

NINA PIERPONT M.D. PH.D.



February 20, 2008

Eric Kostecki
Renewable Energy Project Coordinator
Wisconsin Public Power Inc.
1425 Corporate Center Dr.
Sun Prairie, WI 53590

Dear Mr. Kostecki,

Dr. Pierpont has asked me to reply to your note, excerpted below. (She's buried by her medical practice. You understand. I'm her husband.)

I am an employee of Wisconsin Public Power Inc, a regional non-profit electric power supply company serving 49 customer-owned electric utilities in Wisconsin, Iowa and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. As an electric utility in the state of WI ... we are using a diverse mix of renewable technologies that includes wind.... The major portion of wind energy comes from power purchase agreements from large wind farms....

As you may know, a recent report by the Town of Union *Large Wind Turbine Citizens Committee* on wind turbine siting issues makes reference to your testimony before the New York Legislature March 7, 2006 and describes you as "author of several peer reviewed studies on Wind Turbines" on page 22. As part of our ongoing dialogue with community members and stakeholders, we've been asked to respond to questions based on those articles, however, we have been unable to locate any such peer-reviewed articles. So that we may follow up on these questions, could you please refer me to the titles and publication details for any of your peer-reviewed articles on Wind Turbine Syndrome?

The Town of Union, Wisconsin, *Large Wind Turbine Citizens Committee* is altogether correct to note that Dr. Pierpont's reports have been peer-

19 Clay Street
Malone, New York 12953

(518) 483-6481

Fax: (518) 483-6481

pierpont@westelcom.com

www.ninapierpont.com

reviewed. They all have been peer-reviewed.

Peer-review means that peers (scholars, clinicians or scientists) in the same or cognate field as the author have reviewed that individual's work and passed judgment upon it. Dr. Pierpont's reports have been reviewed by numerous physicians and scientists over the 3½ years she has been writing her reports. (Peer review is always an invisible part of one's report or, in the case of a published article, one's article or even book. Incidentally, as a former university professor I have published numerous scholarly books and articles, and refereed and reviewed many book and article manuscripts.)

In your note you say you have been unable to find these peer-reviewed studies by Dr. Pierpont. They're right in front of your nose, my friend!

I can take this a step further. As a result of the positive judgment of her peers (clinicians and scientists) who have reviewed her work and communicated their judgment to her (like a good clinician-scientist, Dr. Pierpont has sought out such judgment and review by her peers), Dr. Pierpont is about to submit a major article on *Wind Turbine Syndrome* to a leading clinical journal for publication. (This article, too, will be peer-reviewed.) I will be happy to send an offprint when it comes out; however that might not be necessary since it will undoubtedly be picked up by the major media. (Nevertheless I'll try to remember to mail you an offprint.)

I should add that Dr. Pierpont strongly disagrees with the Town of Union *Large Wind Turbine Citizens Committee's* report in one respect. (She's glad you contacted her so she can convey her dissent to you, hoping you might prevail on the committee to fix their blunder.) In her forthcoming article she establishes 1½ miles as the minimum, clinically-defensible setback from homes, etc. The committee's ½ mile setback is clinically and scientifically indefensible, and she urges you and your colleagues to take the committee to task on their shoddy work and insist they bump that setback up to 1.5 miles.

We gather from your reference to community members and stakeholders that you are sensitive to proper setbacks, so we appeal to you to use your good

offices to insist the committee fix its absurd and, as I say, indefensible 1/2-mile setback. (We were so exercised by this slip-up that I actually contacted a committee member and expressed Dr. Pierpont's strong disapproval of this figure. Privately, our hunch is they got it from some wind developer, not unlike the 1000' setback heretofore favored by the State of Wisconsin.)

I might add (since I gather you're neither a scientist or physician—and that's okay, I'm not either) that whenever Dr. Pierpont gives expert testimony in court (something she often does), she is never asked by the judge if she has published her clinical assessment of a particular patient in a refereed professional journal. The judge properly assumes that, given her credentials, and her license to practice medicine, she is qualified to offer such clinical judgment. Of course she substantiates her judgment and claims by clinical evidence, just as she does in the *Wind Turbine Syndrome* reports and papers which you've doubtless read. (See the footnotes: It's all there. Lots of it.)

One might rightfully say that she invoked the customary court-of-law approach to evidence and authority (her authority, in this case) in her work on *Wind Turbine Syndrome*. Of course if the wind developers can find a similarly qualified physician-scientist (MD-PhD, like Dr. Pierpont, or simply MD will suffice) who feels he can refute her work, based on standard clinical protocols and evidence, she would be eager to consider that evidence.

In 3½ years of researching and writing reports on *Wind Turbine Syndrome* not a single clinician-scientist has come forward to refute her work. Nowhere in the world. Impressive, yes?

An aside about Dr. Geoff Leventhall, whose name is often mentioned by the wind developers. Dr. Leventhall, with whom Dr. Pierpont has enjoyed a spirited and mutually cordial correspondence, is not a clinician-scientist. He is a PhD in physics. (I would be happy to forward his c.v.) Dr. Leventhall has no training, that we are aware of, in anything clinical. It's quite proper for him to comment on turbine noise as a physicist, but any opinion he might offer about health effects from turbines would have no standing among clinicians—for the simple reason that, after all, he's not one. (This would be

like me, with my PhD in history, commenting authoritatively on matters of physics. You understand.)

Thanks for your interest in Dr. Pierpont's work and we do hope you will insist that the committee fix its setback recommendation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Calvin Luther Martin", followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.

Calvin Luther Martin, PhD
Associate Professor of History (retired)
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ
www.calvinluthermartin.com