



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
2000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20350-2000

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5090
Ser N4/

From: Chief of Naval Operations (N4)
To: Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet
Commander, Naval Installations Command

Subj: WIND TURBINE ENCROACHMENT AT NAVAL AIR STATION
KINGSVILLE, TEXAS

1. This letter requests your assistance in evaluating and justifying the risk to readiness presented by proposed construction of additional wind turbines in the vicinity of NAS Kingsville.

2. Per the 2011 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), a DoD objection to a renewable energy project cannot be registered unless SECDEF or his designee determines that the project would result in an unacceptable risk to the national security of the United States. This determination must be supported by a report to Congress explaining the readiness impacts that led to the determination; discussion of mitigation options considered; and an explanation of why the mitigation measures were not feasible or did not resolve the conflict.

3. I request that PACFLT, in coordination with CNAF and CNATRA, assess the impacts of wind turbine development near NAS Kingsville on Navy readiness and advise whether such impacts, if unmitigated, would present an unacceptable risk to National Security. I also request that PACFLT and CNIC identify and assess the feasibility and cost of all possible mitigation options, such as technological improvements, training procedure modifications, siting the wind turbines so as to minimize mission impacts, relocating some or all of NAS Kingsville's mission to other installations, and purchasing easements to prevent incompatible development. Please provide the readiness and mitigation assessment by 31 July 2011.

4. My point of contact is RADM Philip Cullom, at (703) 695-5029.

W. R. BURKE



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER, NAVY INSTALLATIONS COMMAND
716 SICARD STREET, SE, SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, DC 20374-5140

11100
Ser N00/11U61537
SEP 23 2011

From: Commander, Navy Installations Command
To: Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Fleet Readiness and Logistics)

Subj: EVALUATION OF WIND TURBINE COMPATIBILITY AT NAVAL AIR STATION KINGSVILLE, TX

Ref: (a) CNO Washington DC ltr 5090 Ser N4/11U156042 of 10 Jun 11
(b) NAS Kingsville TX Predictive Loss Modeling Study of 29 Mar 11

Encl: (1) COMNAVAIRFOR San Diego CA ltr 5090 Ser N01/1468 of 01 Sep 11
(2) COMPACFLT Pearl Harbor HI ltr 5090 Ser N01/1188 of 08 Sep 11
(3) CNIC Washington DC Paper, "Preventing the Incompatible Development of Wind Farms on NAS Kingsville Missions"

1. Reference (a) requested that Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC), supported by Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet (COMPACFLT) Pearl Harbor, HI and Commander, U.S. Fleet Forces Command (COMUSFLTFOR) Norfolk, VA, lead an assessment of the mission impacts of wind farm development in the Kingsville vicinity. Enclosures (1), (2) and (3) provide an assessment of the feasibility and ROM cost of all possible mitigation options, such as technological improvements, training procedure modifications, wind turbine siting to minimize mission impacts, relocating some or all of NAS Kingsville mission to other installations, and purchasing easements to prevent incompatible development.

2. Training Air Wing TWO at NAS Kingsville trains 112 of the Navy's approximately 200 tactical aviation pilots each year. Reference (b), a study of the degradation to NAS Kingsville RADAR and NAVAIDS caused by electromagnetic interference from nearby wind farms, determined installation of wind turbines would reduce Navy's ability to train aviators safely. The study further predicted that Navy would graduate 24-31 fewer pilots

Subj: EVALUATION OF WIND TURBINE COMPATIBILITY AT NAVAL AIR
STATION KINGSVILLE, TX

annually due to this impact. Enclosures (1) and (2) provide detailed assessments of these mission impacts from Commander, Naval Air Forces (COMNAVAIRFOR) San Diego, CA and COMPACFLT Pearl Harbor, HI.

3. Enclosure (3) assessed an additional three potential mitigation options mentioned in reference (a): applying technological improvements; siting of wind turbines so as to minimize mission impacts; and purchasing easements to prevent incompatible development. This paper further examines the possible use of state and local regulations to prevent incompatible development.

4. Siting enforced by regulation remains the most effective way to mitigate wind farm encroachment. Recommend that turbines not be located within 15 nmi of NAS Kingsville DASR-11 RADAR, and further recommend that Kleberg and Nueces counties be authorized by the state of Texas to prohibit wind turbine construction in all areas within a 15 nmi radius of NAS Kingsville DASR-11. As no readily available technological mitigations to wind turbine-related RADAR and NAVAID degradation were identified, I concur with COMPACFLT Pearl Harbor HI recommendation that DoN continue to investigate technological solutions which could minimize wind farm interference with RADAR and NAVAIDS.

5. CNIC's point of contact for this issue is LCDR Jim Roche, Encroachment Action Officer, DSN 288-4892, commercial (202) 433-4892, or e-mail james.roche@navy.mil.


M. C. VITALE

Copy to:
CNO Washington DC (N45)
COMPACFLT Pearl Harbor HI (N01)
COMUSFLTFORCOM Norfolk VA (N45)
COMNAVAIRFOR San Diego CA (N03)
CNATRA Corpus Christ TX (N03)
COMNAVFACENGCOM Washington DC
COMNAVREG SE Jacksonville FL
NAS Kingsville TX