

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

February 22, 2016 - 6:06 p.m.
Antrim Town Hall
66 Main Street
Antrim, New Hampshire
(Hillsborough County)

**IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-02
ANTRIM WIND ENERGY, LLC:
Application of Antrim Wind
Energy, LLC, for a Certificate
of Site and Facility.
*(Public Hearing of the
Subcommittee members held pursuant
to RSA 162-H:10, I-c)***

*[Consisting of a presentation by
the Applicant (Antrim Wind Energy),
followed by a Question-and-Answer
Session, and comments received
from the public]*

| | |
|---|--|
| PRESENT FOR SUBCOMMITTEE: | SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE: |
| Cmsr. Robert R. Scott <i>(Presiding as Presiding Officer)</i> | Public Utilities Commission |
| Cmsr. Jeffrey Rose | Dept. of Resources & Economic Development |
| Eugene Forbes, Dir., Designee | Water Division, Department of Environmental Services |
| Dr. Richard Boisvert, Designee | Dept. of Cultural Resources/ Div. of Historical Resources |
| Michael Ladam, Designee | Public Utilities Commission |
| Rachel Whitaker | Alternate Public Member |

COURT REPORTER: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 052

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

**ALSO PRESENT FOR THE
SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:**

Counsel to the Committee: Michael J. Iacopino, Esq.
Iryna Dore, Esq.
(Brennan, Caron, Lenehan &
Iacopino)

SEC Administrator: Pamela G. Monroe

ALSO NOTED AS PRESENT:

FOR THE APPLICANT:

Reptg. Antrim Wind Energy: Barry Needleman, Esq.
Rebecca Walkley, Esq.
(McLane, Graf...)

COUNSEL FOR THE PUBLIC: Mary Maloney, Esq.
Senior Asst. Atty. General
N.H. Department of Justice

**ALSO PRESENT TO PROVIDE THE
PRESENTATION* AND TO ANSWER QUESTIONS:**

Jack Kenworthy*

David Raphael

Rob O'Neil

Henry Weitzner

Donald Marcucci

Arthur Cavanagh

| | I N D E X | |
|----|--|-----------------|
| | | PAGE NO. |
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT <i>(by Mr. Kenworthy)</i> | 12 |
| 4 | QUESTION-AND-ANSWER SESSION | 42 |
| 5 | PUBLIC COMMENT BY: | |
| 6 | Bill (William) Scott | 66 |
| 7 | Joe Casey | 68 |
| 8 | Benjamin Pratt | 70 |
| 9 | Bev (Beverly) Schaefer | 71 |
| 10 | Chairman Gordon Webber | 73 |
| 11 | Mary Welles | 73 |
| 12 | Michael Ott | 74 |
| 13 | Karen Weisswange | 78 |
| 14 | Albert Weisswange | 80 |
| 15 | Joe Downing | 81 |
| 16 | Stuart Gross | 82 |
| 17 | Peter Moore | 82 |
| 18 | John Martin | 89 |
| 19 | Fred Ward | 90 |
| 20 | Aaron Flewelling | 92 |
| 21 | Jason Riley | 92 |
| 22 | Charles Levesque | 93 |
| 23 | Tim Perry | 97 |
| 24 | | |

| | I N D E X (continued) | |
|----|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| | PUBLIC COMMENT BY: | PAGE NO. |
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | Margaret Warner | 100 |
| 4 | Francie (Frances) Von Mertens | 101 |
| 5 | Wes Enman | 104 |
| 6 | Graham Enman | 104 |
| 7 | Kevin Onnela | 105 |
| 8 | Adam Lyons | 106 |
| 9 | Russell Stephens | 107 |
| 10 | Loranne Carey Block | 108 |
| 11 | Richard Block | 110 |
| 12 | Annie Law | 114 |
| 13 | Bob (Robert) Cleland | 115 |
| 14 | Janice Duley Longgood | 115 |
| 15 | Kathy Chisholm | 116 |
| 16 | Scott Burnside | 116 |
| 17 | Steve Schacht | 117 |
| 18 | Apryl Perry | 118 |
| 19 | Mary Schacht | 120 |
| 20 | John Giffin | 121 |
| 21 | Michael Weider | 121 |
| 22 | Elsa Voelcker | 122 |
| 23 | Sarah Gorman | 124 |
| 24 | | |

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Good evening,
3 everybody. It's almost 6:07. I think we'll get started.
4 I see we have a couple more signing up. So, we'll start
5 the process while they do that.

6 Again, good evening. Welcome to the
7 public meeting of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation
8 Committee. We have one docket for consideration on
9 today's agenda. It's a public hearing in the Application
10 for Antrim Wind Energy, LLC, for a Certificate of Site and
11 Facility. This is under Docket Number 2015-02.

12 Before turning to our agenda, I would
13 ask the Subcommittee members to introduce themselves.
14 And, I'll start on my left.

15 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Good evening. Jeff
16 Rose, Commissioner of the Department of Resources and
17 Economic Development.

18 MR. LADAM: Good evening. Michael
19 Ladam, Public Utilities Commission.

20 DIRECTOR FORBES: I am Eugene Forbes. I
21 serve as the Director of the Water Division at the
22 Department of Environmental Services. I'm here as the
23 Designee of our Commissioner, Thomas Burack.

24 MS. WHITAKER: Hello. I'm Rachel

1 Whitaker. I'm a public member.

2 DR. BOISVERT: Good evening. I'm
3 Richard Boisvert, Deputy State Arch -- Deputy State
4 Historic Preservation Officer and State Archeologist from
5 the Division of Historical Resources.

6 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And, my name
7 is Bob Scott. I'm a Commissioner with the New Hampshire
8 Public Utilities Commission. And, I am the Presiding
9 Officer on this docket.

10 We will now open the public hearing.
11 And, in doing so, I'll start with some background. On
12 October 2nd, 2015, Antrim Wind Energy, LLC, we'll call
13 them "Antrim Wind", filed an Application for a Certificate
14 of Site and Facility, also known as the "Application",
15 with the Site Evaluation Committee. Antrim proposes to
16 site and construct and operate nine wind turbines, each
17 capable of generating 3.2 megawatts each, for a total
18 facility nameplate capacity of 28.8 megawatts, and the
19 associated civil and electrical infrastructure. The
20 Project is proposed to be located in the Town of Antrim on
21 the Tuttle Hill ridgeline, spanning southwestward to the
22 northeastern slope of Willard Mountain. The Project will
23 be constructed primarily on the ridgeline that starts
24 approximately three-quarters of a mile south of Route 9,

1 and runs southwest for approximately two miles. The
2 Project will be located in the rural conservation zoning
3 district on private lands owned by six landowners and
4 leased by Antrim Wind. Antrim Wind seeks the issuance of
5 a Certificate of Site and Facility approving the siting,
6 construction, and operation of the Project.

7 On October 19th, 2015, Assistant
8 Attorney General Mary E. Maloney was appointed to serve as
9 Counsel for the Public in this docket. At this time
10 maybe, Mary, you can introduce yourself.

11 MS. MALONEY: Come up?

12 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: You're welcome
13 to, if you like.

14 MS. MALONEY: He told me I had to. Hi.
15 I'm Mary Maloney, from the Attorney General's Office. I'm
16 been appointed Counsel for the Public. And, as some of
17 you may know, that what that means is I'm looking at the
18 Project and all the various aspects of the Application,
19 not for individual public members, but from the public at
20 large, from both a statewide impact, a regional impact,
21 and local impact.

22 I'm open to speaking with any of you at
23 any time. And, you can call my office or e-mail me, if
24 anybody has information or any questions, then I'd be

1 happy to speak with you, and also relay any information I
2 have to you.

3 And, my contact information is on the
4 website, the SEC website. Thank you.

5 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
6 And, that's a good reminder, Mary, for the public. The
7 Site Evaluation Committee has a website. All the orders,
8 motions, *etcetera*, are all on that website. So, please
9 feel free to look at that.

10 I'll also -- I'm going to point out the
11 Administrator in a minute, she's still busy, so, I'll wait
12 for that, for the Site Evaluation Committee.

13 So, moving forward, on October 20th,
14 2015, under RSA 162-H:4-a, the Chairman of the Committee
15 the Site Evaluation Committee, appointed a Subcommittee in
16 this docket. On November 18th, 2015, the Subcommittee
17 reviewed the Application and determined that it was
18 sufficient -- contained sufficient information for the
19 Subcommittee to carry out the purposes of 162-H. An Order
20 accepting the Application was issued on December 1st,
21 2015.

22 A Procedural Order in this docket was
23 issued on December 10th, 2015. In this Order, the
24 Subcommittee ordered the Applicant to conduct a Public

1 Information Session on January 6, 2016 and this public
2 hearing on February 22nd, 2016. The Committee also
3 scheduled a prehearing conference for this week,
4 February 2015 -- excuse me, February 25th, 2016 and
5 ordered potential intervenors to file motions to intervene
6 by no later than January 15, 2016.

7 On January 6th, pursuant to the Order,
8 the Applicant conducted a Public Information Session in
9 Antrim.

10 The Subcommittee since has received 27
11 Motions to Intervene in this docket. The following
12 parties were allowed to intervene by an Order issued on
13 February 16th: The Antrim Board of Selectmen; the
14 Stoddard Conservation Committee [Commission?]; the Harris
15 Center for Conservation Education; the Audubon Society of
16 New Hampshire; the Windaction Group; the International
17 Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; a Meteorologist Group,
18 with Richard Hendls, Joseph D'Aleo, Robert Copeland, Bruce
19 Schwoegler, and Fred Ward; another grouping was Abutting
20 Property Owners, Stephen Berwick, Bruce and Barbara
21 Berwick, Brenda Schaefer, Mark Schaefer and Nathan
22 Schaefer, Janice Duley Longgood, and Craig A. -- excuse
23 me, Clark A. Craig, Jr; another grouping of intervenors is
24 labeled the "Non-Abutting Property Owners", and this is

1 composed of Lorraine Carey Block and Richard Block, Annie
2 Law, Robert Cleland, Ken Henninger and Jill Fish, Lisa
3 [Elsa?] Voelcker, Mary Sherbourne, Joshua Buco, Katherine
4 Sullivan, and Rosamund Iselin; separate intervenor status
5 was granted to Wesley Enman; and two groups of Antrim's
6 officials, namely Charles Levesque, Mary Allen; Benjamin
7 Pratt and John Griffin [Giffin?] were also named
8 intervenors.

9 We are here today for a public hearing
10 in this docket. Again, this is under RSA 162-H:10, the
11 Subcommittee is required to hold at least one public
12 hearing in each county in which the proposed project is to
13 be located. The public hearing must be held within 90
14 days after the acceptance of the Application for a
15 Certificate.

16 Notice of this hearing was served upon
17 the public by publication in the New Hampshire Union
18 Leader and the Monadnock Ledger Transcript on the
19 February 2nd, 2016.

20 In this docket, we will proceed as
21 follows: First, we will hear a presentation by the
22 Applicant. Following that presentation, Subcommittee
23 members and Committee Staff will have the opportunity to
24 pose questions to the Applicant. Thereafter, the public

1 will be permitted to pose questions to the Applicant. If
2 you have a question for the Applicant, we ask that you
3 please write down the question on a card, and hand it to
4 the Committee's Administrator, Pam Monroe. Pam, can you
5 raise your hand so --

6 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Right here.

7 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So, I started
8 to mention Pam earlier, she's the Administrator for the
9 Site Evaluation Committee. So, she's also a resource to
10 get information from, in addition to the website.

11 Again, so, please write your questions
12 down on the card and hand it to Ms. Monroe. We will try
13 to organize all questions by subject matter and present
14 them to the Applicant in an organized fashion.

15 Once we have asked all the questions
16 that the public may have, we will then take public
17 statements or comments on the Application. Please make
18 your public statements as succinct as possible and try not
19 to be repetitive. You can sign up to make a public
20 statement on the sheets provided at the door. Again, Pam?

21 *(Administrator Monroe holding up the*
22 *sign-up sheets.)*

23 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I will say, to
24 make sure we properly -- there's a transcriptionist here.

1 To make sure we properly get everything down, I would ask
2 that you speak slowly, so Steve -- Mr. Patnaude can get
3 all your information down. If you happen to have written
4 your statement also and have it with you, if you're
5 reading from that, if you could give -- he would very much
6 appreciate you giving him a copy of that, if you're able
7 to, again, to make sure we get everything down in the
8 transcript.

9 Now, we will hear a presentation from
10 the Applicant.

11 MR. KENWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman
12 and members of the Subcommittee. I apologize if my back
13 is to you. But I will -- can you see? Yes. I guess you
14 can look over my shoulder as well.

15 Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My
16 name is Jack Kenworthy. I'm an executive officer of
17 Antrim Wind Energy, LLC, and the CEO of Eolian Renewable
18 Energy, LLC, one of the companies that's developing the
19 Antrim Wind Project. And, I'm here tonight to present
20 information about the Project and to answer questions that
21 the public and the Committee may have, in addition to some
22 other members of the Antrim team that you will hear from
23 tonight.

24 I'm going to start at the beginning.

1 For those who attended the January 6th hearing, some of
2 this information is going to be the same. There have been
3 a couple of updates that I would like to share. And, I
4 apologize, my first slide has been mangled somehow. But
5 I'm going to tell you what it should say, which is that
6 Antrim Wind Energy, LLC, is a special purpose entity. It
7 was a project that was formed in 2009, to develop,
8 construct, and operate the Antrim Wind Project. Antrim
9 Wind Energy is a partnership between Eolian Renewable
10 Energy, LLC, which I mentioned, and Walden Green Energy,
11 who is a global renewable energy firm based in New York,
12 whose founding principals have over 50 years of experience
13 in energy-related businesses and careers that cover a lot
14 of the major commercial banks, including JP Morgan,
15 Goldman, and Barclays. Walden is, in turn, majority owned
16 by RWE Supply & Trading, which is a subsidiary of RWE AG,
17 a German company that's one of Europe's top five electric
18 and gas utilities with over 2,900 megawatts of renewable
19 energy assets operating globally.

20 Eolian is a New Hampshire company.

21 We're based in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. It's operated
22 by its founding partners, and have over 35 years of
23 combined experience in energy and real estate development.

24 As you heard the Chairman speak earlier

1 about the elements of the Antrim Project, Antrim Wind is
2 proposing to build a 28.8 megawatt wind energy facility in
3 the northwest corner of the Town of Antrim. It calls for
4 the installation of nine 3.2 megawatt turbines. It will
5 consist of a collector, an interconnection substation, and
6 operations and maintenance building, and a single
7 permanent meteorological tower. The facility is proposed
8 to be constructed entirely on private property, and will
9 be accessed by a new gravel surface road off of New
10 Hampshire Route 9.

11 Antrim Wind has leased about 1,850 acres
12 of land, 1,870 acres of land from six private landowners,
13 again, in the northwest portion of town. Adjacent
14 development to the proposed Project site consist primarily
15 of rural residential dwelling and seasonal camps and
16 undeveloped forest land in various stages of maturity.
17 The closest residence to any turbine that the Project is
18 proposing to construct is approximately half a mile, just
19 slightly over half a mile, north of the northernmost
20 proposed turbine. And, all other residences are greater
21 than half a mile.

22 Here is a map that kind of shows where
23 we are in New Hampshire. Over here on the right-hand
24 side, this is the Town of Antrim. And, then, this is a

1 little bit harder to see, at least from my angle, but,
2 within the Town of Antrim, this is the ridgeline that the
3 Project is proposed to be constructed on.

4 Again, I mentioned before, nine Siemens
5 turbines. These are 3.2-113 direct-drive wind turbines, a
6 single 100-meter meteorological tower, with a collector
7 substation, and O&M building. There will be roughly three
8 and a half acres of new gravel surface roads that need to
9 be constructed to access the Project, to construct it and
10 to maintain it. The collector system is a 34 and a half
11 kilovolt electrical collection system, which will be
12 placed below ground along the ridgeline. It will be
13 buried along the roadside to collect the energy generated
14 by each of the turbines. And, then, where the access road
15 meets the ridge road, the electrical collection system
16 will go aboveground onto wooden poles until it comes down
17 and is all joined together at our collector substation,
18 which will share a fence line with the interconnection
19 substation.

20 The Project will require 55.3 acres of
21 new clearing in order to construct the facility, and will
22 consist of a little over 900 acres of new permanent
23 conservation land.

24 This slide sometimes takes a minute to

1 load. So, as I mentioned, here is Route 9 *[indicating]*,
2 the very left-hand side of this map here. For those of
3 you who were on the site tour today, the driveway we came
4 up is right here *[indicating]*. And, the Project access
5 road, as we discussed, is about 400 yards further to the
6 east, up Route 9. This is the electrical collector
7 substation and interconnection substation. And, then, the
8 Project road goes along to Turbine 1, which is down from
9 the ridge, on up to the ridge, and then connects Turbines
10 2 through 9 along the ridgeline.

11 I mentioned the Siemens turbines. This
12 is a diagram of the turbine. It's a 3.2-megawatt unit,
13 which means it's rated to generate 3,200 kilowatts. It
14 has a rotor diameter of 113 meters. There are two
15 different hub heights associated with this Project.
16 Turbines 1 through 8 will be on 92 and a half meter
17 towers, and Turbine 9 will be on a 79 and a half meter
18 tower. That results in a tip height of between 446 feet
19 and 488 feet for the turbines.

