

1 STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
 2 SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

3  
 4 October 2, 2008 - 7:00 p.m.  
 5 Groveton High School  
 65 State Street  
 6 Groveton, New Hampshire

7 In re: SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:  
 8 SEC DOCKET NO. 2008-04:  
 9 Application of Granite Reliable  
 10 Power, LLC, for a Certificate  
 11 of Site and Facility for the  
 12 Granite Reliable Power  
 13 Windpark in Coos County, New  
 14 Hampshire. (Public information  
 15 hearing and hearing to receive  
 16 public comments.

17 PRESENT: SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:  
 18 Thomas B. Getz, Chrmn. Public Utilities Commission  
 19 (Vice Chairman of SEC - Presiding)  
 20 Donald Kent Dept. of Resources & Econ. Dev.  
 21 Glenn Normandeau Fish & Game Department  
 22 Robert Scott, Director DES - Air Resources Division  
 23 Jack Ruderman, Dep. Dir. N.H. Office of Energy & Planning  
 24 William Janelle Dept. of Transportation  
 Michael Harrington Public Utilities Commission

18 \* \* \*

19 Reptg. Army Corps of  
 20 Engineers: Richard Roach

21 \* \* \*

22 Counsel for the Committee: Michael J. Iacopino, Esq.

23 COURT REPORTER: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52

24

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:

Reptg. Granite Reliable Power, LLC,  
and Noble Environmental Power:  
Douglas L. Patch, Esq. (Orr & Reno)  
Susan S. Geiger, Esq. (Orr & Reno)  
Mark Lyons, Esq.

Reptg. Counsel for the Public:  
Peter Roth, Esq.  
Senior Assistant Atty. General  
New Hampshire Dept. of Justice

1

2

## I N D E X

3 Statement by Mr. Roach (Army Corps of Engineers) 14

4 Introduction for presentation by Mr. Patch 17

5 Presentation of project by Mr. Decker 17

6 Questions from the public (by Vice Chrmn. Getz) 25

7 Questions by Atty. Roth (Counsel for the Public) 56

8

## 9 STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC BY:

10 Councilor Burton 67

11 Rep. King 69

12 Mr. Judd 75

13 Mr. Burns 77

14 Ms. Richardson 78

15 Mr. Samson 79

16 Ms. Keene 85

17 Ms. Sloat 92

18 Mr. Elliott 94

19 Mr. Dubey 99

20 Mr. Tillotson 103

21 Mr. Moore 106

22 Unidentified speaker 107

23

24

## 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good evening,  
3 everyone. My name is Tom Getz. I'm the Chairman of the  
4 Public Utilities Commission. I'm also the Vice Chairman  
5 of the Site Evaluation Committee. And, I've been  
6 appointed as the presiding officer of the proceeding  
7 regarding the filing by Granite Reliable Power. Tonight  
8 is a public information hearing in the Site Evaluation  
9 Committee Docket Number 2008-04 concerning the Application  
10 of Granite Reliable Power for a Certificate of Site and  
11 Facility pursuant to RSA Chapter 162-H of the New  
12 Hampshire laws.

13 The proposed renewable energy facility  
14 would be located in the Town of Dummer and in the  
15 unincorporated places known as Dixville, Erving's  
16 Location, Millsfield, and Odell. The Applicant seeks  
17 authority for the construction and operation of 33 wind  
18 turbines, each having a nameplate capacity of three  
19 megawatts, for a total capacity of 99 megawatts. It also  
20 seeks authority to construct associated facilities,  
21 including a 34.5 kV transmission line to collect the  
22 energy from the turbines and a 115 kilovolt transmission  
23 line to interconnect with the Public Service Company of  
24 New Hampshire electrical system, also to build a switching

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 station and a maintenance building.

2 The public hearing tonight is being  
3 conducted jointly with the Army Corps of Engineers. And,  
4 at this time, I want to introduce who are the members of  
5 the Committee at the front table here tonight. We don't  
6 have a microphone in front of them, so I'll just -- I'll  
7 start from the far -- on my far left is Don Kent, from the  
8 Department of Resources & Economic Development; Bob Scott,  
9 from the Department of Environmental Services; and it's  
10 Jack Ruderman, from the Office of Energy & Planning; Mike  
11 Harrington is an engineer with the Public Utilities  
12 Commission; and Glenn Normandeau is Director of Fish &  
13 Game; and Bill Janelle is from the Department of  
14 Transportation. Also at the front table is Richard Roach,  
15 he's from the Army Corps of Engineer, and on the end here  
16 is Peter Roth, who is Counsel for the Public, who has been  
17 designated by the Attorney General. Also, the gentleman  
18 standing down to the far left is Michael Iacopino, he is  
19 the Counsel to the Site Evaluation Committee.

