

Hour	Date	First Name	Last Name	Author	Message/Logged Contact
16:37:43	26-Feb-16	Ellen	Banks	Ellen Banks	<p>Hello—I have been getting your messages forwarded by Charley Bowman and I plan to come to your meeting March 2. I've been writing letters to editors and had a big piece in the Buffalo News last March supporting wind power. I'm in the Sierra Club local group, Writers' group and Beyond Coal Campaign. So could you add me to your mailing list?</p> <p>Also, I have an extra copy of the "Tapping Maple Ridge" video that I got after interviewing people there. I realize it's another developer but it answers a lot of questions in the voices of rural people living near Lake Ontario on Tug Hill, where they are very happy with their wind farm and the resources it's brought them. I was going to donate it to the Barker Library but there are such dirty tricks going on, I thought the SOS people would take it out and destroy it. Can you suggest someone on the "Yes" side that I could donate it to for the community's use?</p> <p>Regards and good wishes, Ellen Banks</p>
20:45:32	29-Feb-16	Ellen	Banks	Taylor Quarles	<p>Ellen,</p> <p>We look forward to having you at the meeting this Wednesday. Why don't you bring the DVD, and ask someone there to donate it for you. You have been added to our email list, so should be getting communication moving forward.</p> <p>See you Wednesday!</p> <p>Best, Taylor</p>
11:43:21	20-Jan-16	Christine	Bronson	Christine Bronson	<p>Note from Lighthouse Wind: This message is in regards to a message sent by Glenn Maid on January 20, 2016 Yes, the public outcry against this project is overwhelming. Well stated, Glenn. C</p>
18:05:56	1-Jan-16	Jason	Dragon	Jason Dragon	<p>Note by Lighthouse Wind: This message is in response to a message sent by Lighthouse Wind on December 29, 2015.</p> <p>Thank you for your response to the questions that I asked. It should be helpful to us as we try to have an informed discussion about this potential project in our community.</p> <p>Jason Dragon</p>
16:04:56	8-Feb-16	Cynthia	hellert	Cynthia hellert	<p>I asked this question at the forum at GCC, Medina Campus last April, and I recall that the answer was something to the effect that wind turbines costs do not result in a net loss. Please explain. Cynthia</p>
11:52:17	17-Feb-16	Cynthia	hellert	Taylor Quarles	<p>Ms. Hellert,</p> <p>It appears you are asking about lifecycle analysis of wind turbines, and whether they produce more energy than is required to manufacture and install them, as well as whether the carbon costs of manufacture and installation are outweighed by the energy they produce. Lighthouse Wind is still in the process of analyzing which turbine model will be used, and thus a detailed answer to this question is unavailable at this time. However, there are several analysis done previously which I can point to:</p> <p>Here is a study on older 2 MW turbines. "Researchers have carried out an environmental lifecycle assessment of 2-megawatt wind turbines mooted for a large wind farm in the U.S. Pacific Northwest. They conclude that in terms of cumulative energy payback, or the time to produce the amount of energy required of production and installation, a wind turbine with a working life of 20 years will offer a net benefit within five to eight months of being brought online." (https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/06/140616093317.htm)</p> <p>Reference to a literature review on the subject: " Among 50 estimates from 20 studies passing screens for quality and relevance, the median reported energy payback time for wind power plants is 5.4 months, with a 25th to 75th percentile range of 3.4 months to 8.5 months." (http://srren.ipcc-wg3.de/report/IPCC_SRREN_Ch07.pdf)</p> <p>Based on these two sources and additional research, the "payback time" of modern wind turbines appears to typically be less than 6 months. Even in worst case scenarios the "payback time" was less than one year. This means that for the large majority of a wind farms 20-30+ year operating life it will be "net positive" in terms of it's carbon emissions. Furthermore wind turbines do not require mining of any fuel, as the wind is a free, renewable resource. Additionally, wind turbines require very little water usage when compared to traditional energy sources.</p> <p>Sincerely, Taylor Quarles</p>