20 I mentioned the turbines are a
21 direct-drive turbine, which means there is no gearbox and
22 no gearbox related maintenance or failures. The turbine
23 has a design life of 20 years, and an expected operating
24 life of somewhat longer than that. We expect to be able

1 to operate these turbines for 25 years or so.

2 The Project has spent a lot of time,
3 over the last five plus years, doing work to study the
4 environment, to study potential public impacts in the
5 area, to understand this site and be able to design a
6 project that is responsive to those conditions.

7 Listed here are a number of the studies
8 that we performed over the years to identify potential
9 impacts. In every case where we had studies that were
10 performed that would be on a subject matter that's a
11 subject of the jurisdiction of an agency, we consulted
12 with that agency to develop the appropriate protocols for
13 those studies, including New Hampshire Fish & Game, U.S.
14 Fish & Wildlife Service, the New Hampshire Natural
15 Heritage Bureau, the New Hampshire Division of Historical
16 Resources, U.S. Army Corps, and the New Hampshire
17 Department of Environmental Services.

18 And, we conducted studies on historical
19 resources, including both architectural and archaeological
20 resources, wetlands and vernal pools. I won't read this
21 whole list here, because I know you can all see it there.
22 But there were quite a number of studies that have been
23 conducted over the years.

24 With respect to wetlands and surface

1 waters, they have been delineated by New Hampshire
2 Certified Wetland Scientists, and the full reports of
3 those delineations in the wetland studies are part of the
4 Application that Antrim Wind has submitted, which is
5 available on the New Hampshire SEC website. In general,
6 the wetland impacts associated with this Project are
7 extremely small. There will be only two-tenths of an acre
8 of wetlands impacts associated with construction of the
9 Project. And, in 2012, the New Hampshire DES recommended
10 both the Wetlands Permit and the Alteration of Terrain
11 Permits for approval, with certain conditions, at that
12 time. And, the conditions that were recommended for the
13 approval in 2012 we have incorporated into the 2015
14 Application.

15 Similarly, natural communities: I
16 mentioned the site is generally undeveloped. It's
17 forested, and has been subject to timber harvesting over
18 the past several decades, including some harvesting fairly
19 recently. We have mapped natural communities along the
20 site. Again, those reports are available in our
21 Application. No significant natural communities were
22 identified as a result of those surveys. The New
23 Hampshire Natural Heritage Bureau has performed two site
24 visits over the years, and it determined that it is

1 unlikely that the proposed wind facility will impact rare
2 plant species and exemplary natural communities.

3 Visual assessment: Many of you who were
4 with us on the tour today met David Raphael, from
5 LandWorks, who Antrim Wind engaged to perform a visual
6 assessment for the Project. This was a very comprehensive
7 assessment. It's taken over a year to produce. It
8 involved studying a 10-mile radius from each turbine,
9 which contained over 350 square miles, and covered parts
10 of 20 towns.

11 Viewshed maps were created to determine
12 which areas within that 10-mile study area would have
13 visibility of the Project. And, as David also mentioned
14 earlier today, only about two and a half percent of that
15 350 some square miles actually had visibility of the
16 Project. And, then, using the LandWorks' methodology, the
17 VA identifies the scenic resources that are in that
18 10-mile study area, the sensitivity of those scenic
19 resources, the visual change the Project may have to that
20 sensitive resource, the effect that the visibility may
21 have on the reasonable person, and, using those criteria,
22 comes to an overall conclusion on whether the Project has
23 an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics given the
24 visual change. And, LandWorks' conclusion has been that

1 there is no unreasonable adverse effect created by the
2 construction of this Project.

3 Shadow flicker: This is one area where
4 there is an update from the presentation that we made in
5 January, and from the initial Application that was filed
6 in October. Epsilon Associates performed an evaluation of
7 potential shadow flicker impacts. This study was updated
8 in February of 2015 [2016?] in order to comply with new
9 rules that were adopted in December by the Site Evaluation
10 Committee, some of which pertain to shadow flicker, both
11 in terms of the way the study is performed and in terms of
12 the standard that a project needs to achieve. That report
13 is now also available on, or should be shortly, available
14 on the SEC website, if it's not already.

15 We were required to look at all occupied
16 buildings within one mile of a turbine, of which we
17 identified 150; 77 of those are expected to experience
18 zero shadow flicker, 49 of those are conservatively
19 expected to experience between zero and 8 hours per year,
20 and 24 of those 150 are expected to experience between 8
21 hours and 13 hours and 48 minutes per year without any
22 type of operational controls.

23 In order to meet the new SEC criteria,
24 we would need -- we are required to meet a maximum annual

1 amount of shadow flicker of 8 hours per year. And, so,
2 Antrim Wind will use a Siemens-provided shadow control
3 method that will ensure that the 24 locations that could
4 experience between 8 hours and 13 hours and 48 minutes per
5 year does not exceed 8 hours per year. The remaining 49
6 locations that have some degree of shadow flicker will not
7 require any type of operational controls in order to
8 comply with the 8-hour SEC limit. The control method will
9 allow us to utilize operational controls to curtail very
10 specific turbines that are identified as potentially
11 causing shadow flicker in excess of that 8-hour maximum.

12 FAA lighting: The Project will comply
13 with all FAA lighting requirements for marking and/or
14 lighting of tall structures. The current FAA guidance
15 that Antrim Wind has been given requires that six of the
16 turbines will have a single medium-intensity flashing red
17 light at night attached on the top of the nacelles. So,
18 six of the nine turbines would be required to have those
19 FAA lights.

20 Antrim Wind has made a commitment to
21 utilize a radar-activated lighting control system, which
22 would be the first time that type of a system has been
23 deployed in New Hampshire, once the FAA has approved the
24 technology.

1 In late 2015, as I mentioned in the
2 January meeting, the FAA did issue a new Advisory
3 Circular, which sets forward the guidelines that need to
4 be complied with in order to employ this technology. And,
5 Antrim Wind is going to continue to work with the FAA to
6 clarify what the requirements are for the Antrim Project
7 site and to advance the approval of an ADLS for this
8 Project.

9 And, essentially, if it is ultimately
10 approved by the FAA, that will allow us to keep the lights
11 on those turbines off, unless there are aircraft flying
12 within a 3-mile radius below a thousand feet at night.

13 Sound is another area where we've
14 recently provided an update to our report -- or, to our
15 Application, in response to new SEC rules. Epsilon was
16 also retained to perform a sound study, and this was
17 updated just this month, primarily to -- on a number of
18 levels, but one of the requirements was to the specific
19 way the background sound levels are measured. And, so, we
20 did new background sound measurements in January.

21 We also predicted turbine-only or
22 Project-caused sound impacts using the requirements set
23 forth in the new SEC rules, and consistent with the
24 applicable IEC standards, to predict the sound levels

1 throughout the Project area and off-site, using the sound
2 levels that are emitted from this specific Siemens
3 turbine. And, that study demonstrates the Project will
4 not exceed 40 dBA at any residence, and that level meets
5 the new SEC criteria of 40 dBA at night. And, that
6 conclusion has not changed from the original Application
7 that we filed, but the new -- the new noise update does
8 contain additional information that was required by the
9 rules.

10 Cultural resources: We have worked with
11 both the Division of Historical Resources and U.S. Army
12 Corps. On archeological resources, really, with --
13 primarily with DHR, with a request for Project review in
14 October of '11, we committed -- performed both Phase 1A
15 and B studies that were submitted in 2011, and received a
16 response in January 2012 that "no further study would be
17 required for archeological resources".

18 For historic architecture, the process
19 has been a joint process between U.S. Army Corps and the
20 DHR, under the Section 106 process, with U.S. Army Corps
21 as the lead agency. We also did follow the Division of
22 Historical Resources' guidelines for wind energy projects
23 in New Hampshire, and as well as the U.S. Army Corps
24 guidance.

1 The U.S. Army Corps has filed a letter
2 with the SEC in December, indicating that, from their
3 perspective, no further consultation was required for
4 Section 106. We understand that that may not resolve all
5 of the questions that DHR has, and we look forward to
6 working with both agencies until that process is brought
7 to completion.

8 Orderly development of the region: Wind
9 projects require a lot of really specific criteria that
10 exist in a very rare number of locations. Adequate wind
11 speed is obviously required to be able to generate a
12 sufficient amount of energy from a project to make it
13 economic. Proximity to adequate transportation
14 infrastructure and transmission infrastructure, so that
15 you can both access the site with large equipment and
16 components, and transmission infrastructure to be able to
17 interconnect the project to the utility system to bring
18 that power to market. Setbacks from residences to ensure
19 public safety, and appropriate environmental siting. And,
20 the Antrim site really stands out very favorably in all of
21 these categories.

22 You know, we have a transmission line
23 that runs right through the base of the Project, so no new
24 transmission needs to be constructed for this project. We

1 will interconnect directly to the 115 kV Eversource line
2 that's just to the north of Turbine 1.

3 Again, New Hampshire Route 9, which runs
4 just about a half a mile from Turbine 1, allows us to go
5 to deliver turbine components and the construction
6 equipment directly to the site without having to utilize
7 local roads.

8 I mentioned, in the environmental siting
9 earlier, the limited impacts that have to do with wetlands
10 and natural communities. We've also found no rare,
11 threatened or endangered species that are utilizing the
12 site.

13 And, again, this site allows us to
14 maximize the use of existing infrastructure, and coincides
15 with local and regional land-use patterns and goals.

16 The Project will -- is expected to
17 provide new clean energy sufficient to power approximately
18 12,300 average New Hampshire homes, while it also creates
19 jobs, tax benefits, and conservation benefits to the Town
20 and the region. The Project consists of significant
21 conservation easements that will provide substantial open
22 space benefits. Open space preservation and renewable
23 energy are clearly and strongly supported by the Antrim
24 Master Plan. And, historic activities, such as hunting,

1 logging, and recreational enjoyment of this area will not
2 be substantially encumbered by the Project.

3 I mentioned "economic impact". We have
4 commissioned a study that was performed initially by UNH,
5 and then updated by Seacoast Economics in 2015, to
6 evaluate the economic impact of the Project. Their study
7 estimates the Project will generate roughly \$53.4 million
8 in economic active -- economic benefit to the local
9 region, which is defined as "Hillsborough and the four
10 surrounding counties in southern New Hampshire", over the
11 first 20 years of the Project's life. That consists of
12 11.6 million during construction, and then approximately
13 2.2 million a year, every year, for those first 20 years.
14 And, obviously, that will continue beyond 20 years, to the
15 extent the Project continues to operate.

16 The Project will also create or support
17 84 full-time equivalent jobs during construction and 12
18 full-time equivalent jobs during operations.

19 Public safety is, obviously, of
20 paramount concern for everybody on the Antrim Wind team.
21 In part, public safety, obviously, is something that is
22 addressed throughout the design process and the planning
23 process for the facility. The entire facility, in this
24 case, is located on private lands, with substantial

1 setbacks to neighboring property owners and residences,
2 having greater than half a mile from any wind turbine to
3 the nearest non-participating residence. Will protect the
4 public from any potential safety hazards of the Project,
5 both during normal operations and in the event of any type
6 of unexpected equipment failure.

7 Antrim Wind has also entered into an
8 agreement with the Town of Antrim that includes additional
9 public safety measures that were of concern to the Town,
10 and agreed to between the Town and Antrim Wind. Which
11 will provide that all -- there's only a single access road
12 to the site, but that road will be gated and locked to
13 prevent vehicular access from the public. And, the Town
14 and emergency response personnel will have the ability to
15 access that gate.

16 The wind towers themselves will not be
17 able to be climbable, and all access doors will be locked.
18 All high-voltage electrical equipment will enclosed and
19 marked, and the substation will be fenced in.

20 There is a setback requirement of 1.1
21 times the tip height of a turbine to the nearest adjacent
22 property line. We've agreed that access roads and
23 informal trails will have warnings of potential hazards
24 associated with the Project at not less than 750 feet from

1 roads and 500 feet for informal trails, to make the public
2 aware of potential risks, if they may be traveling by foot
3 or other means in that area.

4 All aboveground electrical equipment
5 will be appropriately marked in a highly visible manner.
6 All equipment shall have design safety certifications as
7 required, and blasting will adhere to New Hampshire DES
8 and Department of Safety standards, with the Town being
9 noticed in advance of any blasting activities.

10 These elements that are in the agreement
11 with the Town of Antrim, this document is also available
12 publicly, either here, at the Town of Antrim, or as part
13 of the Application on the SEC's website, we've also
14 included it as one of our appendices.

15 In addition to the built-in Siemens fire
16 detection and prevention technologies that are included in
17 the turbine, Antrim Wind has also committed to employ a
18 Firetrace active fire suppression system in the nacelles
19 of the turbines. You know, this is a significant
20 additional step. You know, turbine fires are rare. But,
21 should they occur, then we have another step to be able to
22 actually extinguish that fire through a system that is
23 automated and actually releases a fire suppressant in an
24 area where the active fire occurs. So, we have worked

1 together with the State Fire Marshal's Office and
2 communicated with the Fire Department here in the Town of
3 Antrim. And, we'll continue to cooperate with them as we
4 finalize the emergency response plan. But we'll include
5 that active fire suppression system with our Project.

6 The construction process: Right now,
7 the Project is anticipating a commercial operation date
8 that could be as soon as December 2017. Given that
9 timeline, tree-clearing would occur between October --
10 well, tree-clearing will occur between October 1 and March
11 31, regardless, so that we can avoid impacts to nesting
12 birds. Road construction will commence as soon as
13 practical, after clearing and grubbing has been completed.
14 That will be followed by turbine pad and foundation
15 construction, electrical line construction, and then
16 moving onto turbine erection and commissioning.

17 The turbines will be delivered directly
18 to the turbine pads. So, the specialized equipment that
19 is used to transport turbine blades, tower sections,
20 nacelles, will come from wherever its point of origin is,
21 directly on the site and be delivered directly to the pad,
22 so we can limit any need to double-handle those
23 components. And, then, they will be erected shortly
24 thereafter, shortly after we take delivery.

1 The Project roadways will all be
2 reduced. So, the access road is a 16-foot access road and
3 the crane path is a 34-foot crane path, to allow for
4 crawler crane to be able to access the turbine sites to
5 erect the turbines. That crane path will be reduced to
6 16 feet after construction is completed, which will match
7 the access road, and all roads will then be 16 feet wide.
8 That will be completed by revegetating 8 feet on either
9 side of the shoulders.

10 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

11 MR. KENWORTHY: Antrim Wind has selected
12 Reed & Reed as its contractor for this Project. Reed &
13 Reed is the leading wind contractor in New England. They
14 have installed over 411 turbines, nearly a thousand
15 megawatts in New England since 2007. Many New Hampshire
16 subcontractors and suppliers will be used to support the
17 construction of this Project.

18 Decommissioning: Modern wind turbines
19 are, I mentioned earlier, you know, designed to last
20 between 20 and 25 years, could be a little bit longer than
21 that depending. The Project may be repowered after the
22 initial 20-year period. So, Antrim Wind has leases with
23 its landowners that go 50 years from the date that they
24 were first executed, and that first date is around

1 December of 2009. So, you could have up until December
2 2059, is the longest period a lease could go. If the
3 Project is repowered, then it would continue to operate
4 until the end of that lease turn, at which point it's
5 required to be decommissioned, not only under our
6 obligations in lease agreements with private landowners,
7 but in our agreement with the Town of Antrim, and,
8 ultimately, we expect, as a condition of any certificate
9 that may be issued by the Site Evaluation Committee.

10 If it is not repowered, then it would be
11 decommissioned after its initial operating life. And,
12 that's a decision, obviously, that we haven't made about
13 what will happen 20 years from now. But, once they're no
14 longer operational, these turbines will be decommissioned
15 and removed.

16 The facilities will be removed down to
17 at least 48 inches below grade where practicable. This,
18 again, is an update to reflect new SEC rule requirements.
19 And, Antrim Wind has also agreed to break up the roadbed
20 beyond the Ott property, which will ensure -- obviously,
21 there's no ability to use that road without the Project in
22 any event, but will hasten the revegetation of that site,
23 so that those 908 acres that are permanently conserved
24 with the Project, which includes 100 percent of the

1 ridgeline, which I'll show you in a moment, we'll be able
2 to revegetate more quickly after the Project has been
3 decommissioned.

4 With respect to decommissioning funding,
5 Antrim Wind will provide decommissioning funding assurance
6 prior to the commencement of construction. So, from,
7 essentially, day one, before we start construction, a
8 decommissioning funding assurance in an amount sufficient
9 to cover 100 percent of the decommissioning costs, without
10 accounting for salvage value, which is, obviously,
11 extremely conservative, will be posted and made available
12 to cover that decommissioning obligation, which we have
13 committed to.

14 Let's talk a little bit about the
15 emissions benefits from the project. Obviously, this is a
16 fuel-free project. It's powered by the wind, and will not
17 create emissions during its operations. There's been a
18 number of studies in New England and in New Hampshire that
19 consistently demonstrate that installing additional wind
20 energy onto the New England power system results in
21 substantial emissions benefits, including carbon dioxide.

22 It also results in substantial annual
23 fresh water savings, because we do not need to create
24 steam to spin a turbine in order to operate our

1 generators. There was a 2013 report from Environment New
2 Hampshire finding that New Hampshire's wind energy today
3 is already avoiding more than 157,000 metric tons of CO2
4 pollution every year, the equivalent of taking over 32,000
5 cars off the road, while it also saves over 70 million
6 gallons of fresh water every year.

