance (812.2.3, page 8, 26-27 and 812.6 "Prohibitions") states: *"Any wind system larger than the standards outlined in this Section is prohibited in all districts."*

According to the Camden Herald on November 8, 2012, on November 6, 2012 the voters of Hope, Maine *"...approved adoption of an updated Land Use Ordinance by a vote of **559 in favor and 326 against**..." "The new Land Use Ordinance (5.3.36.1, c.) also includes regulations for wind turbines. Requirements include height limitations, the maximum height is 100' for a residential turbine and 140' for a turbine at a school."*

Camden's Planning Board Chair, Chris MacLean, Esq. also weighed in with his Advisory Opinion in the P.B. Minutes recorded on 3/2/2011, page 4, lines 17 & 18, regarding the development of wind atop Ragged stating that such was prohibited on Ragged Mountain.

Further, the Coastal Mountain Land Trust (CMLT) and Georges River Land Trust (GRLT) have binding contracts to preserve and protect several properties on Ragged Mountain. Their trails, including the new "Round the Mountain Trail" traverse Maine Water's and other critical acreage as indicated on the current CMLT and GRLT maps. (included)

On August 23, 2010, CMLT Executive Director, Scott Dickerson wrote to the Camden Select Board: page 2, paragraph 3: *"the land owned by the Land Trust on Ragged Mountain cannot be made available for the roads, utility lines, or towers/turbines that are part of wind generation development. The Board of Directors recognizes that this eliminates some potential sites for wind generation development on Ragged Mountain,*

a fact that should be taken into consideration as decisions are made about how to proceed with feasibility studies of wind generation on this mountain."

On June 21, 2016, Maine Water Company's President, Judy Wallingford sent the following press release: Maine Water and Coastal Mountain Land Trust Announce Collaboration to Protect Land and Water. Clean Water, Recreation and Open Space, Forever. Maine Water also advertised for the 2018 Round the Mountain Water Company Tour, stating: *"CMLT is in the middle of the Round the Mountain Collaboration, a campaign to conserve 1,400 acres of Maine Water Company land surrounding the water source for six towns..."* Clearly, Ragged Mountain is a valuable recreational and clean water resource worth protecting.

Finally, please find the Camden Select Board Minutes from 10/26/2010 in which Select Board Chair, *"John French made a motion to pull the project, keep what we have for research in a file and put energies into another project and send a letter of thanks to Hope, Rockport, the Energy Committee and the applicants who applied for the workgroup for their time. Deborah Dodge seconded this motion. The motion passed on a* ***5-0-0 vote****."*

A decade ago, we Friends voluntarily formed a group and went to great lengths to educate ourselves and our community about the effects of industrial wind. Our Mission is to preserve the quality of place and the quality of life represented by Ragged Mountain. Toward that end, I, Dorie Klein made notes then that explain events briefly dating back to 2008. The exploration began a few years before that. It is important that these details are known.

If the Camden Select Board is interested in delving deeper into the development of industrial wind atop Ragged Mountain in Camden, (Rockport and Hope,) the Friends of Ragged Mountain could provide you with a guide to wind power to substantiate our concerns about the effects of industrial wind.

In the meantime, the National Wind Watch (wind-watch.org) is an excellent source for information about industrial wind:

— BENEFITS : LOW — IMPACTS : HIGH —

Industrial-scale wind energy is often promoted as a clean and sustainable source of energy. It brings, however, many **adverse impacts** of its own. Of most immediate concern for communities targeted for wind power facilities are their size and noise, with the consequent loss of amenity and, in many cases, health.

People concerned with the environment are increasingly aware of the negative impacts of the giant machines and their additional supporting infrastructure (including heavy-duty roads, transformers, and power lines) on wetlands, birds, bats, beneficial insects, and other wildlife — both directly and by degrading, fragmenting, and destroying habitat for their erection, maintenance, and grid connections.

Considering these and other impacts, the construction of industrial wind energy facilities cannot be justified in the rural and wild places that developers usually target.

How much good might they do? The claims of reducing pollution or greenhouse gases appear to be greatly exaggerated. Wind is a diffuse and fickle resource that does not follow demand. Despite decades of experience and substantial installations in Denmark, Germany, and Spain, *the giant turbines have not been shown to meaningfully reduce the use of other fuels on the electric grid* — such as natural gas, coal, and nuclear — let alone oil for transport and heating. For this reason, their ability to reduce carbon dioxide emissions that contribute to climate change or pollutants that cause acid rain and health problems is doubtful, despite their tremendous size and sprawl.

We sincerely hope you find the enclosed information useful and that it saves you countless hours that have already been extensively explored.

Sincerely,

Dorie Klein and the "Friends of Ragged Mountain"
friendsofraggedmountain.org and friends.of.ragged.mountain@gmail.com