

**THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
BEFORE THE  
NEW HAMPSHIRE  
SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

**DOCKET NO. 2010-01**

**APPLICATION OF GROTON WIND, LLC  
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF SITE AND FACILITY**

**SUPPLEMENTAL PREFILED TESTIMONY OF  
EDWARD CHERIAN  
ON BEHALF OF  
GROTON WIND, LLC**

**October 12, 2010**

1 **Qualifications**

2 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

3 A. My name is Edward Cherian. My business address is P.O. Box 326, Concord,  
4 New Hampshire, 03302.

5 **Q. Who is your current employer and what are your responsibilities?**

6 A. I am employed by Iberdrola Renewables, Inc. ("IBR".) I currently hold the  
7 position of New England Development Director. I am responsible for directing all  
8 development activities for the Groton Wind Project which is the subject of this docket.

9 **Q. Please summarize your background and qualifications.**

10 A. My background and qualifications were included in my direct prefiled  
11 testimony and have not changed.

12 **Purpose of Testimony**

13 **Q. What is the purpose of your supplemental prefiled testimony?**

1           A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide the Committee with information  
2 that updates and supplements the Application and my prefiled direct testimony, both of  
3 which were filed March 26, 2010. In addition, my prefiled testimony is intended to rebut  
4 claims made by the Buttolph/Lewis/Spring Intervenor Group concerning the Project's  
5 anticipated effect upon property values. In addition, I wish to offer information in  
6 response to concerns about sound raised by several intervenors.

7           **Updates/Modifications to Application**

8           **Q. Please summarize changes to the Groton Wind Project that have been**  
9 **made since the Application was filed.**

10           A. Although the proposed Project remains substantially the same as when the  
11 Application was filed, there are features which have been modified since that time. The  
12 more significant changes include a revised environmental mitigation package and the  
13 development of a revised interconnection plan.

14           **Q. Please describe the revised environmental mitigation plan.**

15           A. As a result of extensive coordination with the U.S. EPA, U.S. Army Corps of  
16 Engineers, and the NH Department of Environmental Services (NH DES), Groton Wind  
17 proposed a revised mitigation package, which was accepted by the above-referenced  
18 agencies. The most significant change from the original mitigation plan is the payment  
19 of \$150,000 to the New Hampshire Aquatic Resource Mitigation Fund. More details on  
20 the mitigation package elements are contained in Appendix 44 to the Application.

21

22

1           **Q. Please describe the revised interconnection plan.**

2           A. Subsequent to the March 26, 2010 submission of this Application, Public  
3 Service Company of New Hampshire (“PSNH”) conducted additional internal studies of  
4 the Project interconnecting to their 34.5 kV system. The additional PSNH studies caused  
5 PSNH to raise concerns about the Project interconnecting at the 34.5 kV level because of  
6 the size of the Project. Accordingly, in early September 2010, Groton Wind re-filed an  
7 interconnection application with the ISO-NE, proposing an interconnection at the 115 kV  
8 voltage level. The proposed interconnection would still be at or in proximity to the  
9 Beebe River Substation, but would include voltage step-up facilities to increase the  
10 voltage at the point of interconnection from 34.5 kV to 115 kV. It would also include a  
11 short 115 kV line from the voltage step-up substation to the PSNH substation. This  
12 proposal is currently the subject of a Feasibility Study under the direction of ISO-NE.  
13 The Project distribution line would remain at the proposed 34.5 kV voltage level until  
14 reaching the voltage step-up facilities, which would be located in a separate substation  
15 either at or near to the Beebe River Substation, or in immediate proximity to the PSNH  
16 115 kV line that feeds into the Beebe River Substation. Groton Wind continues to  
17 coordinate with ISO-NE, PSNH, and the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative  
18 (“NHEC”) to finalize the interconnection.

19           Once the detailed interconnection study has been fully reviewed, completed, and  
20 approved by the NEPOOL Reliability Committee, the Project will enter into an  
21 interconnection agreement. The interconnection agreement will document all the

1 requirements the Project must follow to be allowed to interconnect with the electrical  
2 grid. Only after completion of these requirements to the satisfaction of PSNH, NHEC,  
3 ISO-NE, and the NEPOOL Reliability Committee will the Project be allowed to  
4 interconnect, thus ensuring the Project will not adversely impact system stability and  
5 reliability.