7 So, the addition of the Antrim Wind
8 Project will only increase these benefits, and it will be
9 a significant increase to the benefits that New Hampshire
10 is already realizing from the operating wind it has in
11 this state.

12 I mentioned "conservation lands".
13 Antrim Wind has taken a pretty unique approach to the
14 conservation element here. It's always been a priority to
15 include conservation as a key benefit from this Project.
16 And, it's been many years that Antrim Wind has been in
17 conversations with numerous conservation NGOs, as well as
18 interested stakeholders here in Antrim, to develop a plan
19 which creates significant and lasting, in this case,
20 permanent conservation benefits.

21 We have met with many, many
22 environmental groups, including the Sierra Club, CLF, the
23 Appalachian Mountain Club, Nature Conservancy, New
24 Hampshire Audubon, Harris Center, Monadnock Conservancy,

1 the Conservation Commission here in Antrim, the New
2 England Forestry Foundation, and the Forest Society, to
3 help us develop this package and help us understand how to
4 make it most effective.

5 We have, in this case, very specifically
6 worked with local landowners and the Harris Center, and
7 the Town of Antrim, to permanently conserve 908 acres of
8 land in and around the Project area, including 100 percent
9 of the ridgeline permanently. This would significantly
10 enlarge the conserved land that's contiguous with the
11 dePierrefeu/Willard Pond Sanctuary. It would add
12 908 acres that are contiguous to the existing 1,671-acre
13 sanctuary.

14 Antrim Wind has also entered into a Land
15 Conservation Funding Agreement with the New England
16 Forestry Foundation, whereby AWE has agreed to fund
17 \$100,000 for acquisition of new conservation lands
18 off-site that are intended to enhance and protect the
19 region's aesthetic character, wildlife habitat, and public
20 recreational opportunities.

21 And, this is a map here that shows a
22 couple different things. You can see, some of you maybe
23 easier than others, there's some squiggly lines here that
24 show that about the 55.3 acres of clearing impact, that's

1 essentially the limit of disturbance for the construction
2 of the Project, is that outline there in black, again,
3 55.3 acres.

4 These green lands are conservation
5 easements that Antrim Wind has entered into, binding LOIs,
6 with the landowner and either the Harris Center, in the
7 case of five of them, or the Town of Antrim, in the case
8 of the sixth.

9 So, this is where that 908 acres is.
10 And, you can see it comprises all of the ridgeline, and
11 abuts other conservation land down here *[indicating]* to
12 the southwest.

13 Antrim Wind has also developed a
14 comprehensive bird and bat conservation strategy, in
15 consultation with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and New
16 Hampshire Fish & Game Department. Our plan takes very
17 innovative and proactive steps to mitigate potential
18 impacts to bird and bats. It obviously starts by
19 performing comprehensive pre-construction surveys, which
20 we have done. It then goes on to performing
21 post-construction monitoring and creating incident
22 response protocols, which includes structured consultation
23 with Fish & Game and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, that
24 enables us to adaptively manage the Project as time goes

1 on. Recognizing that we can't understand everything day
2 one, conditions are going to change over the life of the
3 Project, we ought to be able to adapt to those conditions.
4 That's what this plan does. It's been developed, again,
5 as I said, with the support of New Hampshire Fish & Game
6 and U.S. Fish & Wildlife.

7 It also includes a voluntary curtailment
8 program to test the effectiveness of curtailment under
9 certain conditions to reduce potential mortality to bats.
10 And, so, we will test for five of the nine turbines for
11 the first year, whether increasing that cut-in speed
12 actually does reduce mortality to bat species. And, if it
13 does, then we will continue it. If it doesn't, then we
14 will not continue it.

15 Community benefits of the Project:

16 There's a lot of community benefits, again, that we've
17 developed in conjunction with a lot of different
18 stakeholders here in Antrim, and a lot of different
19 potential areas to impact. I've talked about the
20 conservation lands. Antrim Wind would also become the
21 largest taxpayer in Antrim, bringing steady revenue to the
22 Town over the life of the Project, with little or no
23 direct costs to the Town as a result of the construction
24 of the wind farm.

1 Antrim Wind's PILOT agreement with the
2 Town of Antrim provides the highest per megawatt payment
3 of any wind energy PILOT in the State of New Hampshire, at
4 \$11,250 per megawatt, in year one, increasing at two and a
5 half percent every year for the life of the Project.

6 There are direct and indirect economic
7 benefits brought by the investment, obviously, including
8 the employment benefit and the spending that happens
9 during construction and during operations. Again, the
10 conservation benefits on- and off-site.

11 The Project has also committed to
12 enhance the recreational facilities around the Gregg Lake
13 Beach area, where we visited today, by making a payment to
14 the Town of Antrim of \$40,000. And, Antrim Wind has --
15 which the Town of Antrim agreed was full and adequate
16 compensation for any perceived aesthetic impacts to that
17 particular resource. Antrim Wind has also entered into a
18 letter agreement with the Trustees of Trust Funds in
19 Antrim, where we've committed to make a \$5,000
20 contribution every year for the life of the Project to the
21 Antrim Scholarship Fund to be used at their discretion.

22 I have mentioned again these agreements,
23 the 2012 agreement, that addresses construction and
24 operating period requirements, on issues such as noise,

1 public safety, construction timing, decommissioning,
2 complaint response, and emergency response, as well as
3 other key issues.

4 In 2013, the Town and Antrim Wind
5 entered into a PILOT agreement, which would pay the Town
6 \$324,000 in year one. There are actually going to be
7 pre-commercial operations payments that are also made,
8 starting with \$50,000, and then going from there. And,
9 that PILOT was just extended about -- in November of 2014,
10 to allow the Project until the end of 2018 to hit
11 commercial operations. And, I just mentioned the Gregg
12 Lake agreement and the Scholarship Fund commitment.

13 I want to talk briefly about the changes
14 from the 2012 Project that are listed up here. There's
15 been a number of changes that were made to the 2012,
16 specifically to reduce aesthetic impacts that were
17 associated with the Project.

18 Turbine 10 has been eliminated. So,
19 10 percent of the turbines are gone with that elimination.
20 Turbine 9 has been significantly reduced in height, which
21 means that, from Willard Pond, that turbine is no longer
22 visible, the nacelle and tower of that turbine are no
23 longer visible; portions of the blade may be.

24 We've also changed turbines, from

1 Acciona machines to Siemens turbines, which are smaller
2 and quieter turbines than we had proposed in 2012. We've
3 added 100 acres of conservation land to permanently
4 conserve 908, that includes 100 percent of the ridgeline,
5 which was identified as being important in 2012. We've
6 added the \$100,000 in off-site conservation funding, which
7 was identified as a priority in 2012. The scholarship
8 funding is a new commitment that this Project has made.

9 We've added a landscaping plan around
10 the new substation to provide visual screening. We've
11 incorporated the comments that Department of Environmental
12 Services and New Hampshire Fish & Game had previously
13 recommended, so that all of those recommendations that may
14 have otherwise been included as conditions, are now part
15 of our kind of "proposal-in-chief" in front of the
16 Committee.

17 We've got a more robust decommissioning
18 plan and a more robust decommissioning funding plan. And,
19 we've made the commitment to install active fire
20 suppression in the nacelles of the turbines.

21 As a result of all of these significant
22 changes, and I think Antrim Wind's longstanding efforts to
23 engage stakeholders, going all the way back to 2009, we've
24 had a great deal of support for this Project, which we're

1 very grateful for. And, we think is reflective of the
2 careful siting and design and the establishment of the
3 significant community benefits that Antrim Wind has been
4 able to generate, in partnership with the Town and other
5 stakeholders.

6 We're very proud to have support from
7 the Antrim Board of Selectmen, from Senator Jerry Little,
8 from Representative Marjorie Porter, Representative Frank
9 Edelblut, Representative Gilman Shattuck, and
10 Representative Richard McNamara, all four state
11 representatives who represent Antrim, from the New
12 Hampshire Chapter of the Sierra Club, from the
13 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, from the
14 New Hampshire Clean Tech Council and the Sustainable
15 Energy Association, and many other New Hampshire
16 contractors have also written letters of support for the
17 Project. We're grateful for the support. We're proud to
18 have their support. We think the support is reflective of
19 the type of project that this is and the type of benefits
20 that it can bring.

21 Specifically, just a quick quote from
22 the Sierra Club letter on January 5th. The scale -- it
23 notes that "the scale of this project is exactly what
24 environmentalists endorse for small, local, and manageable

1 power sources that create less climate and visual impact,
2 lower costs, creates local jobs, and improves public
3 health".

4 So, to quickly summarize, Antrim's
5 proposed Project is a result of careful site selection, a
6 process that's focused on high performance and low
7 impacts. The studies that have been performed indicate
8 the Project can be built without undue adverse impacts to
9 the community or environment, while bringing significant
10 economic and energy benefits to the area. The Project
11 will have direct impacts on only 55.3 acres of land, will
12 create enough energy for the equivalent of 12,300 average
13 homes, will bring substantial new revenue to the Town of
14 Antrim, and result in significant ongoing emissions
15 benefits.

16 The Project has been significantly
17 revised since the 2012 docket to address concerns about
18 aesthetic impacts. And, it enjoys broad support from the
19 Town, elected officials, environmental groups, and labor
20 and trade groups.

21 And, the Project is consistent with the
22 goals of the State of New Hampshire for increasing clean
23 energy, and meets the criteria under RSA 162-H to receive
24 a Certificate of Site and Facility.

1 Thank you very much.

2 *[Audience interruption.]*

3 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you,
4 Jack. So, we've provided a table for the Applicant to
5 help answer some questions. And, we will start with
6 questions from the Subcommittee.

7 Does any member of the Subcommittee wish
8 to ask some questions of the Applicants?

9 *[No verbal response]*

10 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. If
11 there's no questions from the Subcommittee, I'll ask from
12 Counsel for the Public, do you have any questions?

13 MS. MALONEY: Not at this time.

14 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: No. Okay.
15 Mr. Iacopino or Administrator Monroe, do you have any
16 questions?

17 *[No verbal response]*

18 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. I
19 guess, so, what we'll do now is, for those who have an
20 agenda, which was passed out at the table as you walk in,
21 we're now on Section IV. I will draw your attention to
22 the back of this. Again, it talks about the procedures
23 here today, and it also, again, I pointed out,
24 Administrator Monroe, it gives her contact information

1 also.

2 So, if there's no questions from the
3 Committee for the Applicant, we will now move to questions
4 from the public to the Applicant. And, I will try to --
5 so, bear with me as I read through them.

6 So, this first question is from
7 Mr. Richard Corazami?

8 FROM THE FLOOR: Corazzini.

9 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And, my
10 apology, I'm sure I messed up the name. So, my apologies.
11 And, he asks, he says "most land is now open, where are
12 the 1,000 acres? How many acres for road" -- all right,
13 you have to excuse me, I'm interpolating here, "How many
14 acres will be for roads? And, what is the length and
15 width of the road?"

16 So, I'll try it one more time for the
17 Applicants. So, "where are the 1,000 acres?", is the
18 first question. And, then, the second question is "how
19 many acres will there be in roads, and the length and
20 width of the road?"

21 MR. KENWORTHY: Okay. Thank you for the
22 question. So, I showed the map earlier that showed where
23 the conservation lands are located. They are kind of
24 within and around the Project area. So, they will run

1 from Tuttle Hill, across the ridgeline, up to the top of
2 Willard Mountain, they also extend down into some of the
3 wetlands to the north on the Macaulay [sic] property,
4 which is roughly a 285-acre property that's being
5 conserved, that does not have any wind farm associated
6 impacts on it. So, the 908 acres are going to be up in
7 the rural conservation district there in the Project area.
8 I'd be happy to show the map again, if that's helpful, or
9 show it to you afterwards.

10 The road length is about 3.55 miles of
11 new gravel surface road. The access road, which is
12 between Route 9 and Turbine 1, about a half a mile, is
13 going to be 16 feet wide, to allow for truck deliveries of
14 equipment. And, then, the crane road, which allows for
15 the crawler crane to walk between the different turbine
16 locations, is 34 feet wide, and then is ultimately reduced
17 down, after construction, to 16 feet wide, by revegetating
18 their shoulders.

19 So, I think I might have heard one other
20 piece of a question, which is that the total kind of
21 facility footprint, after restoration has been completed,
22 post-construction, is about 11 and a quarter acres. So,
23 there's about 11 and a quarter acres of facilities. And,
24 that includes roads, turbine pads, substation, O&M

1 building, everything that's kind of a semi-permanent
2 component of the facility. I don't have a specific
3 breakdown of how much of that is roads, but it's part of
4 that 11.25.

5 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
6 The next question is from Mr. Cleland. "Do we need a new
7 bird and bat study" -- excuse me -- "survey since it has
8 been six years since the last one?"

9 MR. KENWORTHY: So, we consulted with
10 New Hampshire Fish & Game and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
11 prior to filing our Application. And, they have
12 determined we do not require new studies.

13 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
14 Next question is from Ms. Law. "If AWE is so concerned
15 about the environment, why do you not care about blasting
16 the ridgeline from Tuttle Hill all the way to Willard
17 Pond? Don't you realize that you will be destroying the
18 habitat for wild animals living in that area? That is not
19 considered open space preservation that you talk about."

20 Want me to read the question part again?

21 MR. KENWORTHY: Sure.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I believe the
23 question is asking you, "are you not concerned that
24 blasting will have a negative impact?"

1 MR. KENWORTHY: Certainly, there's going
2 to be some impacts associated with the construction of the
3 Project. Those impacts during construction are
4 short-term. They're going to take place over a period of,
5 you know, total construction for the Project will take
6 place in less than a year. It's obviously able to operate
7 for better than 20 years. While it's operating, it's
8 obviously creating a significant amount of environmental
9 benefit, in terms of clean emission-free energy.

10 And, then, of course, once it's
11 decommissioned, it will not leave behind, you know, toxic
12 waste and anything that's going to be a permanent hazard,
13 and all of that land that surrounds there will be -- will
14 be permanently conserved.

15 So, we certainly recognize there are
16 going to be impacts to build this Project. There has to
17 be. But we think those benefits far outweigh the impacts.

18 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Next question
19 is from Mr. Moore. He asks "are there any Antrim
20 residents employed by the wind energy project, or their
21 partners? And, if so, who are they?"

22 MR. KENWORTHY: Not at this time, no.
23 Antrim Wind does not have any employees at this time.

24 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I apologize.

1 This is a long question, I need to digest it here. Okay.
2 The first -- this is from Ms. Gorman. Her first part says
3 she "would like to read a statement". So, I'm going to
4 hold that for -- the next portion of this is for
5 statements, and we have 40 people asking to comment.

6 She asked "where does the money come
7 from? If taxpayers, it should go back to the taxpayers to
8 subsidize small house" -- "home-based wind/solar" -- "wind
9 and solar in energy credits." So, that would be the first
10 question, "where does the money for the Project come
11 from?"

12 MR. KENWORTHY: So, the Project is
13 privately funded. As I mentioned, the Project is a
14 partnership between Eolian Renewable Energy and Walden
15 Green Energy. To my left here, Henry Weitzner, is a
16 managing partner at Walden Green Energy. And, so, Walden
17 will be providing all of the equity to construct the
18 Project. And, then, obviously, there will be financing
19 that is obtained from private sources to supplement that
20 equity to construct and operate the Project as well.

21 I don't know if you want to add anything
22 to that? But the capital is private capital.

23 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: She also asked
24 "Has the state audited the existing industrial wind sites

1 to see if they are still valid?"

2 MR. KENWORTHY: In terms of -- in terms
3 of their energy production, is the question? Or, is it
4 about --

5 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I believe so,
6 yes.

7 MR. KENWORTHY: I don't know if the
8 state has audited those wind facilities. There's three
9 operating kind of grid-scale wind farms here in New
10 Hampshire. We've got Lempster, which is the first one to
11 be built; we've got Groton Wind, and we've got Granite
12 Reliable. Jericho, I think, may be operational. It is
13 now operational, so, four. And, I think the operational,
14 you know, all those projects continue to operate and be
15 viable.

16 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: She also asked
17 "is there a view impact from Mount Monadnock?"

18 MR. RAPHAEL: We did not look at the
19 visual --

20 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

21 MR. RAPHAEL: Mount Monadnock is outside
22 of the viewshed area that we are charged to study. It's
23 beyond 10 miles. So, we did not review the view from the
24 summit of Mount Monadnock.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: She also
2 asked, I think you answered this earlier in your
3 presentation, "what is the service life of your turbines?"

4 MR. KENWORTHY: Design life is about 20
5 years. We expect to get a service life of about 25 years.

6 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And, she also
7 asked about the "impact of eagles of the Project?"

8 MR. KENWORTHY: We really don't expect
9 to have any impact on eagles. They're -- obviously, we've
10 studied eagles. We've done eagle nest surveys, we've done
11 eagle use surveys. We've consulted with U.S. Fish &
12 Wildlife Service and New Hampshire Fish & Game on eagle
13 populations. There's never been an eagle mortality at any
14 wind farm in the Northeast. And, so -- and, there's
15 obviously been wind farms that have been constructed in
16 areas that have significantly higher eagle use than this
17 Project has.