13:51:58	17-Feb-16	Cynthia	hellert	Cynthia hellert	<p>Taylor,</p> <p>I appreciate that you have taken the time to answer my question, along with links to more fully understand your response. Had this type of answer been provided over the past year, rather than the first sentence in your second paragraph, I sincerely believe that you may have gained the respect, although not support, of some of your opponents. Unfortunately, it is now too late.</p> <p>I, personally, have never intended disrespect, as that is truly not my nature. As I offered "motherly advice" a year ago, I continue to believe you are a sincere person who is at the threshold of what you believe to be a promising career. It is unfortunate that the industry in which you embark is less reputable than the person I believe you to be.</p> <p>Tactics being forced upon you by your employer are predictable. They follow the same pattern of other wind companies. Bringing in union workers to bully a town council is far from respectable. Empty promises made to these hard working individuals has resulted in law suits against the wind company in other areas. All I can say to this is "beware".</p> <p>Every month, you witness the determination of the majority of the attendees at Town Board meetings. These are intelligent, highly educated people, taking time from their very busy lives, investing money from their own pockets, to show you that this project is not right or wanted in our area. As the crowd disperses following these meetings, you are seen with less than a handful of supporters. I offer another piece of advice for you; you would be wise to be on your way immediately after the meetings. These people can do nothing for you, other than read your statements at public meetings, write a few letters to the editor, publish form letters to the DPS website and provide you with cookies.</p> <p>While the small group of folks who hope to gain their "windfall" fortune continue to rally in your support, please keep in mind the will of the majority of residents in these two townships. Although I cannot readily access the source of this comment made by an Apex employee, "we will not go where we are not wanted", surely you know that the Apex movement is not adhering to their promise.</p> <p>I will read the two links you provided, and will most certainly have more questions.</p> <p>Thank you. Cynthia</p>
19:03:25	25-Feb-16	Cynthia	hellert	Taylor Quarles	<p>Ms. Hellert,</p> <p>I appreciate your opinion, and look forward to answering any followup questions.</p> <p>Sincerely, Taylor Quarles</p>

15:33:58	4-Jan-16	James C	Hoffman	James C Hoffman	<p>Re: US Fish & Wildlife Service letter to Mr. Dave Phillips Of Apex Clean Energy dated May 6 ,2015.</p> <p>Based on information contained in the reference letter pertaining to Lighthouse Wind, The US Fish & Wildlife service has concluded that " the risk to wildlife from operating wind turbines could rise to severe levels." In view of this it has been recommended by them that turbine setbacks "of at least 3 miles from the lake shoreline" be implemented to reduce the risk to protected bat and migratory birds in the area. Does Apex Clean Energy in the design and layout of The Lighthouse Wind project, intend to comply with this recommendation?</p> <p>Jim Hoffman</p> <hr/> <p>Fast, Secure, NetZero 4G Mobile Broadband. Try it. http://www.netzero.net/?refcd=NZINTISP0512T4GOUT2</p>
13:38:12	14-Jan-16	James C	Hoffman	Taylor Quarles	<p>Mr. Hoffman,</p> <p>Lighthouse Wind is in active consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife service central and regional offices, as well as the New York State Department of Conservation. We have worked with these agencies, as well as other stakeholders, to design a system of study to accurately address any impacts the project may have, and inform the siting of turbines to minimize or avoid impacts.</p> <p>This plan of study was presented in the PSS, which was open for stakeholder review from November 23, 2015 to January 12, 2016. Lighthouse wind is now in the process of responding to these comments. The final results of these studies, and the component layouts which are based on these studies will be presented in the final application, which will be open to agency/stakeholder review for up to a year. The NYSDEC sits on the siting board which will have the ultimate decision on granting a permit for the project.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Taylor Quarles</p>
23:10:15	29-Feb-16	Don	Lewicki	Don Lewicki	<p>I viewed an APEX map on the PSC website which was called "buildable ". Are these sites which you have secured leases from landowners?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
20:41:55	3-Mar-16	Don	Lewicki	Taylor Quarles	<p>Mr. Lewicki,</p> <p>The buildable area map you reference does not incorporate an indication of land under lease. It is in essence showing all the possible buildable area in the project area using the setbacks listed clearly on the map.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Taylor Quarles</p>