6 In addition to the above-described changes to the initially-proposed  
7 interconnection plan, the Project is proposing an alternate route for the line that will carry  
8 power from the turbines on NHEC's distribution system located along Route 25. Instead  
9 of installing this line down Groton Hollow Road to reach Route 25, the Applicant  
10 proposes to follow a shorter path on private land next to the Project site. Thereafter, the  
11 alternative route would be primarily along Route 25. A map showing the interconnection  
12 route alternative is contained in Appendix 42 as Figure 6.a.

13 **Outreach Activities**

14 **Q. Please describe additional outreach activities in which you have**  
15 **participated since the Application was filed.**

16 A. Since the Application was filed on March 26, 2010, the Applicant has  
17 conducted numerous additional meetings and outreach, including with: the Town of  
18 Groton (Board of Selectmen meetings); Town of Rumney (numerous Board of Selectmen  
19 meetings, meetings with the Rumney Fire Chief, Police Chief, and EMS Director; and a  
20 meeting with residents of Groton Hollow Road); and the Town of Plymouth (Board of  
21 Selectmen meetings, Planning Board meeting and visual effects tour for the Planning

1 Board). These meetings have served to supplement the Applicant's communication and  
2 outreach to communities, and to continue the ongoing dialogue with area residents and  
3 officials. In addition, I wish to note that the Applicant has reached an agreement in  
4 principle with the Town of Rumney on the issues of site access, emergency services and  
5 related matters. This agreement, when finalized and signed, will be submitted to the  
6 Committee.

7 **Project's Impacts on Property Values**

8 **Q. Please respond to claims asserted by the Buttolph/Lewis/Spring**  
9 **Intervenor group that the Project will adversely affect property values.**

10 A. The Applicant stands behind the comprehensive, multi-state hedonic analysis  
11 contained in the 2009 Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory Report ("LBNL Report")  
12 submitted with the Application as Appendix 37. This Report has been characterized by  
13 Professors Ross Gittell and Matt Magnusson of the University of New Hampshire  
14 Whittemore School of Business and Economics as "the most significant analysis to-date  
15 using real estate market data." Appendix 36, p. 18. I believe it is important for the  
16 Committee to keep in mind that the LBNL Report was funded by the United States  
17 Department of Energy and examines 10 study areas and 24 projects located in nine states,  
18 including projects in the Pacific Northwest, upper Midwest, the Northeast and the South  
19 Central region of the United States. It also examines 7,500 real estate sales transactions  
20 both pre- and post-construction to evaluate the impact of wind power projects on  
21 residential property values. Based on the data and analysis presented, the report found no  
22 evidence that home prices surrounding wind facilities are consistently, measurably and

1 significantly affected by either the view of wind facilities or the distance of the home to  
2 those facilities.

3 As an additional response to the Intervenors' concerns about property values I  
4 offer the following anecdotal information about the Town of Lempster. Since the  
5 Lempster Wind Farm began operating approximately two years ago, we have received no  
6 complaints or any other negative comments concerning the Project's effects on real estate  
7 values. In fact, I have seen real estate listings which highlight the wind farm as one of  
8 the amenities of the Town of Lempster. This indicates to me that at least some realtors  
9 and sellers consider proximity to the wind farm to be an asset to their property. Other  
10 groups within the Town of Lempster also view the wind farm as a positive addition to  
11 their community. For example, as a fundraiser, the Lempster Historical Society sells  
12 magnets with pictures of the wind farm. In addition, the Lempster General Store sells t-  
13 shirts depicting the wind farm.

14 **Sound Issues**

15 **Q. Please respond to concerns expressed by the intervenors concerning the**  
16 **Project's impacts on sound levels.**

17 A. The Applicant's sound expert, Robert O'Neal will address this subject in  
18 greater detail. However, I wish to note that in the two years since the Lempster Wind  
19 Farm began operations, we have received only one complaint about sound. In  
20 investigating that complaint, we learned that the complaining party's hearing aids were  
21 malfunctioning and therefore he determined that the hearing aids were the cause of his  
22 sound issue. In addition, I wish to note that the closest non-participating residence in

1 Lempster is quite a bit closer to the turbines than the closest non-participating residence  
2 will be to the Groton turbines. In Lempster that distance is 1,300 feet and in Groton it is  
3 2,700 feet. Because we propose to install in Groton the same turbines as those that are  
4 currently operating in Lempster, and based on our sound expert's analysis, I believe it is  
5 reasonable to conclude that the Groton Project's sound impacts will not be unreasonably  
6 adverse.

7 **Q. Does this conclude your supplemental prefiled testimony?**

8 **A. Yes.**

9

10 695672\_1.DOC

11

12

13

14

15

16