18 There are some eagles in the area.
19 Obviously, where we were today, on Lake Nubanusit, there's
20 an eagle nest there, there has been for a long time, we
21 expect there to continue to be. And, eagles do use this
22 area, but we don't expect them to have any negative
23 interactions with the turbines, and kind of history has
24 borne that out, thus far, across New England, there is no

1 evidence to suggest that wind turbines are killing eagles
2 in the Northeast.

3 Of course, this is one of the things
4 that our bird and bat conservation strategy does, is it
5 enables us to have a continued dialogue. Obviously, if
6 there ever were any type of impact to eagles, it would be
7 something that we would report directly to Fish & Game and
8 U.S. Fish & Wildlife, and that would lead to a
9 consultation process that enables us to move forward.

10 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Two more
11 questions. She asked "why is it appropriate that these be
12 located on a steep slope watershed? Will that not have an
13 adverse impact?"

14 MR. KENWORTHY: So, you know, wind
15 projects need to be in windy places. And, generally,
16 around here, that means they need to be at some elevation.
17 Wind speeds are generally correlated with elevation in
18 this part of the world. And, so, we have to get there,
19 which means we need to go up slopes. But there's been a
20 lot of experience constructing wind projects on steep
21 slopes. Certainly, Reed & Reed has got a tremendous
22 amount of experience building the roads and transporting
23 the equipment up steep slopes to access these areas in
24 ways that are, you know, not overly impactful to the

1 environment.

2 Ultimately, you know, things like where
3 you'd be concerned about a steep slope is going to be with
4 respect to storm water management. Storm water management
5 is a process that we work, obviously, very closely with
6 DES on, not only as we work to get a permit for the
7 Project and get those wetlands -- and get those storm
8 water plans approved, but, obviously, during construction
9 as well, to ensure that those storm water systems that
10 have been designed are operating properly.

11 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And, her last
12 question asked "what are the losses to the tax base
13 related to the loss of equity in real estate?"

14 MR. KENWORTHY: The studies that we have
15 performed, and I think studies generally that look at the
16 question of wind energy and property values, demonstrate
17 that there is no -- there is no significant impact to
18 property values from the construction and operation of
19 wind farms. So, we don't expect that there is going to be
20 a negative impact on property values in Antrim, that's
21 what our studies have shown, both that we performed and
22 that are supported by a lot of data in this part of the
23 country and nationally.

24 So, I don't think there will be any kind

1 of negative offset to the kind of new investment that
2 comes from a decrease in property values.

3 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: The next set
4 of questions is from Dr. Ward, who I'll note is an
5 intervenor also. So, he may -- this may be a glimpse into
6 the future for the hearings.

7 The first section regards noise. "What
8 does your noise model show for sound levels that you'll be
9 broadcasting, particularly to residents in the bowl-shaped
10 area to your north and west, and particularly during a
11 stable atmosphere environment when there's ice-covered
12 snow on all exterior surfaces?"

13 MR. KENWORTHY: So, I'm going to ask Rob
14 O'Neil to help field part of that question. Rob is here
15 from Epsilon. He's performed the study for us. I think
16 he could describe a little bit more, at least about the
17 type of atmospheric condition questions that were present
18 in our study.

19 MR. O'NEIL: Thanks, Jack. Rob O'Neil,
20 from Epsilon Associates. So, as part of looking at the
21 sound levels, there's a set of meteorological conditions
22 that are put into the model. They assume a moderate
23 ground-based temperature inversion, that's part of the
24 propagation standard that's included in the model. There

1 are a set of ground conditions, there's a lot of detail
2 that goes into the model.

3 FROM THE FLOOR: Could you talk up
4 please? Just talk louder. Thank you.

5 MR. O'NEIL: I don't want to get too
6 close here.

7 FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you.

8 MR. O'NEIL: How's that?

9 FROM THE FLOOR: It's not for me, but
10 thank you.

11 MR. O'NEIL: So, really, to answer the
12 question, we did study sound levels during those types of
13 conditions. And, if you look at the report, sound levels
14 are 38 decibels or less at any location. So, the closest
15 residence to the north is predicted to be 38 decibels.
16 And, then, as you go in either -- any direction from
17 there, it goes down into the 30s and the 20s.

18 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
19 Second question regarding noise references both the Site
20 Evaluation Committee rules, 301.18, and ISO 9613-2. And,
21 he quotes 13-2, saying "the equations for attenuation are
22 the average for meteorological conditions", and "these
23 conditions also hold, equivalently, for average
24 propagation". So, he asks "how do you square that quote

1 with your statement in your Application, which says "the
2 Project will not produce noise that will unreasonably
3 adversely affect nearby residents or the general public?"

4 MR. O'NEIL: Sure. So, there's, again,
5 there's a lot of different inputs to the model, and the
6 temperature and the relative humidity are a couple of
7 meteorological parameters that you put into that. And,
8 what we have historically done is use values that are
9 conservative, in the sense that they -- they minimize the
10 reduction in propagation values over distance from certain
11 frequencies. So, in other words, they're going to
12 minimize the attenuation over distance for the middle
13 frequencies, which are the ones that really control the
14 A-weighted values.

15 For example, we could put in 20 below
16 zero conditions in a cold New Hampshire winter, that would
17 give us even lower numbers than the numbers that we put
18 into the model, which are 10 degrees Celsius and 70
19 percent relative humidity.

20 MR. KENWORTHY: And, if I could just add
21 one further, I guess, response, is that, obviously, the
22 Committee has now established rules that have a limit for
23 noise that we need to meet. They have also established a
24 standard that we need to follow to demonstrate that we

1 meet those rules. We have followed that standard. And,
2 it references the IEC standard we must use, which we did,
3 and we meet the standard.

4 So, it is the SEC that has set the
5 standard as to what will not be an unreasonable adverse
6 effect on that is caused by noise.

7 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
8 The next section from Dr. Ward addresses shadow flicker.
9 His first question is, "where can he get a picture or a
10 diagram showing the turbine blades, with dimensions?"

11 MR. KENWORTHY: That would probably be
12 from me. I think --

13 DR. WARD: I'm here.

14 MR. KENWORTHY: Yes, I think we provided
15 some general dimensions in the Application, in the
16 technical specifications of the turbines. You know, some
17 stuff I -- I sometimes need to double check to see what
18 may or may not be proprietary. But I think there is
19 certainly information we can provide to you about the
20 width of blades, that's not an issue. Length and width of
21 blades.

22 DR. WARD: Do you need --

23 MR. KENWORTHY: I can't get you a 3D
24 model.

1 DR. WARD: Do you need my e-mail?

2 MR. KENWORTHY: I know you have mine.

3 DR. WARD: I will send it.

4 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.

5 And, his next question really asks "what do you consider
6 "shadow flicker"?" I'm summarizing here. "Is
7 half-covered a shadow flicker?" What is "shadow flicker"?
8 What's your definition?

9 MR. KENWORTHY: Yes. So, I'll start to
10 answer this question a little bit, and then I can also
11 turn it over to Rob, because Epsilon also performed our
12 shadow flicker study.

13 Ultimately, the definition we used is
14 the SEC definition. So, the SEC rules define "shadow
15 flicker". And, that required us to evaluate locations out
16 to one mile from any turbine, which is beyond the distance
17 that we would ordinarily evaluate under other
18 jurisdictional standards for where shadow flicker would be
19 expected to occur.

20 But it is an effect that is,
21 essentially, kind of alternating shadows and light that's
22 experienced inside a structure. And, then, we model it
23 based on things that are very well-known, like the
24 position of the Sun, the location of these receptors in

1 space, these homes, where they are, what the elevation of
2 the landform is, excluding vegetation. So, it assumes
3 kind of "bare earth", that there is no trees anywhere that
4 might mask a particular home, and it assumes that there is
5 a window all the way around every home.

6 So, it's really not our definition of
7 "flicker". The "flicker" is defined in the SEC rules. We
8 need to evaluate it and determine what levels of expected
9 flicker there will be, and that's what we have done in
10 accordance with those rules, and led to the findings that
11 we presented in our most recent reports.

12 DR. WARD: It's not in the SEC rules.

13 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
14 So, the next question is, is also "have you looked at,
15 regarding shadow flicker, the impact of sun or flicker in
16 the eyes of drivers?"

17 MR. KENWORTHY: In the eyes of drivers?
18 No. I think, the -- generally, I think it would be
19 indistinguishable. The roads in this area are, and we
20 have, you can tell from the shadow flicker maps that we've
21 produced within a mile, how flicker may or may not be
22 experienced on roads. But -- or, again, assuming kind of
23 "bare earth" conditions. But turbines are -- create
24 shadows like trees create shadows. I think, for a moving

1 vehicle going along a road, there is no experience of
2 shadow flicker like there is if you're standing in a home
3 stationary and a blade is spinning with an unobstructed,
4 you know, view to your window.

5 So, I guess the short answer is, there's
6 no requirement for us to evaluate drivers experiencing
7 shadow flicker. And, further to that, we don't believe
8 drivers do experience shadow flicker in the way somebody
9 at a stationary building does, because of the fact that
10 you're moving through an environment, and light is
11 constantly changing due to that movement, and the fact
12 that you have other things that are also creating shadows
13 in the environment.

14 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And, the last
15 question on shadow flicker, he asked "have you done any
16 analysis regarding the curvature of your blades and any
17 focusing effect they may have on reflected sunlight?"

18 MR. KENWORTHY: So, different from
19 shadow flicker?

20 DR. WARD: [inaudible] sunlight, rather
21 than in shade.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: It's under the
23 same topic.

24 MR. KENWORTHY: So, no. We haven't.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: The next
2 section of Dr. Ward's questions regards -- is regarding
3 ice throws. And, he asks "what kind of analysis have you
4 done to ensure that thrown ice from the turbine blades
5 will not cause a problem?"

6 MR. KENWORTHY: Well, our Application
7 describes how ice throw is managed through the design of
8 the Siemens turbines, and the Siemens condition monitoring
9 system and the SCADA system. Certainly, ice can build up
10 on objects in the wintertime. Turbines are no exclusion.
11 Most of that ice is going to fall directly to the base of
12 the turbine. Some of it may be cast off the blades, as
13 the blades rotate, and most of that is going to be very
14 small. There's been a lot of evidence that showed that
15 most ice that's -- excuse me -- discarded from the blades
16 are very, very small pieces of ice that don't make it very
17 far.

18 So, I think our evaluation -- or, our
19 Application discusses the kind of general risks that ice
20 throw may cause. Again, in this situation, you've got
21 private land that is significantly set back from nearby
22 property owners. So, it's not an area where there's a
23 high risk of potential interaction. There will be signage
24 that's posted, on both informal trails and roads, for

1 people to be made aware of potential hazards.

2 And, further, there are systems that are
3 built into the Siemens turbines to detect when there may
4 be heavy icing events by an imbalance in the rotor, which
5 would stop the turbine from operating until that condition
6 has been cured, meaning the ice melts.

7 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: The next set
8 of questions regards visual impact. And, he asks a series
9 of questions, and the context "will these issues", which
10 I'm about to read, "increase the visual impact?" One is
11 "its isolation and elevation? Its reaction to changes in
12 the wind? Its noise? Its flashing lights? The
13 continuous motion of its turbines? Its changing
14 background and lighting? And, its huge size and
15 visibility from many places?"

16 MR. RAPHAEL: Okay. There were quite a
17 few questions there. Most of those will not change the
18 visual effect from the Project. I mean, the effects of
19 atmosphere, obviously, can, at times, heighten the
20 visibility of the Project, and, at the same time, lessen
21 the visibility. So, yes. Atmospheric conditions do have
22 some effect on the visibility -- I mean, on the visibility
23 of the Project. That doesn't necessarily translate into
24 an unreasonable or an adverse visual impact from that

1 visibility.

2 So, I think that was the first question.
3 Could you go through the others please, if you wouldn't
4 mind?

5 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: He asks about
6 "isolation and elevation?" "Changes in the wind?"
7 "Noise?" "Flashings lights?" "Continuous motion of the
8 turbine blades?" "Changing background and lighting?"
9 And, basically, "the size and visibility?"

10 MR. RAPHAEL: Well, I mean, I think many
11 of those will have an effect on the visual quality of the
12 Project. What the net result of that effect, you know,
13 depends on the vantage point that you're seeing the
14 Project from, your attitude toward the Project. Wind I
15 don't believe would have a significant effect, except
16 that, certainly, wind, in my experience, actually can mask
17 noise from a project, so that, depending on where you're
18 standing, certainly, in distance, you're going to hear the
19 wind, if you're pretty close, and this is out of my area
20 of expertise, to have a noticeable noise from the
21 turbines.

22 So, from many of the vantage points, I
23 don't think noise -- that, certainly, from the number of
24 vantage points that we looked at, you know, at a distance

1 certainly of a mile or greater, noise would not
2 necessarily have an effect.

3 Flashing lights, at night, certainly
4 have a visual effect in the landscape. That certainly may
5 be a moot point in this regard for this Project, insofar
6 as the developer has committed to the radar system --
7 detection system, so that perhaps there would not
8 necessarily be a need for lighting, if that approach is
9 approved by the FAA. Even with that, the presence of
10 flashing light tends to affect those individuals who may
11 have a direct view of the Project. But, given the fact
12 that nighttime recreation and nighttime activity is often
13 much less so than daytime, the effect to numbers of people
14 would be greatly diminished.

15 There's been no evidence, I believe,
16 that the night lighting of the turbines would affect night
17 sky viewing from any number of vantage points in the
18 radius of the Project. Certainly, if you were, again, at
19 the base of the turbines, it would be a distraction
20 perhaps, but the throw and the nature of the night
21 lighting is such that it wouldn't affect someone's view
22 from a distant location of the night sky.

23 So, I think I've answered most of those.
24 Did I miss anything?

1 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: We'll move on.
2 The next question regards "cumulative impacts". I believe
3 this is about noise. And, to summarize, the question is
4 "Have you analyzed this Project with other wind projects?
5 And, will this correlation produce any accumulated large
6 surges in your or other wind facilities?"

7 MR. KENWORTHY: I think it may be an
8 electrical question, I'm guessing.

9 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. Could
10 be.

11 MR. O'NEIL: It's certainly not a noise
12 question. Any other wind farms in New Hampshire are
13 certainly way too far away to have any impact, from a
14 noise point of view.

15 MR. KENWORTHY: Yes. I think Rob is
16 right. So, I mean, obviously, the closest project to the
17 Antrim Wind Project is the Lempster Wind Project, which is
18 not at all audible, or at any location in between could
19 you hear both.

20 From a -- I'm interpreting "surge" to
21 mean "an impact on the electrical grid". And, yes, this
22 is exactly what is studied when the Project goes through
23 the interconnection review process with ISO-New England.
24 So, ISO-New England is the grid operator for the New

1 England operating region. Their responsibility is to
2 ensure the safe and reliable operation of the New England
3 electric grid, and to ensure that no new generator causes
4 any impacts on reliability or safety on that grid.

5 And, the Antrim Wind Project is no
6 different than any other project, it needs to go through
7 that evaluation, which looks at every other generator
8 that's on the system. So, you know, you go through in a
9 sequential process. So, now, when Antrim Wind gets
10 studied, every other wind project in New England is
11 assumed to be, you know, on line. Every other generator
12 of every other type is assumed to be on line, then they
13 start stressing the system, for line outages, for other
14 types of generator outages, and they see how the system
15 responds when it undergoes those stresses.

16 And, if our system causes any
17 significant or any -- any reliability impact, we need to
18 mitigate that. So, we need to invest in any upgrades that
19 would be required to ensure that that impact does not
20 occur.

21 In the case of this Project, we have
22 never found any such impact. So, we're interconnecting to
23 a reasonably strong point in the New England electrical
24 system. And, so, we should be able to deliver our power

1 to market without any issue.

2 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And, the last
3 question from Mr. Ward is regarding your models and the
4 data used in them. And, he asks: "How can he determine
5 with your models and weather data used to drive them
6 actually produces the results that you say, unless you
7 make them available for analysis?"

8 MR. KENWORTHY: I think I answered
9 Dr. Ward's question in January in a similar way. That the
10 data that we have that are wind data, that are very
11 specific to our site, which determine what the energy
12 yield of our Project will be, is competitively sensitive
13 information. We can't release that publicly.

14 However, there is data that we certainly
15 can share. And, there's inputs to models that, you know,
16 we -- you know, for noise and flicker, that, you know, if
17 you request them during discovery, some of that stuff is
18 certainly stuff that we can provide.

19 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
20 That concludes the questions.

21 And, we'll now move onto oral public
22 comment. I'll start with, we have 40 people who have
23 asked to speak. And, having said -- having seen 40 people
24 speak, I want everybody to be respectful that there's a

1 lot of people who would like to speak, so, to start, I'm
2 going to limit the time of people who speak. I'm going to
3 limit you to four minutes. And, if everybody takes four
4 minutes, we'll be here for two and a half hours. If
5 there's anybody aggrieved by that and wants to speak for
6 more than that, they can wait till the end and we'll hear
7 them at the end.

8 So, with that, and again, again to be
9 respectful of everybody's time, if somebody else's before
10 you has said really pretty much what you want to say, you
11 can just refer to that, you don't have to repeat the whole
12 thing. Again, we have -- everything here is being
13 transcribed, so, there's a public record of what was said.
14 So, again, to be respectful of people's time, you don't
15 need to repeat what's already been said.

16 And, again, if you have written
17 something to bring with you, you can give Mr. Patnaude a
18 copy of that at the end. And, also, perhaps say your
19 name, too, because I will inevitably get somebody's name
20 wrong.

