

Dr. Fred Ward Meteorological Consultant

386 Route 123 South
Stoddard, NH 03464

drfred@myfairpoint.net
Tel: 603-446-2312
Fax: 603-446-2313

31 December 2014

Mr. Michael J. Iacopino
Brennan Lenehan
85 Brook Street
Manchester, NH 03104

RECEIVED

JAN 05 2015

BRENNAN LENEHAN

Dear Mr. Iacopino:

Re: SEC Procedures

I have two procedural issues regarding the new application by Antrim Wind Energy, and I need your legal advice as to the proper format for their presentation to the SEC, and the timing.

The two issues are the publication of the notice of hearings, and the question of whether the SEC can indeed conduct a hearing on the matter of the AWE proposal without first considering the cumulative impact, statewide, of wind facilities sufficient to meet the stated goal of wind making a serious contribution to reducing CO2. Such a contribution would, of necessity, lead directly to giant turbines covering most/all of our special viewpoints.

The first issue is simple, the center of the Town of Stoddard is closer to Tuttle Hill than the center of the Town of Antrim. Stoddard is not in Hillsborough County however, it is in Cheshire County, and has its own newspaper, the Keene Sentinel. According to your notice, the announcements will appear in the Hillsborough paper but not in the Cheshire paper. That is unacceptable. A proper procedure would take into account that Cheshire county residents, who were kept in the dark last time, require regular notice about an issue which will affect a large number of them. I need your advice on what can be done to ensure that Cheshire County residents are properly notified of the proceedings in this case and in the future.

The second issue is far more serious. The rationale for the AWE facility is not about cheaper power, nor more reliable power, because it's neither cheaper nor more reliable. Its sole rationale is that it will contribute to reducing greenhouse gases. Yet, any single facility such as Antrim Wind, can make only an infinitesimally small contribution to any such reduction, even at the state level, and as such is hardly worth the time of the SEC to consider it. The special topography and meteorology of NH (hills and valleys) would require almost one-thousand giant turbines, situated in 100 arrays on the tops of the hills of every county in our state, to accomplish their alleged purpose of eventually replacing a coal or nuclear generating station. (This leaves aside another key point, namely that wind energy is mostly generated in the middle of the night, when demand is very low anyway.) Since there are about 100 isolated hills in our state, 100 arrays would be draped over EVERY isolated hill/ridge, and be visible from EVERY highway, hiking trail, lake, etc. While there are NH residents who would have no problem with such scenery, I suggest that most residents would not find our conversion from a tourist state to a windmill state so desirable. In any event, the question of the cumulative impact of such statewide arrays needs to be answered PRIOR to SEC consideration of any single proposed facility. If there is something in the laws that would inhibit the SEC from considering this fundamental question before it proceeds to consideration of any single proposal, I would appreciate the citation.

I therefore request your advice and assistance in filing the proper papers, in the proper forum, and in the proper time frame to cause these issues to be considered by the SEC. I realize that my request may entail some effort on your part, but I suggest that the time and cost required to pursue these issues will be a much more substantial burden on any affected resident such as myself, and therefore should instead be an integral part of the SEC process.

Since I'm unsure as to whom to submit this request, I have sent a similar letter to Mr. Roth.

Thanking you in advance,


Fred Ward