



Bill and Susan Morehouse

P.O. Box 122, Beechner Road
Cohocton, New York 14826

June 23, 2006

Hal & Judy Graham
5754 Lent Hill Road
Cohocton, NY 14826

Dear Hal & Judy,

Susan and I are neighbors of yours on Lent Hill that you may remember. 12 years ago we purchased 120 acres of recreational property just southeast of you off Beechner Road and have been fixing it up and spending more and more time there on weekends throughout the year and weeks during the summer. When we were looking for a contractor to expand our main cabin, we talked with you about the excellent work that was being done on your house, and you referred us to Ron Lindsay. He took our job and did it up wonderfully! Ever since then we've held you in warm esteem whenever we drive by your home.

Please let me respond to the sincere and well-intentioned letter you posted in last week's Valley News. We see you as mature and caring neighbors who have lived in and served our community for years. Your reputations are well known and reflected in the positions of honor and respect you hold as Acting Town/Village Justice and Acting Town/Village Court Clerk, respectively.

I would like to appeal to both of you as neighbors and thoughtful people of influence to moderate your enthusiasm for the proposed wind farm on our hill and allow yourselves to take still another look at the subject. Our Town Board and Planning Board have both decided to postpone further decision-making on the matter until August to give them time to review community input, and this gives us all time to settle back and reflect.

Have you visited the website we've been developing since first hearing about the proposed wind turbine project 2 months ago? Ours is at www.cohoctonfree.com, as posted on the yard signs you may have seen. Please come visit us online, hear what we have to say, and then let us know what you think. We know and understand the concerns of the Cohocton Wind Watch folks but, like you, we've done our own research and have our own ideas.

People who go to Tug Hill have different responses. The visit you had was apparently encouraging to you. Please read the enclosed email I received this week, indicating that not everyone sees (or hears) things the same way. As you know from sitting on the bench, there is a variable relationship between personal experience and truth.

Your small random sample of residents and folks in town wasn't negative. When making a decision of this magnitude, however, a larger and more statistically valid sample is advisable. Addressing the noise issue, for example, the Swedish windmill study I reference online studied 356 people living near windmills and found that when the noise level rose above 40 dBA, 36% of respondents were "very annoyed." Of course, that means that the other 64% weren't very

annoyed. You might find yourselves among the 64% who wouldn't be bothered. However, that doesn't mean that 36% who would be should be left to cope on their own with a local law that allows sound levels up to 52 dBA.

Why might the noise not bother you? Well, you just might not be able to hear it. It's a well-known fact that our hearing sensitivity diminishes with age. Kids these days are actually using this difference to their own privacy advantage by downloading ring tones to their cell phones that only they can hear (www.msnbc.msn.com/id/13274669) because they're at a frequency most adults are no longer able to hear. This website (www.ochenk.com/entry.php?id=63) gives you the opportunity to actually test (in a non-scientific way, of course) how high your threshold is.

Will the turbines be as loud as 747 jets? Of course not. Preposterous. However, if you check your references more carefully I think you'll find that CWW's comparison with the 747 had to do with size of the rotor, not noise generated. Please be careful: when you speak, people listen. But how loud will UPC's 2.0 MW turbines be? Louder than Tug Hill's 1.65 MW turbines, or 105.3 dBA of turbine noise at the nacelle, according to the information UPC posted as part of its DEIS. That's louder than a jackhammer at 6' or one jet engine (a 747 has 4) at 750', and I'm not sure that the turbine manufacturer's number includes the blade noise at all.

Why didn't you hear much at 700'? Well, you were getting out of your car on a hilltop during the daytime and comparing what you heard over the wind with what you had been hearing while you were driving your car. You weren't lying in your quiet bed at night trying to sleep. I think you both may also be older than I am (63) and just can't hear as well as you used to. You might have been upwind rather than downwind. I don't know. There are lots of factors that influence the transmission and hearing of noise. How did you measure your distances, for instance? Maybe you're just in the 64% that wouldn't notice anyway, for one reason or another. Please be kind to the rest of us.

I agree that there have been some concerns raised that are much less likely to represent problems. 36% of ponds won't be stagnant, wells polluted, birds killed, or children struck by ice throw. If events like this occurred even 1% of the time, it would be bad enough, however. The few people you talked to on Tug Hill, now less than 1 year into their experience, would hardly be able to report rare events like these. It will take several years and thousands of turbines to accumulate the data. Personally, I'm not worried, but there are some neighbors who are. Do we just ignore, ridicule, or reprimand them?

You've evidently developed a dislike for the "anti group" and accuse them (as if we can all be lumped together and dismissed) of asking for greater and greater setback distances. Different people, each speaking for themselves, have suggested different setbacks. I personally think they should be set back far enough that they aren't in the Finger Lakes region at all. However, if we are to consider the noise experience of others alone, they should be set back at least far enough so that the sound generated is less than 35 dBA at residences or the boundaries of non-leaseholding landowners. UPC knows that a reasonable limit like this would effectively eliminate the use of 2.0 MW turbines on our hills, so they have proposed higher noise limits, first 50 dBA and now 52 dBA, to suit their purposes. This needs serious reexamination.

Property values are also a realistic concern, more in specific than in general. I've enclosed a copy of the "Post Standard" article with some of my comments on the back. Their report is far from a "scientific" study, and its origins need much closer scrutiny. I would be very interested in how much the assessed property values have appreciated in the Town of Cohocton over the same decade, for instance.

In summary, I do think that in your earnestness you may still be missing something of great value, and that is your ability to be the healing influence in our community that comes from keeping an open ear. Please be receptive to Susan and I, look over what we have to say online at www.cohoctonfree.com, and let us know when we could get together to talk over a glass of iced tea, either at your place or ours.

God bless you!

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B.ice". The letters are cursive and somewhat stylized.