4:59:28	20-Jan-16	Glenn	Maid	Glenn Maid	<p>Good Morning,</p> <p>This is a follow-up to a previous email about Apex continuing to pursue the Lighthouse Wind Project, The last correspondence in this area was that Apex would take all aspects of community input to guide their decision to continue with the project.</p> <p>Since then, there have been several additional community events that clearly express the regions unwillingness to have this project in their community. Let me recap them for you.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The Somerset community survey clearly stated that the residents do not want this project. 2. The Somerset Town Board voted unanimously to oppose the project. 3. The Niagara County Legislature voted unanimously to oppose the project 4. The Yates community survey conducted by SOS clearly showed the residents don't want this project. 5. The Yates community survey conducted by the Town of Yates clearly showed the community does not want tis project. 6. The Yates Town Boards voted unanimously to oppose the project. 7. The Orleans County Legislature voted unanimously to oppose the project. 8. Two regional media surveys concluded that the region does not want this project. 9. The Niagara County Health Department has expressed concerns over whether this project should continue forward. 10. The Orleans County Health Department has expressed concerns over whether this project should continue forward. 11. Analysis of the electricity production and need in the region, there is no evidence that such a facility is needed. 12. Several State elected officials that govern the region have spoken out against this project and have vowed to stop it. 13. Your company, evidenced by the recent PSS filing, has been unable to show that this region needs additional electricity production. <p>...</p>
4:59:28	20-Jan-16	Glenn	Maid	Glenn Maid	<p>Based on all this overwhelming opposition to the Lighthouse Wind Project by the people that live in the proposed project area, I ask:</p> <p>Why does your company continue to move forward with the project when you are clearly not wanted, and not needed ?</p> <p>How much more opposition will it take for your company to get the fact that you and your project are not welcome here ?</p> <p>With the aforementioned facts, why do you continue to claim to be looking out for the best interest of the community, when said community obviously doesnt see it that way ?</p> <p>What is your motivation to ignore the clear will of the people ? Money ? We certainly dont need the energy. Is it that if the project doesnt go through, you wont be able to repay the hundreds of millions of dollars in investor funding and / or satisfy the position of those that hold millions of dollars of Apex equity ?</p> <p>How is that your desires are more important than ours, as evidenced by your actions ?</p> <p>How can you continually claim community support during public meeting, media and mailings, when the numbers overwhelmingly state the opposite ? Are you deliberately being disingenuous ? Do you really consider 19 land lease signers and a smattering of residents as substantial support, when opposition is 4 fold ?</p> <p>Glenn Maid</p> <p>Yates</p>
22:10:59	29-Jan-16	Glenn	Maid	Taylor Quarles	<p>Mr. Maid,</p> <p>Thank you for your comment. As you know, we are underway in responding to comments received on the PSS. We are working hard to provide substantive response to all comments received, and looking forward to moving forward to a productive stipulations phase.</p> <p>I will work to provide a response to your question in the next week.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Taylor Quarles</p>

20:56:48	13-Mar-16	Glenn	Maid	Taylor Quarles	<p>Mr. Maid,</p> <p>Pardon the delay in response. Lighthouse Wind intends to submit an article 10 application which will satisfy the requirements of the regulations. This application will be a result of the extensive outreach we have performed as part of the pre-application process including the PIP, PSS, PSS comment response, and stipulations period, and will list the location of any components proposed, and the landowners in the area who have agreed to host these project components.</p> <p>The opinions of stakeholders and members of the public have been kept in the public record throughout the process thus far, and will continue to be diligently recorded both before and after the article 10 application is submitted. This record will be considered along with the application by the siting board.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Taylor Quarles</p>
21:26:55	11-Jan-16	Stu	Penny	Stu Penny	<p>Dear Mr. Denn:</p> <p>Please see attached a letter addressed to Hon. Kathleen H. Burgess Secretary to the Commission New York State Public Service Commission Agency Building 3 Albany, NY 12223.</p> <p>Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <p>Stu Penny</p>
13:42:21	14-Jan-16	Stu	Penny	Taylor Quarles	<p>Mr. Herstek,</p> <p>I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your PSS comment letter sent on January 11, 2016.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Taylor Quarles</p>
