

William Pollock

Senate Utilities Committee

Proponent Testimony for SB 353

Chairman Thompson and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify in favor of SB 353.

I'm a lifelong Kansan, Vietnam era veteran, County Commissioner, a long-time rural land owner, and farmer. As a County Commissioner I speak only for myself and not for the commission as a whole.

When I was campaigning for commissioner the concern that was most often brought to my attention was that of rural residents that were opposed to a wind turbine being built near their property (home).

I have been listening to previous testimony on other wind energy bills presented to your committee. The question has come up, as to whether land owners are "trusting and naïve", my question to you is; are you "trusting and naïve"? An attorney, and professor at KU (and shareholder of a national energy group according to his biography on law.ku.edu), quoted to you from the Federalist paper #44. However, in one portion he changed a word, added a word and didn't finish the sentence. James Madison was speaking of personal rights and not necessarily property rights as was quoted. Personal rights could also include how your tax dollars are taken and used. He also didn't finish the sentence that said these "sudden changes and legislative interferences, in cases affecting personal rights, become jobs in the hands of enterprising and influential speculators," (wind companies) "and snares to the more-industrious and less-informed part of the community." (tax payers). SB353 provides local controls, protecting the "personal rights" of those not otherwise profiting from industrial wind development.

Tax incentives should never have been approved to fund an unreliable, intermittent energy source which has "become jobs in the hands of enterprising and influential speculators".

If set back regulations slow down the "jobs of influential speculators" and allow tax dollars to be used more efficiently, and for more desirable energy sources, so be it.

As a veteran, I know a strong national defense depends on a strong industrial base, and neither can function at it's best with excessive dependance on an intermittent, unreliable energy source. All "personal rights" need to be protected, not just those of " influential speculators".

Freedom isn't "blowin' in the wind".