21 So, I will start with Mr. Bill Scott
22 please.

23 MR. W. SCOTT: Good evening. And, thank
24 you. My name is Bill Scott. I'm the Chief Engineer from

1 Maine Drilling & Blasting. I'm here to support the Antrim
2 Wind Project. We believe our company's -- country's
3 economic and energy future is reliant upon us taking
4 advantage of our natural resources. In New Hampshire
5 there are wind resources, and we should be utilizing those
6 for the benefit of the people. We believe the Antrim Wind
7 Project as proposed is good for our country's energy
8 profile and the economy.

9 While our Company name says "Maine", we
10 have significant resources throughout the Northeast, with
11 our central operations facility located in Auburn, New
12 Hampshire. Our company employs between 300 and 450
13 people, depending on the season, with 70 to 100 of those
14 employees being based out of our New Hampshire location.
15 Five of the engineers in my department work in the Auburn,
16 New Hampshire office.

17 Wind energy projects have contributed
18 significantly to our company's performance during the down
19 economy, sometimes contributing up to 15 percent of our
20 revenues in the last five years. These types of
21 percentages allow us to help maintain a consistent and
22 stable workforce that contributes to the local economy.
23 In addition to the construction jobs that these projects
24 provide, they also leave behind permanent jobs supporting

1 the local economy.

2 At Maine Drilling & Blasting, we're
3 engaged early during the permitting process for these
4 projects and continue through construction. These
5 challenges projects provide quality jobs and development
6 opportunities for engineers, drillers, blasters, laborers,
7 and rock bolt installation specialists, as well as work
8 for rock bolt suppliers, grout suppliers, explosives
9 suppliers, and fuel suppliers in the local area.

10 Thank you very much for this time.

11 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
12 I'd now like to ask Mr. Joe Casey to speak please.

13 MR. CASEY: Thank you. My name is Joe
14 Casey. I'm a business development rep for the
15 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. And, I,
16 too, I also support this Project. And would like to just
17 speak a little bit on the opportunities in the
18 construction industry.

19 I was the former President of the New
20 Hampshire Building & Construction Trades Council, a
21 position I held for the last ten years. And, I think --
22 I'm a licensed electrician, and I believe that my comments
23 reflect the entire construction industry. The
24 construction industry has, as we all know, has suffered

1 dearly over the last five to six years. And, projects
2 like this help to bring forward work for the
3 construction -- people that work in the construction
4 industry, electricians, laborers, operators, all will
5 enjoy an opportunity to work on this job.

6 We have an Electrical Apprenticeship
7 Program located in Concord, New Hampshire. And, it's not
8 very far from here. And, we're able to offer
9 opportunities to young kids that want to get into the
10 electrical trade. And, it has been real trying,
11 everything that we do is based on the -- on the
12 construction market and the state of the market as we try
13 to put people to work. It's been very tough, as of late,
14 to give opportunities in the electrical industry to young
15 apprentices. And, we need projects like this. I'm not an
16 expert on wind mills, but I am an expert on putting people
17 to work and giving opportunities.

18 The IBEW has no vested interest in this
19 Project. You know, we only hope to have a contractor win
20 and be able to employ people on this Project. We were
21 able to do the one in Lempster, which we put about 20
22 electrical workers to work, ten apprentices and ten
23 journeymen. And, it's very trying for a construction
24 worker to put together a career in today's construction

1 market, over 30 or 40 years, or whatever that may be, when
2 you have to piece these small projects together to get a
3 career.

4 So, I just want you to not underestimate
5 the impact on the construction industry. Thank you.

6 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
7 Mr. Benjamin Pratt please, and he'll be followed by
8 Beverly Schaefer.

9 MR. PRATT: My name is Benjamin Pratt.
10 I'm a long-time resident of the Town of Antrim. Mr.
11 Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I wish to speak
12 in favor of the Antrim Wind Project. Specifically, I wish
13 to speak on behalf of my five great grandchildren, aged
14 five and younger. Long before they reach my age, they
15 will be attempting to deal with the effects of global
16 warming and climate change. They have done nothing to
17 create the problems now facing us, but they will get the
18 bill. Our generation has a basic obligation to leave this
19 world in the best shape possible for those that come after
20 us.

21 It has been calculated that, if we are
22 to keep the world's average temperature increase within
23 2 degrees Celsius, we will have to leave 80 percent of our
24 known fossil fuel reserves in the ground. As far as I

1 know, no one has been able to factually disprove that
2 conclusion.

3 The most important thing that we can do
4 now is to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels, and we
5 need to do it quickly. With the technology available to
6 us today, we will need to make more use of electricity
7 generated by solar, wind, and small-scale hydro. We will
8 need to develop better methods of storing that electricity
9 and more effective ways of using it efficiently.

10 The Antrim Wind Project is one small
11 step in the direction that we must go. I hope that your
12 Committee will approve this Project. Thank you.

13 *[Audience interruption.]*

14 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Beverly
15 Schaefer, please, and she will be followed by Gordon
16 Webber.

17 MS. SCHAEFER: Hi. I'll make this short
18 and sweet. I am Bev Schaefer. I live on Loveren Mills
19 Road, with my husband Jim. And, we've lived there since
20 the late 1970s.

21 The very first time we ever saw a wind
22 turbine was about twenty years ago on a business trip to
23 Texas. And, we thought they were awesome. We had a
24 chance to talk to a lot of people there and find out about

1 what they considered the benefits, we also heard some pros
2 and cons. Well, twenty years later, I'm proud to say, we
3 were happy to find out that there was a projected project
4 that's going to be just down the road from where we live,
5 and we do hope that it gets approved.

6 Most of the things that are coming to
7 the Town of Antrim came out on your displays. So, I don't
8 have to go into that. It is a small step, but it's in the
9 right direction.

10 And, the people at Eolian, we have to
11 congratulate them. They have been so outspoken. They
12 have been there, they have had numerous meetings, they
13 have answered questions. They have bent over backwards.
14 They have made changes and amendments, and I congratulate
15 you for that.

16 I do hope it's approved. It is a small
17 step. It's going to help the Town of Antrim. But, most
18 of all, it is going to help our children and our
19 grandchildren.

20 There are over 400 states right now that
21 are making use of wind power. Some of them are even
22 bragging that they could sell energy today for two to
23 three cents a kilowatt-hour. That's not going to happen
24 with our electricity here.

1 But it would be great, and it is a first
2 step. And, it's a clean energy. Thank you.

3 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Gordon Webber,
4 please, followed by Mary Welles. Gordon Weber.

5 CHAIRMAN WEBBER: Good evening. I am
6 the Chairman of the Antrim Board of Selectmen. The Antrim
7 Board of Selectmen have been in support of this Project
8 consistently and unanimously since its inception. We
9 continue to be in support of this Project. Thank you.

10 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
11 Mary Welles, followed by Michael Ott. Mary Welles,
12 please.

13 MS. WELLES: Hello. My name is Mary
14 Welles. I lived in Antrim for 20 years, and I work in
15 town for another eight years beyond that. I have strong
16 family ties here.

17 I've been following the Antrim Wind
18 Project since it started. I am a supporter of the Project
19 because I believe it will benefit the town, the people in
20 town, and the environment as a whole. I care about Antrim
21 and the future of Antrim a lot. I think the construction
22 of the wind farm will help make Antrim an even more
23 attractive place to live. I hope that my own two boys
24 will return to town someday to work the same farmland that

1 I did growing up.

2 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
3 Michael Ott, and he will be followed by Karen Weisswange.
4 I apologize if I got the name wrong.

5 MR. OTT: All right. Good evening. My
6 name is Michael Ott. I live at 354 Route 9. I'm one of
7 the property owners for the Project and I'm a big advocate
8 of wind.

9 I bought my property ten years ago next
10 month. I've hiked and camped all over it, before building
11 my house there in 2007, with the help of about six local
12 subcontractors. Scott, with Landsite, did a bunch of my
13 work, and then Gordon's brother Gary poured my floors.

14 Now, in the interest of full disclosure,
15 there is a financial gain to me for the Project, but that
16 has very little to do with why I support it.

17 Antrim is my home, and my house will be
18 the closest structure to any of the turbines. While
19 that's enough to allow me to make some comments, my
20 background with a career in energy gives me a slightly
21 different view as well. Years ago I worked as a nuclear
22 operator on Seabrook Station for about five years. Then,
23 I moved to the other side of the desk and I worked as a
24 financial -- for a financial consulting company for air

1 quality control systems on coal plants. I actually worked
2 as part of the financial review for the mercury scrubbers
3 at Merrimack Station in Bow. So, I know the idea with
4 emissions on coal.

5 Now I work for Siemens energy field
6 service, not the wind side, the field service side for
7 fossil generation, having spent five years with them as a
8 field engineer going from power plant to power plant.
9 I've been inside all kinds of their facilities, from the
10 largest and cleanest plants in the country, mostly
11 nuclear, to some of the dirtiest coal plants as well.
12 This past December I was shocked when I was working at the
13 largest single coal plant in the country, Zimmer Station,
14 in Ohio. There was an incident investigation I was
15 involved with there. It's a huge plant. It's a 1,300
16 megawatt single-unit coal plant, 45 times the size of the
17 proposed project here. It takes a lot of coal to produce
18 that much electricity, about a million pounds an hour.
19 So, in another form, if we filled this room with coal, it
20 would power that plant for about four hours. That's about
21 4 million tons of coal a year, and burning all that is 10
22 million tons of carbon dioxide, from one plant, in a
23 country that's run 67 percent by fossil fuels. It's not
24 sustainable.

1 When Jack Kenworthy called me in 2009
2 about what my feelings were for a project sited on Tuttle
3 Hill, I remember being pretty excited about it. I'm a big
4 fan of renewable energy. I've got solar on my roof, and
5 I'm hoping to put micro hydro in when that access road
6 goes in.

7 Jack, John, Drew, and Travis from the
8 Antrim Wind group, we call kind of became friends. When
9 the met tower went up six years ago, they were careful to
10 watch out for the trees that I had marked that protected
11 by campsite up on top of the hill. Those trees are all
12 still there, when they had to clear, they went way out of
13 their way to make sure those trees were protected.

14 It's a company that exists to make
15 money, sure. But it's obvious that they care about the
16 land, the people, and the Town.

17 Wind is a piece of the solution for
18 sure. Along with solar, fuel cells, and some of the other
19 emerging technologies that will hopefully save us from
20 this energy crisis we find ourselves in. All of these
21 turbines in operation don't use any fuel, don't produce
22 any emissions. We need 133 more projects like this to
23 offset the CO2 from that one plant I was talking about,
24 Zimmer. We have to start somewhere. And, it's not my

1 generation, my parents' generation, if I had kids, their
2 generation, it's their grandchildren and the generations
3 after that.

4 I do like fossil fuel, it keeps me
5 employed all the time. There's lots of incidents going on
6 that I get to investigate. But it's also going to be our
7 demise as well.

8 I personally think wind turbines are
9 quite a nice site, because, to me, they're a testament to
10 our progress as a species. I've visited plants in Europe
11 and the North Sea, I've been to plants in Washington and
12 Oregon, Michigan, recently Aruba. There's a nice wind
13 plant in Aruba, too. That's a good one to go visit.

14 I guess viewshed is very subjective, it
15 don't matter. What I believe is pretty might not be what
16 somebody else believes. But I guess my comment to that
17 is, look at the bigger picture. You know, you might not
18 like the turbines on the hill for the next couple of
19 years. But, if we don't do something, there won't really
20 be any forests on that hill for our great grandchildren
21 anyway.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Need you to
23 wrap up, Mr. Ott.

24 MR. OTT: Okay. In the whole scheme of

1 things, this is a small project. It's a drop in a huge
2 bucket and that bucket keeps getting bigger. But every
3 drop counts, and we can do our part right here, with a
4 project that's well-sited, efficient, clean, and
5 beneficial. Antrim Wind will be the largest taxpayer with
6 zero cost. No students in the schools, no fire, no
7 police, no EMS. And, once in operation, no added wear and
8 tear on the roads, other than maybe some ecotourists.

9 It's clear to me that this is a good
10 project. I love this town just as much as the opposition
11 do, and Tuttle Hill isn't just something that I look at,
12 it's the actual stone that my home is built on. This
13 project personifies the highest and best use of my land,
14 and I sincerely hope the Committee approves the
15 certificate. Thank you.

16 *[Audience interruption.]*

17 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
18 And, I'm going to get this name wrong again, Karen
19 Weisswange. Am I anywhere near close? I apologize.

20 MS. WEISSWANGE: That's close enough.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Followed by
22 Albert.

23 MS. WEISSWANGE: I just wanted to say
24 that I wrote a letter to the SEC, and I mailed it e-mail,

1 but, unfortunately, my attachment couldn't be opened. So,
2 I'd like to read the letter that I wrote. It was to
3 Administrator Monroe:

4 I would like to say that I am distressed
5 by your decision to deny my petition to intervene as it is
6 very clear that most all of the accepted intervenors are
7 anti-wind project. Is that fair?

8 I have been with this project since the
9 beginning. I have tried to learn all that I could about
10 wind energy. You must know, as well I do, that climate
11 change is real. We can no longer depend on fossil fuels
12 to supply our energy needs.

13 I attended all SEC meetings in Concord
14 and Antrim for this project the first time around. I
15 truly feel that the State's counsel was biased and not
16 neutral with his opinion.

17 Health issues, such as result of fossil
18 fuel use, certainly outweigh the aesthetics view that some
19 hold to be so sacred.

20 I would expect to see an unbiased and
21 fair decision by the SEC taking into consideration the
22 points I have listed above.

23 The advantage to the state would be a
24 contribution the project would make to cleaner air,

1 meeting the state's requirements for 24.8 percent of
2 electricity from renewable resources by 2025.

3 Last, but not least, Antrim Wind would
4 be our largest taxpayer. They have offered to support
5 local scholarships, spruce of Gregg Lake, and conserve
6 almost a thousand acres of forest lands. I can't imagine
7 any other business willing to do as much for a town.
8 Sincerely.

9 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
10 Albert Weisswange. And, he'll be followed by Joe Downing.

11 MR. WEISSWANGE: Al Weisswange, Old
12 Hancock Road, in Antrim. And, I'm in favor of this
13 project, because the benefits of wind power are too great
14 to ignore. Wind energy does not pollute the air like
15 power plants that rely on combustion of fossil fuels, such
16 as coal or natural gas. Wind turbines don't produce
17 atmospheric emissions that cause acid rain and greenhouse
18 gases. Their fuel is the wind, which is endless and free.
19 They do not use water, which, in conventional power
20 plants, is used to make steam to power their turbines.

21 And, as far as bird mortality is
22 concerned, studies show that among bird deaths associated
23 with coal, oil, and natural gas, wind energy may be the
24 least harmful to birds. According to the National Audubon

1 Society, the biggest threat to birds today, including the
2 bald eagle, is global warming.

3 And, as far as aesthetics are concerned,
4 I have no problem with the sight of wind turbines.
5 Actually, they remind me that we're trying to do what we
6 can to preserve our climate and our way of life.

7 If Antrim Wind is allowed to proceed,
8 the town would benefit by the creation of jobs. The PILOT
9 payment of 8.4 million in tax revenue, \$40,000 to enhance
10 and upgrade the facilities at Gregg Lake, and \$5,000 per
11 year into the town scholarship fund. Thank you.

12 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
13 Mr. Joe Downing, please. He'll be followed by Stuart
14 Gross.

15 MR. DOWNING: Good evening, ladies and
16 gentlemen. My name is Joe Downing. I'm here representing
17 E.J. Prescott, in New Hampshire. We are a small
18 contractor. We've been established since 1970. We
19 strongly support this project, along with other wind
20 projects. If it wasn't for projects like this, we would
21 not have our existence, and we would not be able to
22 provide stable employment for the employees that we
23 employee.

24 So, again, we would encourage that you

1 accept and approve this project. Thank you.

2 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.

3 Mr. Stuart Gross, followed by Richard Corazzini, please.

4 MR. GROSS: Stuart Gross, --

5 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.

6 MR. GROSS: -- 250 Pleasant Street. I
7 supported the original project, I support the revision of
8 the project, and may it proceed. Thank you.

9 *[Audience interruption.]*

10 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Richard
11 Corazzini, please. I probably got the name wrong.

12 *[Inaudible comment.]*

13 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Yes.

14 FROM THE FLOOR: He left.

15 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. Peter
16 Moore, please. He'll be followed by John Martin.

17 MR. MOORE: Chairman Scott and members
18 of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee, as an
19 engaged community member serving the Town of Antrim for
20 over 30 years in many capacities, and a former Land Use
21 Planner for the Town of Antrim during Antrim Wind Energy's
22 previous application, I have a great deal of interest in
23 the ongoing proceedings of this subsequent application
24 submitted by them, and currently before you. I am also

1 the author of a series of articles that I have written
2 over the years for the town's journal, The Limrik,
3 entitled "These Antrim Hills". I believe that I have, and
4 can offer, a unique perspective of the actual location
5 proposed by Antrim Wind Energy for the erection of their
6 industrial-sized towers and wind turbines.

