

Allan Cherry response :

Am I saying that global climate change is not a reality?

No - global climate change is definitely a reality. What is in dispute is what causes it.

The truth is that nobody knows - every scenario that we hear is just a theory based on computer models, which are only as accurate as the data and assumptions that are fed into the computer.

What is known

The earth in the past has gone through a series of hot and cold periods (well before man appeared on the scene).

We are currently coming out of the Little Ice age

The factors that contribute to global climate change are many and varied - Eruption of Mt Pinatubo (1991) caused a 0.5C decrease in global temperatures

Of the study that is the basis of the UN IPCC policy making, no fewer than five separate studies have concluded that Mann and Jones's calculations were fatally flawed. The findings of these studies, reported by the National Centre for Policy Analysis -

"unjustifiably truncated or extrapolated trends from source data, used obsolete data, made incorrect calculations, and associated data sets with incorrect geographical locations' and had further 'methodological problems' including unjustifiably excluding bore-hole data which was described as 'just bad science' and a 'selective and inappropriate presentation' of results, not to mention 'incorrect representation of longer-term trends' and fatal errors in all three components of their temperature reconstruction."

The No 1 greenhouse gas is water vapour (100 times more than CO2)

95.5% of the CO2 produced is from natural sources

34% of the man made CO2 is from power stations (0.0004284% of the atmosphere)

We dont know a lot about climate change - except that is a natural occurrence.

What are the costs of different power generation systems?

I havent researched the costs of every means of power generation, as the wholesale price of convential generated electricity from the different sources goes up and down (but they all seem to follow each other) - as happens in an unsubsidised market.

The problems creep in when hidden subsidies (paid for by the consumer) are applied to the renewables energy market.

This hidden subsidy (ROC and CCL) make the cost of wind generated power almost 4 times that of conventionally produced power.

Denmark - the world leader in wind generated power - sometimes has to pay up to 20 times the going price for imported power.

Coal power generators have said that they can upgrade their plant with clean burn, high efficiency technology for a quarter of the cost of building the number of windfarms that the government want - this would reduce pollution, make our reserves last longer and we would receive the demand-led supply that the national grid needs.

I'm quite happy to answer any other questions, or give links to original reports.

Bob Yuill response :

1. As those suffering from 'fuel poverty' (10 times those killed on the road) are going to be funding the wind farm, why not put proceeds into a charitable fund to help them?

2. What do you think of building energy efficient low cost rentable housing in Glass, rents to go into the community fund?

Same answer to them both I think that is:

A co-op for the benefit of the community provides a democratic structure for the community itself to decide the priorities for the use of funds.

Malcolm Hay response :

Sharing your concern for water quality in the process of building roads in the forest, does Mr. Hay believe that the conditions and practices as described in Forests & Water Guidelines and used locally do not safeguard the rivers? Over 110 of roads have been built in the Clashindarroch Forest. (Norman Davidson, Forestry Commission).

Mr Davidson is being more than a little disingenuous in making the comparison between a 3 to 4 metre wide existing forestry track and the new 10 to 15 metre wide construction highways envisaged here and about to be gouged out of the Grumack! In any event, I doubt very much if the existing forestry roads within the Clashindarroch were designed to cope with a clear felling operation of the magnitude now being contemplated; so, yes, I do think that the existing guidelines will be hopelessly inadequate in terms of protecting the river system from this project, a fear whose validity is confirmed by Professor Soulsby, the Head of Geography at the University of Aberdeen and an internationally renowned expert on upland hydrology.

The movement of felling equipment and timber lorries is one thing, but this is to be followed by multiple trips made by the heaviest transporters on the planet lugging the monstrous turbines up the hill. This all adds up to a level of activity and ground disturbance unprecedented in even the largest commercial construction sites.

The original road construction and planting activity within Clashindarroch effectively destroyed the River Bogie as a fishery - there used to be an hotel in Gartly which made its living from the fishings. It no longer exists. The ploughing up and planting of the Grumack in the 1970's had a similarly catastrophic effect on the upper Deveron. I have seen with my own eyes the 20 foot deep crevasses up behind the Succoth which started off as six inch forestry grips and are the legacy of that hugely inappropriate activity.

Now, many years later, the forestry roads and most of the ploughing have stabilised - building the proposed new, and hugely wider construction routes with all their attendant culverts, ditches and bridges, and bulldozing them diagonally across the remnants of the ploughed up ground will simply remobilise all the fine sediment currently trapped by the vegetation and once again deposit it in our rivers, most likely with disastrous effect. I would defy anyone to design a silt trap which could stop this on such a steep, wet, boggy escarpment.

Two further points - the period during which all this is to happen is five years - i.e. five seasons of heavy rainfall. I only have to look at what happened to my own roads and farm and forestry roads all across the northeast during August and September this year, or during the autumn of 2002, to see what our wetter, more stormy climate can do. Experts are predicting more landslides caused by torrential rain such as those in Devon and Cornwall in 2002 and which blocked the A9 north of Perth this year. Perhaps the disaster which occurred at Derrybrien in County Galway last year should be a lesson to us and make us think twice about digging up a wet, boggy hillside immediately above a major salmon river.

Secondly, I gather that established practice is to back fill the massive construction roads to 3 to 4 metres once the turbine building phase is completed - the rationale for this is that people will object to the awful scar they leave. However, all that will achieve is re-mobilisation of the fine sediment yet again for another round of environmental devastation.

There is no serious or sensible discussion of any of this in the developer's EIS - it is as if the salmon fishery interest has been air brushed out. Also, so-called supplementary ecological reports perversely discuss only mammals and birds among the protected species at risk from this development. The authors do briefly mention the myriad of spawning streams and juvenile fish habitats that proliferate through the forest, but only in the context of those parts that exist within the site itself. It seems to have escaped their notice that these same streams flow directly into a major river system only a few hundred metres away!

Relying on existing rules and regulations for road building which were drawn up under a wholly different scenario is simply not good enough. At the very least, one would have expected an outline plan of how to block up the burns and streams with straw bales during the felling and construction period, followed by a systematic program of re-stocking the catchment to compensate for five years of loss of spawning activity and the destruction of juvenile fish habitat. Other wind farm developers on other sites have negotiated monitoring and mitigation agreements with fishery interests which, inter alia, commit them to restock damaged habitats. However, in most other situations only one or two streams are affected - the problem with this proposal is that it not only directly threatens the entire catchment of a major tributary of the Deveron, but also endangers the main stem of the river itself. The Derrybrien disaster destroyed 22 miles of river and killed between 50,000 and 100,000 fish - this was the result of construction work and clear felling activity for a wind farm only half the size of that contemplated for Clashindarroch!

Finally, I would like to stress that the Deveron, Bogie & Isla Rivers Charitable Trust is not against wind farms in principle - we are merely trying to avoid a repeat of the Irish experience here in our own back yard.

Yours sincerely,

Malcolm Hay

Councillor Strathdee response :

*West Denmark has massive wind power investment and strong winds, but less than 4% of its power comes from wind. Does it matter?
(Vicky Spencer)*

West Denmark is only one region of Denmark and I know that Denmark produces much more electricity from wind than the 4% quoted in the question. I wonder if the 4% figure stated, is the percentage that that region contributes to the over all wind energy goal for Denmark, another region, North Jutland, produces 25% of the national goal.

Tom Brinicombe response for AMEC :

Provided in separate document.