

Chairman and Members of the SEC
c/o New Hampshire DES
29 Hazen Drive, PO Box 95
Concord, NH 03302

September 14, 2012

Chairmen Ignatius and members of the NH Site Evaluation Committee,

As an engaged community member serving the town of Antrim for over 30 years, and the former Land Use Planner for the Town of Antrim, I have a great deal of interest in the ongoing application and proceedings of the project proposed by Antrim Wind Energy, currently before you. I also am the author of a series of articles that I have written over the years for the town's journal, *The Limrik*, entitled *These Antrim Hills*. I believe that I have, and can offer, a unique perspective on the evaluation of actual "sites" proposed by Antrim Wind Energy for the erection of their wind turbine towers.

It is evident from my reading of the many published articles in the local newspapers, letters, verbal testimony, and postings on the SEC website, that opposing arguments have been primarily about the impact of the "sight," or view, of the proposed towers across the breadth of the Tuttle and Willard range. All parties appear to refer to their special interests, and how it will affect them personally. While I understand each of the interveners positions; those *opposed* to the facility - potential devaluation of their property values, scenic degradation of their view-scape, impending sound, light and shadow flicker pollution, and those in *favor* - the opportunity to create a renewable, intermittent energy resource, and profit supported by substantial tax incentives – little attention seems to be focused on the actual *site* of each turbine and supporting structure , i.e., the physical location of each on the ridge itself.

Many claims and representations have been made by the applicant as the process has evolved, as a way to support their effort, and to convince the SEC that Tuttle-Willard is an appropriate site. I understand their motivation to do this, however, the photo-view simulations that were presented to the SEC, and posted to its website back in late April, clearly understate the visual impact that these structure will have on the landscape, with the almost translucent imagery and color depiction against the clear sky. And, the favorable economic insinuations made by AWE at the only public hearing in Antrim held by the SEC on April 29, 2012, that the project "...would generate \$55.7 million in local economic benefits...then \$2.3 million yearly for 20 years...as well as 13 permanent fulltime jobs during operation..." can not be substantiated, and are clearly made in an effort to justify this project in the minds of the SEC membership, and the Antrim community. But I know that this is all circumstantial evidence, and I understand its motivation by AWE in its presentation to the SEC and the Antrim community.

From the vast amount of information in the application and supporting appendices, and reports to the submitted from the various member departments of the Site Evaluation Committee, it is implied that the Tuttle-Willard range would make a good "site" for the proposed project, with its ten structures reaching upwards of 500 feet, the substantial foundations required to support these turbines, and the

massive alteration of terrain needed to develop each of the sites, and link them for construction purposes across this range. But I am very concerned that the SEC is looking at the Tuttle-Willard range as *one* all inclusive site, when the committee should be closely evaluating *each* tower placement site on its individual merit, and/or detriment to each specific location. And, I am concerned also, that many of you as the decision makers on the SEC, and those with a vote to approve or disapprove this project have not actually been up on the Tuttle-Willard range to witness first-hand the substantial alteration of terrain that will be required to develop this proposed facility.

Often, the Lempster, NH industrial wind facility operated by has been referred to and compared with the AWE project. However, I urge the members of the SEC not to generalize this comparison, or to consider it as valid, for it certainly is not the case. The Tuttle-Willard range is *very* different than Lempster Mountain in its geologic make-up, the eco-system upon the range and around it, and the substantially difficult access, and the alteration of the ridge's terrain that will be required to place these structures. I know the claims have been made by proponents of this project that industrial scale renewable wind facilities "... have to be placed in someone's "back yard," but the fragile rocky ridges and talus slope that make up the heights and environs of Tuttle-Willard are of a precious and irreplaceable nature. It is these two related distinct habitats, of which few exist in New Hampshire, and that have been identified and sought for protection in the profile of the NH Wildlife Action Plan. Development of the AWE project, should it go forward, will completely compromise and degrade this important area and the wildlife species that it supports.

The SEC Mission Statement, as set forth in RSA 162-H sets threshold limits for determining the type and magnitude of proposals put before it. It charges that it is "...*essential to maintain a balance between the environment and the possible need for new energy facilities...*" The charge goes further, and more specifically sets the guidelines for appropriately sited projects to have the characteristics, among other considerations;

- Are compatible with local land use plans and regulations.

- Avoid or minimize degradation of the quality of life for local residents.

- Avoid or minimize disturbance of populations or habitat for rare plant and animal species.

- Avoid areas that create a high risk to birds and bats.

- Avoid or minimize disturbance of uncommon or high-quality wildlife habitat.

- Avoid or minimize fragmentation of large blocks of natural habitat.

- Avoid or minimize disturbance of steep or fragile soils.

- Avoid or minimize disturbance of areas of high recreational use, especially use that is focused on the natural environment.

- And...

- Avoid or minimize degradation of scenic views, especially from areas of recognized high scenic value that depends on the undeveloped natural environment for their appeal.

I trust that the members of the SEC, whether they have actually been to the heights of the Tuttle-Willard ridge, or if they have only heard and read the testimony and evidence presented by the interveners in their review and consideration of the AWE project, and what will be required of the landscape to put it in place, will agree that this ridge is *not* an appropriate place to site this project. There are good places and lands on which to generate wind energy with large industrial wind turbines, and there are places that will be irreparably devastated by these facilities. Tuttle-Willard is an inappropriate location for this project, and I ask the SEC to carefully weight its responsibility and its clear mission to protect this unique place. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Moore
55 Clinton road
Antrim, NH 03440