7 It is clear from my experience that
8 opposing arguments have been primarily about the impact of
9 the site or view of the proposed towers across the breadth
10 of Tuttle and Willard range, and about the potential sound
11 that the nine wind turbines could create. All parties
12 understandably refer to their special interest, and how it
13 will affect them personally. Those opposed to the
14 facility cite the potential devastate -- devaluation of
15 their property values, scenic degradation of their
16 viewscape, and impending sound, light and shadow flicker
17 pollution. While those in favor promote the opportunity
18 to create a renewable, intermittent energy source, and an
19 industrial facility supporting substantial tax incentives
20 to the town, and possible future employment, among other
21 yet-to-be-determined promises. Little, if any, attention
22 seems to have been focused on the actual site of the nine
23 proposed towers, or the substantial terrain alteration
24 that will be required to host it atop the Tuttle-Willard

1 Mountain range. I, for one, want to speak for the land
2 and the habitat that it supports up there, and the effects
3 they will suffer should this industrial-scale development
4 take place.

5 Many claims and representations have
6 been made by the applicant as the process has evolved, as
7 to a way to support their effort, and to convince the SEC
8 and the people of Antrim that Tuttle-Willard is an
9 appropriate site.

10 Often, the Lempster, New Hampshire wind
11 farm operated by Iberdrola has been referred to and
12 compared with the proposed Antrim Wind Energy Project by
13 proponents of the plan. However, I urge the SEC not to
14 generalize this comparison, or to consider it as valid,
15 certainly not in this case. The Tuttle-Willard Mountain
16 range is very different than Lempster Mountain; in its
17 geological make-up, and ecosystem -- the ecosystem upon
18 and around the range with the unique habitat that it
19 supports, and particularly its very challenging
20 construction access and narrow ridge-summit development.

21 Of course, claims have been made by
22 proponents of this project that industrial-scale renewable
23 wind facilities have to be placed in someone's backyard. But
24 the fragile rocky ridges and talus slope that make up the

1 heights and geology of Tuttle-Willard are a precious and
2 irreplaceable -- are of a precious and irresistible
3 nature. It is these two related district habitats --
4 distinct habitats, of which few exist in New Hampshire,
5 that have been identified and sought for protection in the
6 profile of the New Hampshire Wildlife Action Plan.
7 Development of the Antrim Wind Project, should it go
8 forward, will completely compromise and degrade this
9 important area and the wildlife species it supports. And,
10 despite claims that in 20 to 50 years everything will
11 return to normal, this premise and its promise cannot be
12 honestly substantiated. And, this is not just someone's
13 backyard; its undeveloped value and its view belong to all
14 of us.

15 From the vast amount of information
16 submitted by Antrim Wind in its first ill-fated attempt to
17 get approval for this development, and this present
18 effort, it is implied that the Tuttle-Willard range would
19 be a good site for their 500 foot towers and wind
20 turbines, ideal perhaps in its proximity to high voltage
21 power lines and a pretty fair nighttime wind source, but
22 that is where the idealism ends. It cannot be denied or
23 overlooked by the SEC that the substantial alteration of
24 terrain and devastation of this rocky-ridge/talus slope

1 will be required to build access roads to the summits,
2 create link roads between tower sites, level acre-sized
3 areas for on-site construction -- concrete production
4 facilities, and immense leveling and blasting to create
5 40-foot deep foundation cavities required to hold these
6 towers and turbines aloft.

7 I have spent a good deal of time on and
8 around the Tuttle-Willard Mountain range over the past 30
9 years as many of you may have, and I have witnessed with
10 distress over the last several years the survey stakes and
11 pre-approval clearing -- clear-cutting that has taken
12 place up there. And, I am very concerned also that many
13 of you on the SEC, if any at all, have not actually been
14 on the range to see for yourselves firsthand the unique
15 geology, the delicate and beautiful ecology that exists
16 there, and have imagined what would result there should
17 you approve this project. This is not a good or
18 appropriate site for the limited short-term gain that
19 destruction of this ridge will permit.

20 In closing, I want to advise and remind
21 everybody in this room tonight that the SEC's own Mission
22 Statement, as set forth in RSA 162-H, sets threshold
23 limits for determining the type and magnitude of proposals
24 put before it. In this charge, it is clearly set out that

1 it is "essential to maintain a balance between the
2 environment and the possible need for new energy
3 facilities". The directive goes further, and more
4 specifically sets the guidelines for appropriately sited
5 projects to have the characteristics, among other
6 considerations, that are compatible with local land use
7 plans and regulations; that avoid or minimize degradation
8 of the quality of life for the local residents; that avoid
9 or minimize disturbance of populations of --

10 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Need you to
11 wrap up, Mr. Moore.

12 MR. MOORE: -- or habitat for rare plant
13 and animal species; that avoid areas that create a high
14 risk to birds and bats; that avoid or minimize disturbance
15 of uncommon or high-quality wildlife habitat; that avoid
16 or minimize fragmentation of large blocks of natural
17 habitat; that avoid or minimize disturbance of steep or
18 fragile soils; that avoid or minimize disturbance of areas
19 of high recreational use, especially those that is focused
20 on the natural environment; and, finally, that avoid or
21 minimize degradation of scenic views, especially from
22 areas of recognized high scenic value that depend on the
23 undeveloped natural environment for their appeal.

24 I trust that the members of the SEC,

1 whether they have been to the heights of the Tuttle ridge
2 or not, or only heard and read testimony and evidence
3 presented by the applicant and intervenors that their
4 review and consideration of the Antrim Wind project, will
5 agree that this ridge is not an appropriate place to site
6 this project. There are good places and lands on which to
7 generate wind energy with large industrial wind turbines
8 and other alternative methods of renewable energy, and
9 there are places that will be irreparably devastated by
10 these facilities.

11 Tuttle-Willard is an inappropriate
12 location for this project. As a friend of mine commented
13 on the previous denial of Antrim Wind Energy's
14 application --

15 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Moore, how
16 much more do you have? I invite you to submit that into
17 the record.

18 MR. MOORE: Okay. I just, last -- the
19 last point, it's not that wind energy is itself a bad
20 idea, it's just too bad that they chose the Rural
21 Conservation Zone and the Tuttle-Willard Mountain range to
22 plan their industrial development.

23 Thank you for your time and
24 consideration.

1 *[Audience interruption.]*

2 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And, again,
3 you can submit those in writing into the record, if you
4 want.

5 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

6 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. We're
7 going to take a five-minute break for Mr. Patnaude's
8 fingers. We're off the record.

9 *(Recess taken at 7:59 p.m. and the*
10 *hearing resumed at 8:02 p.m.)*

11 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: All right.
12 We're going to proceed now, or resume. Again, the next
13 speaker will be Mr. John Martin, followed by Fred Ward.
14 Mr. Martin.

15 MR. MARTIN: Hi. I'm John Martin. I
16 live at 17 Stacy Hill Road, in Antrim. I've been there
17 for about two and a half years. I'm a relative newcomer
18 to the town. I want to speak in favor of the Project.
19 I've seen a few small wind tower projects in Rhode Island,
20 where I moved from. And, my impression of them is that
21 they're aesthetically pleasing. I especially like to see
22 wind towers rising up out of a green forest. My property
23 is right across the river across Route 9, from where
24 Tuttle Mountain is. And, I truly hope that I'll be able

1 to see the wind farm from my home.

2 I think that the 900 acres of
3 conservation land added is going to be a great benefit to
4 the wildlife in the area. Once construction's complete,
5 you know, there's going to be no impact on the animals in
6 the area from the wind towers.

7 So, I am really in favor of it. And, it
8 helps the town with the tax base. It helps create jobs.
9 It helps reduce fossil fuel emissions. It's a
10 win/win/win/win situation in my mind.

11 So, that's all I've got to say. Thank
12 you.

13 *[Audience interruption.]*

14 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
15 Mr. Fred Ward, followed by Aaron Flewelling. And, again,
16 please keep your comments under four minutes.

17 DR. WARD: I do it in two and a half all
18 the time. My name is Fred Ward. I live across the county
19 line, in Stoddard. And, my wife and I are probably
20 amongst the top house in Stoddard in conservation. It's
21 very efficient, heavily insulated, passive solar. We have
22 high-mileage cars. We contribute to the Harris Center and
23 all the other things in getting conservation land,
24 including the big chunk in Robb Reservoir. So, I'm a

1 conservationist. I've been a conservationist for 60
2 years, since I was just that little, of course.

3 I'm a meteorologist. And, I'm looking
4 at this thing as a meteorologist would look at it.
5 There's just a couple of little things that are important
6 here.

7 Number one, windmills are about a third
8 efficient. That means, if you have a 3-megawatt windmill,
9 like Jack has, it's going to average 1 megawatt, but it's
10 going to put out between zero and 3 megawatts. Now, the
11 problem is that, if you want to generate 10 percent of
12 your energy by wind, or 20, whatever the number is, then
13 your potential, if it's 10 percent, of generating between
14 zero and 30 percent, or, if it's 20, on average, it's
15 between zero and 60 percent.

16 So, the meteorological question is
17 simple: If you put enough windmills up, and they put a
18 lot of them up, hundreds of them up, will they tend to
19 turn on at the same time? Because, if they do, then
20 you're going to get big surges. It didn't take very much,
21 when I looked at the wind data around, the answer to the
22 question is "yes". If one's on, almost all the others are
23 going to be on. And, if one's off, almost all the others
24 are going to be off.

1 So, while it's nice to say I'd like 10
2 or 20 percent, the ISO-New England, the grid can't take
3 between zero and 30 or 60 percent. It just can't happen.
4 It's nice, it would be clean. I would love to see nice
5 clean energy. But there isn't any way you can get it out
6 of something that's only a third efficient, give or take a
7 little bit, and would be synchronized all over the state.
8 In other words, if you put enough of them up all over the
9 state, to make a real dent in fossil fuels, which I would
10 like to do, then you've got to put up with surges that
11 will blow the grid a couple of times every week. Thank
12 you.

13 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
14 Again, Aaron Flewelling, followed by Jason Riley.

15 MR. FLEWELLING: My name is Aaron
16 Flewelling. I'm in favor of the Antrim Wind Project. I
17 work for a local contractor. We perform a lot of work on
18 the wind energy projects, and would like to see that
19 continue, not only for the economic benefit, but more so
20 for the clean energy benefit to the state.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
22 Jason Riley, followed by Charles Levesque.

23 MR. RILEY: Hi. My name is Jason Riley.
24 I'm a manager from Maine Drilling & Blasting. I'm a New

1 Hampshire resident for well over 40 years.

2 This is a great opportunity for your
3 town, for contractors alike, as you've heard, and
4 certainly hope that you vote to push this forward. Thank
5 you.

6 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Levesque,
7 followed by Tim Perry.

8 MR. LEVESQUE: Thank you, members of the
9 SEC Subcommittee. Thank you for coming to town and
10 spending, I know, the day here. It's been a long day for
11 you. Appreciate the opportunity to speak to you here.
12 I'm a near 20-year resident of Antrim. I live on Old
13 Pound Road, which -- and our home is about 1.7 miles from
14 the ridge where the proposed project is to be placed. I'm
15 a forester by profession and owner of a natural resource
16 consulting firm that also does a tremendous amount of work
17 in renewable energy, including wind, solar, and biomass.

18 I was involved in the first docket on
19 the Antrim Wind Project, as an intervenor representing the
20 Antrim Planning Board. We have an elected Planning Board
21 here. I was an elected member of the Planning Board. I'm
22 no longer on the Planning Board. Previous to that, I was
23 the Chair of the Open Space Committee in town. And, there
24 is an Open Space Plan that's part of their Master Plan.

1 And, you'll see probably more of that during the
2 adjudicatory process.

3 I wanted to cover two topics that are
4 not going to get covered during that process. And,
5 hopefully, I'll be fairly brief here.

6 First thing is the issue of the
7 relationship of the proposed project and this company with
8 our Board of Selectmen. I think it's fine that boards of
9 selectmen take the time to support or oppose projects in
10 their communities. In fact, it's probably their right and
11 responsibility to do so. But it's also the responsibility
12 of the selectmen to represent the interests of the
13 taxpayers and residents of the community. And,
14 unfortunately, for some reason, our Board of Selectmen has
15 done the former, but not the latter. They haven't
16 represented all the interests of the residents and
17 taxpayers in this town on this project. Hopefully, you
18 will do that, hopefully, Mary will play some role in that,
19 in this second docket on the project.

20 And, in that light, I wanted to make
21 sure and get into the record something that you may not
22 know. And, that is, during the first docket on the
23 project, there was a court suit against the selectmen, I
24 was part of that suit, and the selectmen were found guilty

1 of violating the Right-to-Know law, because they had a
2 series of secret meetings, illegal meetings with Antrim
3 Wind, as they negotiated the contract, and also the PILOT
4 for the project.

5 I have the court order that came out of
6 that. I'll give it to Pam for the record, so that you
7 have it. It's probably not something that will come out
8 in the process. But you need to know what happened during
9 that first one, but it certainly affects what you should
10 be deciding in the second one.

11 The second point has to do with the
12 financing of the project. You have a responsibility under
13 the statute to be looking at the financial side of this
14 project. And, you may know, but some of the members of
15 the Subcommittee may not know, that quite a while back the
16 Selectmen signed a PILOT agreement, a Payment in Lieu of
17 Taxes agreement, with Antrim Wind for this project. And,
18 unfortunately, in the process of doing so, have given away
19 millions of dollars of tax revenue to this town. And,
20 it's nice that, if the project is built, we'll get some
21 tax revenue. But, unfortunately, we're going to be short
22 millions of dollars that we would have received if the
23 project is built had we not had a PILOT.

24 Now, clearly, it's within the rights of

1 the Selectmen to sign that PILOT. But I'd have to say
2 it's really not in the best interest of the community, the
3 taxpayers, the residents of the town, to give up millions
4 of dollars of tax revenue for a project such as this.

5 I know a number of selectmen who were
6 part of towns elsewhere in this region where wind projects
7 have been built, and every one of them I have asked about
8 PILOT agreements, they simply said to me "why would they
9 do such a thing?" There is no reason to do such a thing.
10 These projects can be profitable and pay their fair share
11 in their communities. And, unfortunately, our Selectmen
12 have given away millions of dollars that I know folks in
13 this room, who are residents, are going to have to pay.

14 So, as part of your financial analysis,
15 and it won't come out on the adjudicatory part of this
16 process, you need to consider the fact that part of the
17 financing for this project is going to be on the backs of
18 the taxpayers in Antrim because of this PILOT Agreement.
19 So, it may be considered outside of your jurisdiction to
20 be looking at that PILOT, but I would encourage you to, in
21 fact, look at the PILOT Agreement. We'll certainly
22 provide it as part of testimony that we'll have in the
23 process. But I'd consider that part of the financial part
24 of the project, because I'm sure Antrim Wind is not going

1 to include that in what they described as their financial
2 package for the project.

3 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: You're at four
4 and a half minutes.

5 MR. LEVESQUE: I'm done. Those are the
6 two points I wanted to make that you probably won't hear
7 in the later process.

8 And, again, I wanted to thank you for
9 spending the better part of your day and evening here, and
10 we appreciate it. Thank you.

11 *[Audience interruption.]*

12 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
13 Now, we'll go to Tim Perry. And, he will be followed by
14 Margaret Warner. Tim Perry, please.

15 MR. PERRY: In this room right now, when
16 nobody is talking, is about 39 decibels, just for a
17 comparison of what we're talking about for potential sound
18 being generated by this facility. I love public speaking,
19 so forgive me for rambling.

20 Most everyone wants clean, reliable,
21 affordable power, unless it's going to have an impact on
22 their backyard. Then, all of a sudden we're back to the
23 old-fashioned "Not in my backyard". This is a fantastic
24 project. It's got a phenomenal site. It's a temporary

1 use of 50 some odd acres, for a permanent conservation of
2 908 acres. I'm a passionate outdoors person. I
3 absolutely love hiking and kayaking in this region.
4 Pillsbury State Park, Gregg Lake, Willard Pond are three
5 of my favorite places to kayak. I bring friends and
6 family there whenever they come to the region to visit.

7 I was paddling across Pillsbury Park
8 last summer. Got all the way to the far side, turned
9 around and come back to the boat launch, and realized that
10 the whole time the Lempster facility had been right behind
11 me. I will continue to do the same thing on Gregg Lake
12 and Willard Pond with these towers up there. They're not
13 going to have any kind of a negative impact on the
14 aesthetics, and they will have a significant positive
15 impact on the environment by displacing the carbon that
16 would have to be produced.

17 Yes. Wind is an impulse power, so is
18 natural gas. That's why we have the electric prices we
19 have in New Hampshire now, is because we have the baseline
20 of nuclear and coal, and then we have the gas plants that
21 have to pick up the slack whenever we have greater demand
22 that can't be fulfilled by the baseline. But those plants
23 will be able to remain idle whenever the wind is blowing
24 and these turbines are producing.

1 Lempster is actually a really good
2 comparison to make to this project. Most of the arguments
3 you've heard here were made there. None of them have been
4 substantiated since that facility has been built. There
5 is one significant difference, in that you're talking
6 about a wooded ridgeline and valley here, whereas they've
7 got more of a rounded space.

8 I've actually been to the house of the
9 resident who abuts closest to the turbines, but who is not
10 part of the financial agreement up there. And, I had a
11 chance to ask him "what's it like?" Warm summer day,
12 windows in his house open, less than half a mile away is
13 the first turbine, he can hear them, if it's a warm
14 summer's day and his windows are open. It does not ruin
15 his life. He has not had any epileptic seizures from
16 shadow flicker. Sorry.