0:01:25	8-Jan-16	Alice	Sokolow	Alice Sokolow	<p>Dear Mr. Daniel Fitzgerald,</p> <p>Please find the attach pdf as my submission to the Lighthouse Wind PSS.</p> <p>Please send a confirmatory email of receipt.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alice Sokolow</p>
21:58:48	12-Jan-16	Alice	Sokolow	Alice Sokolow	<p>Honorable Secretary and Siting Board,</p> <p>Please clarify whether Apex filed with the Attorney General's Office as per the established Code of Conduct for Wind Energy Companies. Has Apex filed the leases and trained for conflict of interest? This Code was established in July 2009 under then AG Cuomo. The Article 10 does not replace this filing nor was Article 10 originally intended to. Should this not have happened since they filed with the PSC for Article 10 in 2014?</p> <p>The solution may require a declaratory ruling.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respectfully, Alice Sokolow</p> <p>See attached Code as well as the two links. http://www.ag.ny.gov/press-release/attorney-general-cuomo-establishes-code-conduct-wind-energy-companies-operating-new http://www.ag.ny.gov/press-release/attorney-general-cuomo-announces-new-ethics-code-adopted-wind-industry-companies</p>
14:22:33	14-Jan-16	Alice	Sokolow	Taylor Quarles	<p>Ms. Sokolow,</p> <p>As you may know, the code was promulgated prior to Article 10 being the law, so there are numerous issues with the code that don't fully mesh with Article 10. We continue to work with the AG to address these issues and sign the code at their request. We already substantively complying with the code by asking if any participating landowners are municipal officials within our leasing documents. If they are, we expect that they will recuse themselves from any vote on matters involving the project.</p> <p>When we launched the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for the project on October 31, 2014, the New York State Attorney General's Office was contacted as part of our stakeholder outreach. That started a conversation that has been ongoing in regard to the code of conduct, including a letter from Apex to the AG's office explicitly stating that Apex is willing to sign the code. This specific letter was sent April 1st, 2015, and is attached. This letter represents only a portion of the communication we have had with the AG's office on this issue since October 2014. Apex will continue working with the AG's office as we develop Lighthouse Wind.</p> <p>Regardless of the status of the Code, Apex has a high internal standard for ethics in development and has and will continue to ensure that it avoids conflicts of interests in development of all of its Projects.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Taylor Quarles</p>
20:13:37	12-Jan-16	Tom	Staples	Tom Staples	<p>Regarding: "CASE 14-F-0485 re" Application of Lighthouse Wind</p> <p>Hon. Kathleen H. Burgess Secretary Public Service Commission Three Empire State Plaza Albany, New York 12223-1350</p> <p>Mr. Dan Fitzgerald Senior Development Manager Court Square Building 310 4th Street NE, Suite 200 Charlottesville, VA 22902</p> <p>Regarding Apex PSS: I have been a resident of Town of Somerset since 1954 and have been actively farming on the family farm for more than 40 years. The PSS put forth by Apex, specifically section 2.1 Land Use, fails to address micro-climate effects which would be caused by the proposed installation of many wind turbines. Deciduous fruit farming and vegetable farming in this unique geographic area are dependent on the temperature moderating effects of both prevailing winds and lake breezes. The actual placement as well as the height of the turbines will certainly have a negative effect to the moderating effects of these climatic phenomenon. The PSS should be stricken and resubmitted with details on how to address this problem.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Tom Staples 7366 W. Somerset Rd Appleton, NY 14008</p>

13:52:32	14-Jan-16	Tom	Staples	Taylor Quarles	<p>Mr. Staples,</p> <p>We are in receipt of your comment on the Lighthouse Wind Preliminary Scoping Statement (PSS) sent January 12, 2016. We are actively working on our response to the comments received.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Taylor Quarles</p>
23:17:07	13-Jan-16	June	Summers	June Summers	<p>Mr. Fitzgerald, It has come to my attention that comments submitted to the Siting Board on the Lighthouse Wind PSS should also be submitted to Apex. Is this email address acceptable for that purpose or should I use another? Or do you want them in print? June SummersPresidentGenesee Valley Audubon Society</p>
13:50:10	14-Jan-16	June	Summers	Taylor Quarles	<p>Ms. Summers,</p> <p>We are in receipt of your comment sent on December 28, 2015. Thank you for your attention to the project, and let me know if you have any other questions.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Taylor Quarles</p>