17 So, Antrim Wind has aggressively
18 addressed every concern that the opposition has brought
19 up. I have never seen a company put as much effort into
20 mitigating the impacts that a facility is going to have.
21 This is a fantastic project.

22 I am actually ashamed that an
23 organization that I used to support, the Audubon Society
24 of New Hampshire, was opposed to this initially. This

1 will be considerable benefit to their existing
2 conservation land, to the health of that land, and to the
3 future expansion of that contiguous conservation property.

4 The needs of the few are always
5 outweighed by the needs of the many. This, from the
6 beginning, has been the perfect example of "Think
7 globally, act locally." Please do so.

8 *[Audience interruption.]*

9 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
10 Margaret Warner. She will be followed by Frances Von
11 Mertens. Margaret Warner, please.

12 MS. WARNER: I'm Margaret Warner. I
13 live on Clinton Road. I wish I had a better view of the
14 mountain, because I happen to -- on a personal note, I
15 really like looking at wind towers. I've been on wind
16 farms in Canada and love them, and had no noise problem.

17 But my real big concern is I grew up in
18 Antrim. I retired back to Antrim. I was brought up on
19 the principle of sustainable, renewable energy, and doing,
20 you know, working with the environment. And, I could rest
21 my case on what Ben Pratt and many others have said.

22 I think that we need to take this chance
23 to do clean power sources. It's the environmentally
24 responsible thing to do. And, I really support this

1 project. Thank you.

2 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
3 Next would be, again, Frances Von Mertens. She will be
4 followed by Wes Enman, please.

5 MS. VON MERTENS: Good evening. Thank
6 you. Francie Von Mertens. I'm from Peterborough, a
7 couple towns to the south. I'm involved with New
8 Hampshire Audubon and the Willard Pond Wildlife Sanctuary
9 that I think you visited today, the dePierrefeu, hard to
10 pronounce, but Willard Pond Wildlife Sanctuary.

11 I was involved as a witness for New
12 Hampshire Audubon in the first SEC Antrim Wind 1. But I'm
13 speaking for me, not for Audubon right now. The
14 proceedings were thorough, they involved many days,
15 actually, many weeks. And, I got to know the other
16 intervenors who were in opposition to the project, as was
17 New Hampshire Audubon. And, often our opposition is
18 portrayed as being NIMBY, "Not in my Backyard", or perhaps
19 we're not as concerned about global climate change caused
20 by the extraction and burning of fossil fuels, that's the
21 other assumption. To the contrary, I know Ben Pratt. He
22 has great grandchildren. I have grandchildren. And, I
23 sometimes can't get through the day without being
24 concerned about man-made climate disruption.

1 We don't believe that the solution is
2 industrial development of our wildlands. We're
3 conservationists of land and natural resources. We're
4 active members of land trusts. We've served on many town
5 committees, land use planning, master plans, steering
6 committees. We're conservationists of electrical energy
7 also, all forms of energy. And, we advocate for policy
8 changes that back energy conservation. A few weeks ago,
9 on NPR, the radio, there was coverage of a -- the
10 California Energy Commission set new energy efficiency
11 standards for household and commercial lighting, and they
12 will be -- they will come into effect in two years from
13 January. Commissioner Andrew McAllister, of the
14 California Energy Commission, said that this change,
15 mostly to LED lighting, will save 3,000 gigawatt-hours of
16 energy a year, enough to power 400,000 homes, equal to all
17 the households in Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties
18 combined. I'm, obviously, a little nervous here.

19 So, energy conservation, as opposed to
20 industrial development of our wild ridgelines. And, the
21 request has been made that the met tower and the other
22 wind sensor apparatus up there, that we know what the wind
23 resource is up there, and we're told it's proprietary.
24 But, if you look at the map of wind resource

1 continent-wide, our area does not light up on the color
2 codes. It's all very color-coded. And, I think you
3 probably looked at that map. So, that brings the
4 question: What is the wind source? What is the actual
5 net electrical energy that's going to be fed into the
6 grid? What is the actual fossil fuel that's not going to
7 be burned by a power plant?

8 As for NIMBY, Not in my Backyard, we
9 opponents, we know what's in our wild ridgeline backyards.
10 It's one of the few places where industrial development
11 does not go. We're from New Hampshire, we're known for
12 our environmental ethic and history of land conservation.
13 In your tour today, and certainly as the application
14 process unfolds, you'll see maps of impressive land and
15 natural resource conservation in the immediate area -- area
16 and the region. So, we say "yes" in our backyard. "Yes"
17 to wildlands, "yes" to wildlife habitat, and "yes" to
18 intact forests.

19 Most of us have worked hard to designate
20 areas appropriate for development and areas appropriate
21 for natural resource protection.

22 We respectfully question the true public
23 benefit of a utility-scale wind development along the
24 Tuttle Hill to Willard Mountain ridgeline. And, we

1 question how much fossil fuel combustion it actually will
2 replace. And, I await the more formal and technical
3 Committee proceedings to determine that, hopefully, with
4 your help. Thank you.

5 *[Audience interruption.]*

6 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Wes Enman,
7 followed by Graham Enman. Wes Enman, please.

8 MR. W. ENMAN: I'll keep this very
9 short. The first thing I wanted to do is thank the Board
10 today for coming and spending some time in the northeast
11 Monadnock Region. Appreciate your time.

12 To keep it very short, Mike Ott has a
13 lot more experience, *etcetera*, and I will let his words
14 create what -- what he said was amazing. I believe this
15 is the right project, at the right time, in the right
16 place. And, I look forward to seeing you guys later in
17 the season. Thank you. And, I support the project.

18 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Graham Enman,
19 followed by Kevin Onnela.

20 MR. G. ENMAN: Graham Enman, 16 Pierce
21 Lake Road, Antrim. I'm here in support of the project.
22 And, I would love to see it come to town. Thank you for
23 your time.

24 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Onnela,

1 followed by Adam Lyons.

2 MR. ONNELA: Good evening. I'm from
3 Lempster, New Hampshire. I'm a conservationist. I bought
4 2,500 acres, and everybody is welcome to use it. On our
5 property, we have a wind farm. My wife came by Tower 7
6 tonight, two deer were there. We never saw any deer up
7 there. I shouldn't tell you this, but the state's kind of
8 messing this up a little, there's two bobcat that live up
9 there also. We see them logging.

10 But I didn't come here to tell you that.
11 We quite often do field trips for schools and elderly
12 people. And, when we go out there, they talk about "Well,
13 what about the birds?" "How many birds do you kill?"
14 I'll reach into my pocket, and I always put ten \$100 bills
15 in there when people are there to do a field trip. And, I
16 take them out and I said "You got all day to find me a
17 bird, don't leave the property, and that \$1,000 is yours",
18 because we don't kill birds.

19 I live 506 feet from Tower 12. The
20 noise inside the house, unless you open the windows, you
21 can't hear it. Motorcycles on Route 10, a mile away, you
22 can hear those, but not the turbines.

23 So, I'd like to -- I'd like to tell you
24 some of the things that the wind farm that's on my

1 property has done for our town. We've got a new few
2 toys -- a few new toys up there. We use to have an old
3 backhoe, two-wheel drive; we now have two. We got a new
4 wood chipper. We got a new grader. We had two
5 six-wheelers, one two-wheel drive, one four-wheel drive;
6 now we got two four-wheel drives and two ten-wheelers to
7 go with it. We now have two pickups for the Highway
8 Department. We now have a vibratory roll. We have --
9 actually have a little less roads, as we gave up some
10 roads, but we've gone from two employees to four
11 employees.

12 This is what the wind farm has done for
13 that town, they pay a lot of taxes. We now have a new
14 firehouse that looks like Sunapee's. They have a great
15 tax base, they have the lake. We have two new four-wheel
16 drive crew cab pickups for the fire department. We have a
17 second rescue pumper truck that is brand-new. All this,
18 and our taxes, what we actually pay, fluctuate only
19 pennies every year.

20 *[Audience interruption.]*

21 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Adam Lyons,
22 followed by Russell Stephens. Adam Lyons, please.

23 MR. LYONS: Hi. My name is Adam Lyons.
24 I work for Maine Drilling & Blasting in New Hampshire.

1 I'm also a New Hampshire resident. And, I'm here tonight
2 to support the Antrim Wind Energy Project. I think that
3 it would be a very good addition to not only our power
4 grid, but to the Town of Antrim.

5 I am very impressed with the nature that
6 the project was approached with. I feel like we went
7 above and beyond what was necessary to provide the public
8 and the environment with what it needed, not just for the
9 short term, but the long term. And, I think that this
10 could be a model for other wind projects in the state.

11 Thank you.

12 *[Audience interruption.]*

13 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.

14 Russell Stephens, followed by Lorraine Carey Block.

15 Russell Stephens, please.

16 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you. Good evening.
17 My name is Russell Stephens. I reside at 22 Sachem Cove
18 Road, in Meredith. I'm the co-founder of nextGen Telecom
19 Services Group, where I serve as the President and CEO.
20 NextGen Telecom was incorporated in New Hampshire in 2004
21 and is based in Rochester. We construct, maintain, and
22 restore fiber optic networks. We currently employ 50
23 people. Our headcount has been as high as 100 during peak
24 activity periods.

1 I stand here tonight to speak in support
2 of the Antrim Wind Energy Project as it relates to the
3 potential economic benefit it would afford my company,
4 and, more importantly, our employees.

5 We have worked on several wind farm
6 projects over the past several years, and have the
7 expertise and capacity to perform the fiber optic
8 placements, splicing and testing component of the project
9 should it move forward.

10 Thank you for your consideration.

11 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
12 Lorraine Carey Block, followed by Richard Block.

13 MS. CAREY BLOCK: Good evening. I'm
14 Lorraine Carey Block. I live on Loveren Mill Road -- thank
15 you very much. I've lived there for 28 years. And, I
16 would be directly affected by the project.

17 Nearly eight years ago I attended my
18 first hearing before Antrim ZBA about AWE's proposed
19 industrial wind project. At that hearing, I addressed my
20 concerns about the potential impact of the project, based
21 on the scale of massive turbines on a relatively low
22 rising hill. Today, that is still my primary concern.

23 While I'm not opposed to wind energy
24 development, I feel the siting of industrial projects

1 needs to carefully balance with the aesthetic nature of
2 the area. Placing nearly 500-foot turbines on a hill that
3 rises only 550 to 650 feet from the valley floor is
4 grossly out-of-scale and just totally inappropriate for
5 the region. It is not the elevation of the site above sea
6 level that is relevant, but rather the elevation rise or
7 the difference between the base of the hill and the summit
8 compared to the height of the turbines that is of
9 paramount importance.

10 Tuttle is a central focus hill that can
11 be seen from all corners of our community. It dominates
12 the Rural Conservation District zoning region that was
13 created 27 years ago to protect, conserve, and preserve
14 the remote mountainous portions of Antrim from excessive
15 development pressures. This zoning prohibits all types of
16 industrial development. While I certainly have many
17 concerns about noise, shadow flicker, flashing red lights,
18 and the loss of value to our property, it is the potential
19 industrialization of our Rural Conservation District that
20 I find most disturbing.

21 When we first moved to Antrim 28 years
22 ago, we purchased just five acres, but have been able to
23 add on an additional 237 previously subdivided acres. We
24 did this solely to protect the area from development. We

1 knew that the North Branch region of Antrim, as part of
2 the largest contiguously forested area outside of the
3 White Mountain National Forest, was a special area that
4 should remain undeveloped.

5 Over the years, my husband and I have
6 both served on the North Branch Rive Advisory Committee.
7 We successfully worked to extend the RCD zoning north of
8 Route 9. We were named "informal land stewards" for the
9 Nature Conservancy's Loveren Mill Cedar Swamp Preserve and
10 the additional Meadowsend Timberlands property by the
11 Forest Society. Additionally, I served on Antrim's Open
12 Space Committee. Throughout all this, we've learned that
13 our instincts were right; that the northwest corner of
14 Antrim is indeed a special place. It is a small wild
15 region part of the Quabbin-to-Cardigan Corridor and the
16 Monadnock Supersanctuary. Despite the claims to the
17 contrary, this industrial project would undeniably
18 permanently destroy the Tuttle-Willard Ridge in a way that
19 could never be restored. Thank you.

20 *[Audience interruption.]*

21 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Richard Block,
22 followed by Annie Law. Richard Block, please.

23 MR. BLOCK: Members of the Committee,
24 thank you for this opportunity. My name is Richard Block

1 and I have lived on Loveren Mill Road on the north side of
2 Route 9 for almost three decades. We own 242 acres of
3 south-facing land, all of which, as well as most of the
4 rooms in our house, have a commanding view of Tuttle Hill.
5 It was this view which was the deciding factor for us when
6 we bought our house. In my 67 years, I have traveled
7 extensively throughout North America, visiting every state
8 except Hawaii. I have seen some of the world's most
9 spectacular scenery and visited people who live in
10 pristine valleys, high mountaintops, undeveloped
11 seashores, and vast prairies. There are many places we
12 could have chosen to live, but we decided to settle here
13 in Antrim because this is a special place.

14 A number of towns in the region have
15 long recognized the value of open space for improving the
16 quality of life for their residents, but only Antrim
17 actually wrote it into our zoning ordinance as our Rural
18 Conservation District, where industrial development of any
19 sort was prohibited. Antrim's Master Plan and Open Space
20 Committee confirmed and reinforced that concept. This
21 played a large part in our desire to reside here.

22 I'm a Professor of Graphic
23 Communications and Visual Studies, and I've worked in the
24 advertising field for almost 50 years. When I worked in

1 the newspaper business and supervised a staff of
2 advertising salespersons, one of the most difficult
3 concepts I had to teach them, and the clients they served,
4 was that, in advertising, blank space can have very real
5 value, particularly in the context of dense, busy pages
6 full of words and pictures. Rather than the common belief
7 that one would get the most for their advertising dollar
8 by packing as much into a space as possible, the ads which
9 received the best results were the ones who creatively
10 used open space to frame and accent the core information.

11 Likewise, human beings need space; to
12 grow, to breathe, and to give them the ability to recover
13 from stress and the dense, busy lives most of us have.
14 Maintaining some of the natural world around our homes is
15 absolutely the best way we can increase our chances for a
16 healthy, productive life.

17 Tuttle Hill rises only 550 to 600 feet
18 over the North Branch, yet it is the dominant geological
19 feature of most of Antrim. It is almost inconceivable to
20 imagine the effect that 500-foot industrial wind turbines
21 would have on top of this terrain. The questionable
22 possible energy production from this facility could never
23 outweigh the permanent damage that would be inflicted on
24 the region.

1 I was very disappointed by today's site
2 visit. First of all, I have a hard time understanding how
3 the Committee can judge the impact this project would have
4 on the Tuttle-Willard ridge if they never have the
5 opportunity to actually visit it, so they can see the
6 beautiful land up there, witness firsthand the abundant
7 signs of small and large wildlife activity, and experience
8 the extensive spectacular 100,000 year old boulder
9 formations, which would be dynamited to oblivion for
10 Antrim Wind's access road.

11 More time was spent today on the views
12 from locations some distance away, where the turbines
13 either would not be visible or where the visibility would
14 be very limited, than from locations which would be
15 directly and significantly affected. No effort was made
16 to address and demonstrate how neighbors and residents,
17 both abutters and nearby landowners, will be impacted.

18 There are many, many residents who live
19 in the Rural Conservation District, most of whom have
20 lived there for decades for the same reasons we do; for
21 the peace, tranquility, and healing value of the space
22 around us. How can we allow our quiet, tranquil
23 atmosphere to be replaced by the largest industrial wind
24 turbines in the Northeast. How can it be right to allow a

1 company with no wind farm construction or operation
2 experience to reap such irreversible massive havoc on our
3 tranquil rural town?

4 Thank you again.

5 *[Audience interruption.]*

6 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Annie Law,
7 followed by Robert Cleland. Annie Law, please.

8 MS. LAW: My name is Annie Law. I live
9 on 43 Farmstead Road, on Windsor Mountain, directly across
10 from Tuttle Hill and the whole ridgeline where the
11 proposed wind site is going to be built, or they want to
12 build.

13 We have been -- we built our house 28
14 years ago. We've been paying taxes in this town. We live
15 on top of a mountain because we love the serenity and
16 peace there. We love seeing the wild animals. We love
17 seeing the mountains and the wildlife just the way it is.
18 And, we oppose this strongly. I oppose this strongly.

19 I was an intervenor. I'm an intervenor
20 again. And, I ask you to please turn down this permit
21 again. Thank you.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Robert
23 Cleland, followed by Janice Dudley **[Duley?]** Longgood.
24 Robert Cleland, please.

1 MR. CLELAND: My name is Bob Cleland. I
2 live at 43 Farmstead Road, in the Rural Conservation
3 District. I love it. I'm out there all the time on the
4 mountains daily. And, I'm strongly against this project.
5 I do not want to see this area destroyed, and never be
6 repaired again. Thank you.

7 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
8 Janice Dudley Longgood, followed by Kathy Chisholm.
9 Janice Dudley Longgood, please.

10 MS. DULEY LONGGOOD: Hi. My name is
11 Janice Duley Longgood.

12 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Oh, I'm sorry.

13 MS. DULEY LONGGOOD: That's okay. I
14 live at 156 Salmon Brook Road. I have been there for 30
15 years and pay taxes. I'm an abutter to the proposed
16 project, and I'm not in favor of it. I moved here from
17 the City of Concord, mainly because of the rural nature,
18 and, for 30 years, have enjoyed being out there. And, I
19 think the cost/benefit analysis that you do, ruining the
20 wildlands is not worth what we will get from this.

21 We will not benefit from the power that
22 they're generating. I am for alternative energy, but this
23 is -- community wind, something smaller, but this is way
24 out-of-scale. And, I am opposed to the project.

1 Thank you very much.

2 *[Audience interruption.]*

3 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.

4 Kathy Chisholm, please, followed by Scott Burnside. Kathy
5 Chisholm.

6 MS. CHISHOLM: Hi. My name is Kathy
7 Chisholm. And, mine is going to be very simple. I'm
8 strongly in favor of this project. I've only lived in
9 Antrim 30 years, but it's my home. And, I pay taxes.
10 And, I think this is one of the best things that could
11 happen to us. We have to start somewhere, changing how we
12 deal with electricity. And, this may be a drop in the
13 bucket, but we do have to start somewhere. And, I would
14 like it to be here.

15 Thank you.

16 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.

17 Scott Burnside, Burnside, followed by Steve and Mary
18 Schacht, I'm going to get this wrong, I apologize.

19 MR. BURNSIDE: Hi. Scott Burnside. I'm
20 here wearing three hats tonight; personally, businesswise,
21 and also as a past Planning Board member. I was on the
22 Planning Board when Jack first came. And, their fortitude
23 has been great, just fantastic.

24 Secondly, I'm a local contractor. And,

1 now that I know that Reed & Reed is going to be the
2 general contractor, there's quite a few local contractors.
3 I own an excavation business, there's a bunch of other
4 excavation businesses, that this could potentially open up
5 some work for them, while they're supplying materials,
6 sand, gravels, trucking. Obviously, probably not some of
7 the bigger work, but we might get a piece of the pie. So,
8 I'm speaking in favor of the project for all the other
9 local contractors, too.

10 Thirdly, personally, I live probably a
11 1,000-1,200 feet in elevation, on the side of Meetinghouse
12 Hill, facing directly west to Tower 1 and 2. So, I've got
13 a beautiful view of these towers. I was actually going to
14 ask Jack if he could paint some red and white swirls on
15 them, so I could jump in and get my mojo back.

16 I support the project.

17 *[Audience interruption.]*

18 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
19 Steve and Mary Schacht, followed by Apryl Perry.

20 MR. SCHACHT: Steve Schacht, Antrim.
21 Been here for most of my life. I'm in support of this
22 project. I was also originally a selectman in the Town of
23 Antrim, when Antrim Wind came in, also part of the
24 Planning Board and be part of it. I think the project is

1 going to be good. I like the idea, the design and stuff.
2 My wife didn't want to come up. So, I want to talk for
3 her, too, at the same time to shorten this up.

4 But, like I said, I've been impressed
5 with the way they have done their stuff. And, I'm glad
6 you guys are taking the time to come see us, to see what
7 the townspeople actually want.

8 And, at that point, I would just say
9 thank you.

10 *[Audience interruption.]*

11 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
12 Apryl Perry, followed by John Griffin [Giffin?]. Apryl
13 Perry, please.

14 MS. PERRY: My name is Apryl Perry.
15 And, I am an Antrim resident. I also work on climate
16 research at the University of New Hampshire. And, I don't
17 want to rehash everything that's gone over with the pros
18 and the cons, and, you know, we don't -- we want to worry
19 about shadow flicker, and we want to worry about the
20 environment, because I think everybody, for their own
21 reasons, has those same concerns.

22 But I think what I want to illustrate is
23 that comfort and convenience don't come without impacts.
24 Every decision we make every day has a repercussion, good,

1 bad or otherwise. This is a regular coffee *[indicating]*.
2 Why is it in a latte cup? Maybe because I'm crazy? Maybe
3 because styrofoam lives in the environment forever.
4 Unless it's recycled, it stays there. So, I make a
5 decision that, if I'm going to stop at Dunkin's, and I'm
6 going to get a coffee, I get something that I can recycle,
7 or I don't get it.

8 I choose to drive an energy-efficient
9 vehicle, because I'm aware of the consequences. I drive
10 4,000 miles a month. I'm trying to limit my impacts.

11 I am also a shrewd Yankee. And, this
12 project has so many benefits. No, it's not without
13 impacts, but it's never going to be. The question is, is
14 have we minimized those impacts to the point that they're
15 good with our conscience? That the benefit we're getting
16 from this project is outweighing the fact of not doing it
17 and our footprint on the environment.

18 I support this project. I hope it goes
19 forward. And, you guys have had a long day, but thank you
20 for coming.

21 *[Audience interruption.]*

22 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So, Mary
23 Schacht, did I omit you? Okay.

24 MS. SCHACHT: I don't like to share the

1 limelight with him.

2 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I made the
3 mistake of listening to him, he said he was speaking for
4 you.

5 MS. SCHACHT: Yes. Never listen to my
6 husband, okay?

7 The assumption we're all making is that
8 that land will remain untouched for a long time, and that
9 is probably not the truth. It will be touched. I
10 appreciate you opening your land to everyone who likes to
11 go there. I personally like the windmills.

12 As far as the impact for me, I can only
13 tell you that we have grandchildren, and I am so excited
14 that that land will be open for them to walk on. That
15 they will be able to walk on that ridge as we did.

16 That said, there's been a whole lot of
17 talk about what selectmen supported or didn't. This all
18 started with a vote by the Town and a little cardboard box
19 downstairs, and they asked us what we thought, and we told
20 them. Please see this project through fruition.

21 *[Audience interruption.]*

22 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
23 John Griffin **[Giffin?]**, and he'll be followed by Michael
24 Weidler **[Weider?]**.

1 MR. GIFFIN: Mr. Chairman, members of
2 the Committee, thank you for being here today. My name is
3 John Giffin. I'm a long-time resident here in town, 38
4 years to be exact. I've been on the Zoning Board here for
5 ten years, also a Chairman of the Board right now. I also
6 work for the town, I'm a police officer here full-time.

7 Most of the other people here have hit
8 on all the main points. I'm in favor of the project. You
9 know, in the world's global warming, tax base for the
10 town, plus it's a finite timeframe it's here. Once it's
11 gone, all that land will go back to conservation.

12 So, like I said, I'm also an intervenor.
13 So, I'll be speaking for in the judicial process. So,
14 thank you for your time. I'm in favor of it.

15 *[Audience interruption.]*

16 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
17 Michael Weidler. Did I get your name wrong, too? No?

18 *(Mr. Weider nodding in the affirmative.)*

19 MR. WEIDER: I'm Michael Weider, from
20 the Maine Drilling & Blasting. I'm the Corporate Safety
21 Manager for the company, and we support this project.
22 It's good work for good employees in New Hampshire, and
23 it's a good process. I also sit in the Town as a planning
24 board member in the Town of Chester. I've been a resident

1 in New Hampshire for 30 years. And, I understand this
2 process, I understand what you go through as a town. And,
3 I support this process.

4 *[Audience interruption.]*

5 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
6 Elsa Voelcker, please.

7 MS. VOELCKER: My name is Elsa Voelcker.
8 I live at 97 Old Pound Road. I understand you drove by my
9 house today.

10 FROM THE FLOOR: No, they didn't.

11 FROM THE FLOOR: They did not.

12 MS. VOELCKER: No, they didn't?

13 FROM THE FLOOR: They didn't.

14 MS. VOELCKER: Oh, that's too bad.
15 Because last time the other SEC drove right by my house,
16 they went over to Gregg Lake, and saw osprey flying
17 around.

18 I just wanted to say that the last SEC
19 said this was "too big a project for too little a hill".
20 And, I hope that that's your feeling, too, at the end of
21 this.

22 I was part of the original group that
23 designated the Conservation District of Antrim. I've
24 lived here for 32 years, in the same house. I walk down

1 my hill in front of Tuttle Hill almost every day with my
2 dogs.

3 And, two tons of cement have to be put
4 in for each one of their nine towers. And, that's after
5 they blast the hell out of the top of it, so that they can
6 put cement in there. It will never be recovered. I'd be
7 111 years old when this project ends. I don't think I'm
8 going to be around to say "make sure you take that thing
9 down, make sure you put back all those trees and
10 boulders."

11 When we created the Conservation
12 District, we added to a huge lot of lands that had been
13 conserved by five different towns and lots of different
14 organizations. If you'd look at the map of wild places,
15 we have the biggest spot of wild place in southern New
16 Hampshire. And, this wind tower goes across the middle of
17 it, like a belt, like a fence.

18 There was discussion on NPR this year
19 that they put just a recording of a town in the middle of
20 a wild space, a recording of a road. There were fewer
21 birds, and the birds that were caught were lighter
22 weighted and not as healthy. We know now noise hurts
23 living things. And, these wind towers are very noisy.

24 I have been by the Lempster's, I've

1 heard them on a low cloud-covered, snow-covered
2 environment. And, it's like a jet plane that doesn't go
3 away.

4 This is not a good use of this land. I
5 am against this project. And, I hope that you see that
6 you are against it, too.

7 Many of the people that have spoken
8 tonight in support of it are going to gain money. That's
9 how Jack got into this town to begin with, because the
10 people on our Planning Board, on our Zoning Board, have
11 interests that are going to make money from this project.
12 They're not caring about the people of this town and the
13 way we want to live.

14 *[Audience interruption.]*

15 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
16 Sarah Gorman, followed by Cynthia Crockett, I believe.

17 MR. IACOPINO: She's gone.

18 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: She's gone?

19 MS. GORMAN: Thank you for coming. I'm
20 from North Branch, Antrim, which is the area of town
21 that's being assaulted by this. I've been there for 34
22 years. My husband is born and raised in Antrim. And, we
23 have two pieces of property that will be adversely
24 affected.

1 I also have worked construction, heavy
2 construction my whole life. And, have worked on some
3 projects that I'm very proud of, treatment plants,
4 Manchester Airport, Granite Lake Bypass, that brought
5 truck traffic away from Granite Lake. I drive a truck,
6 run equipment.

7 What we need for construction employment
8 is rebuilding infrastructure, which is bridges and roads.
9 That's what we need. If it doesn't benefit the
10 environment, then there's another word for it:
11 Destruction. Because you have to blast, you strip the
12 trees, you strip the topsoil, you blast the ledge; it's
13 total destruction.

14 Tuttle Mountain is a steep-slope
15 watershed. It sheds water, Robb Mountain, Willard
16 Mountain shed water to Robb Reservoir, Willard Pond, Gregg
17 Lake, the North Branch River, Steels Pond, Franklin Pierce
18 Lake, and all shed water to the Contoocook River. This is
19 a steep-slope watershed, inappropriate for industrial
20 sites. A cup of gas is -- I don't know what the
21 astronomical amount of gallons of water that it can
22 pollute, but it's not worth the risk.

23 The reasons to protect the North Branch
24 River watershed and the surrounding area known as "North

1 Branch Antrim" area as follows:

2 The environment: Tuttle, Robb, and
3 Willard Mountains make up an important steep-slope
4 watershed, recommended for protection by the New Hampshire
5 Fish & Game's course-filter water study and Governor
6 Lynch's Fresh Water Protection Act. This is an intact
7 ecosystem that maintains a green link in the Monadnock
8 Region and the Contoocook River Valley for all life to
9 thrive, including nesting Bald and some sightings of
10 Golden Eagles. See the State of Wyoming versus Industrial
11 Wind, they were sued near industrial wind sites for
12 killing Golden Eagles up there.

13 The historical significance: This is
14 the birthplace of New Hampshire's only President, Franklin
15 Pierce, who was, as some believe, born on the North Branch
16 side of the town line. And, there are many historic sites
17 and buildings along the old Turnpike and the old King's
18 Highway, otherwise known as "Old Stage Road" between
19 Concord and Keene. These include the old tavern that sits
20 on the shores of Franklin Pierce Lake, Steele Homestead,
21 the antique shop, other colonial-era buildings around the
22 old Hawthorne College grounds, and the mortar-less double
23 stone arch bridge, that, if they start blasting, could be
24 jeopardized. And, there are also Native American sites

1 that have not been, but need to be documented, including
2 possible burial sites, smoke boxes, and possible stone
3 calendar sites. Other important geological sites are
4 caves where endangered bats hibernate.

5 As for industrial wind being a viable
6 energy source: We need to audit the current wind sites to
7 see if they have actually contributed in any meaningful
8 way to be considered a practical energy alternative, as
9 industry-wide industrial wind produces, as I've
10 read/studied, at a dismal 17 percent efficiency, sometimes
11 drawing energy from the grid to turn turbines so wings
12 don't warp when the wind doesn't blow.

13 How can we depend on something that
14 depends on something as unpredictable as the wind? Other
15 more dependable sources would be plasma technology, which
16 burns human waste, i.e. trash, at high heat, something
17 like 2,700 degrees, leaving no pollutants behind. If we
18 invested in local municipal units, we could reduce
19 landfills that produce methane and pollute groundwater,
20 and also reduce trucking trash around the country, which
21 produces a huge amount of CO2.

22 Also, the North Branch River has two
23 hydroelectric generators that have been producing
24 electricity for over 30 years. The drawback to this is

1 that we don't have salmon able to reach their historical
2 birthright, the Salmon Brook. In that same period of
3 time, the Town of Antrim has produced methane from its
4 treatment plant and landfill, unchecked, methane, the
5 other dangerous greenhouse gas, that we really hear
6 anything about, but is more dangerous than CO2, because it
7 is not absorbed by plants. There are numerous chip plants
8 that are consuming our CO2-absorbing forests at an
9 unfathomable rate, and here again, we should be burning
10 trash instead, and capping and tapping methane from all
11 landfills and treatment plants.

12 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Ms. Gorman,
13 how much more do you think you need?

14 MS. GORMAN: When I'm done. The first
15 step is conservation:

16 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Well, if you
17 could hold on a second. You're the last one right now.
18 So, I'll ask --

19 MS. GORMAN: I've just got one more
20 paragraph.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. Go
22 ahead.

23 MS. GORMAN: Okay?

24 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Yes.

1 MS. GORMAN: The U.S. is 4 percent of
2 the world's population; we consume 25 percent of the
3 world's resources. The first step is conservation, i.e.,
4 using less, buy local, buy used, put up a clothes line,
5 changing our consumptive ways. Scale down, maybe a
6 smaller house, maybe you're two people in a ten-room
7 farmhouse, more efficient systems, drive less, four-day
8 workweek, commute from home via computer. Put up small
9 wind, put up solar panels. And, we should tax out of
10 existence household chemicals, unrecyclable plastics,
11 single-use plastics, *etcetera*, anything that is noxious to
12 the environment.

13 You can't put a price on scenery. This
14 used to be "Scenic New Hampshire". I've lived here for 48
15 years, and it used to be "Scenic New Hampshire", before it
16 was "Live Free or Die". People come here. It's one of
17 the biggest moneymakers in the state. People flee the
18 manmade skyline to the south to come here to recreate.
19 You cannot put a price on the number one or number two
20 income for this state, which is recreation.

21 They have ruined Lake Umbagog with wind
22 turbines, the Nash Stream area has been ruined. And,
23 there's no comparison between Tuttle, Robb, and Willard
24 Mountain to the Lempster Mountain site. Please Google

1 Tuttle, Robb, and Willard Mountain, so you can see the
2 terrain lines and how steep a slope this is. And, there's
3 already been a washout of gravel into the river, because a
4 culvert got plugged. And, these things are not going to
5 be able to be prevented.

6 I appreciate your time. And, this is --
7 there's four types of people here: People with nothing to
8 lose; people with nothing to gain; people that have -- are
9 either going to profit or have profited; and those that
10 have everything to lose, which is the sanctity of our
11 home.

12 And, I urge everybody in the area to
13 apply for a tax abatement for the devaluation of your
14 property until this is put to rest. This has taken ten
15 years off of all of our lives. And, we want to raise our
16 grandkids here with the same beautiful area that links big
17 giant pieces of undestroyed earth. You cannot save the
18 Earth by destroying the Earth. The only thing you can do,
19 and I would ask everybody that is pro, what have you done
20 in the last ten years to curb your consumption?

21 And, it's just like wild horses. Let's
22 stop wild horse slaughter. It's a feel-good thing, --

23 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Ms. Gorman,
24 you have gone more than twice your limit. If you could

1 close up, please.

2 MS. GORMAN: -- the horses still get
3 slaughtered. They're just trucked farther away to Mexico
4 and Canada. Putting up windmills does not curb
5 consumption. Thank you.

6 *[Audience interruption.]*

7 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
8 So, is there anybody else? I have no more slips.

9 *[No indication given.]*

10 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And, I did
11 promise, with the Committee's forbearance, if somebody
12 wanted to come back. Does anybody else want to speak or
13 speak again?

14 *[No indication given.]*

15 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. Seeing
16 no one. I'll thank you all for your time. I appreciate
17 your interest.

18 The next step for the SEC is a
19 prehearing conference on --

20 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Thursday.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: -- Thursday,
22 the 25th, --

23 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: At 10 o'clock.

24 PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: -- at 10

1 o'clock, in Concord. From that, among other things, will
2 come a procedural schedule for moving forward. Thank you
3 all. I appreciate it.

4 ***(Whereupon the Joint Public Hearing was***
5 ***adjourned at 9:01 p.m.)***

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24