20 Let me just describe the way the public  
21 hearing will proceed this evening. Most of you may have a  
22 draft agenda in front of you. And, basically, it lays out  
23 the opening remarks by myself, as presiding officer, and  
24 in a moment I'll go into some more extensive procedural

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 background about how the Committee works and how the  
2 process will go this evening. Once I conclude with that,  
3 there will be an opportunity for the Applicant to make a  
4 presentation describing its project. On the agenda, it  
5 has Items 3, 4, and 5, but really it's one item, for  
6 questions from the Committee, from Counsel for the Public  
7 or from the public. And, then, we'll have an opportunity  
8 for public comment, and that will conclude the proceedings  
9 for this evening.

10 If you would like to make a public  
11 comment, there is a sign-up sheet on the table. Most of  
12 you should have seen it when you come in. And, if you  
13 missed it, go back and, if you want to sign up, and then  
14 we'll just take public comment at the end of the evening  
15 in the order that folks have signed up. If you would like  
16 to submit a question, please fill out a card and we'll  
17 collect those, and we'll ask the questions of the  
18 Applicant.

19 With respect to the questions, I want to  
20 emphasize that the goal of the questions this evening is  
21 to get a better understanding of what the Applicant is  
22 proposing. Tonight is really not the occasion for  
23 cross-examining the witness, the Company as witnesses, as  
24 we will be doing when we get to the actual adversarial

1 adjudicative public hearings that will be conducted in  
2 Concord in March. So, the notion is to just try to get a  
3 better idea of what the proposal is that the -- for the  
4 project that the Applicant would like to construct.

5 And, then, public comments, whatever  
6 comments you would like to make or -- and there's also  
7 sheets over there, if you want to, if you don't care to  
8 speak, if you want to do something in writing, fill out  
9 one of the sheets and hand it in. The sheet actually says  
10 "I wish to speak"/"I do not wish to speak", just ignore  
11 that. If you want to speak, sign up on one list. If you  
12 want to put in a written comment, just put that comment in  
13 and that will become part of the docket file in this  
14 proceeding.

15 So, let me, I'll describe -- I'll turn  
16 now to describe the overall process for reviewing an  
17 application for a facility of the type that has been filed  
18 by Granite Reliable Power. The Site Evaluation Committee  
19 uses a formal judicial-style approach to reviewing  
20 applications. The process begins when an Applicant  
21 submits certain specific testimony and evidence required  
22 by the Committee's rules. And, you can see over there on  
23 the left is -- that's the Application, it's five volumes  
24 that the Applicant has filed, and our rules are very

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 detailed in the types of issues that we want addressed,  
2 and there's also testimony by various persons on behalf of  
3 the Company that's part of that filing. And, the  
4 Applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence  
5 that it has the adequate financial, technical, and  
6 managerial capability to construct and operate the  
7 facility, must prove that the facility will not unduly  
8 interfere with orderly development of the region, that the  
9 facility will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on  
10 esthetics, historic sites, air and water quality, the  
11 natural environment, and public health and safety, and  
12 that the operation of the facility is consistent with the  
13 State energy policy. So, that's what is the requirement  
14 for the Applicant to prove in this case.

15 So far, as a procedural matter, the  
16 Applicant filed its Application on July 15th. The first  
17 formal step that was taken by the Committee occurred on  
18 August 14, when Tom Burack, who is the Director of -- or,  
19 the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental  
20 Services, and who is also the Chair of the Site Evaluation  
21 Committee, he issued an order finding that the Application  
22 was complete, and designated the Subcommittee to hear the  
23 case. By accepting the Application and finding it  
24 complete, the statutory clock starts for the Committee's

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}



1 review. We have 240 days from August 14th to issue a  
2 decision either approving or denying the certificate, and  
3 that deadline is April 6th.

4 On August 27, another order was issued  
5 providing notice of the public information hearing tonight  
6 and also of a prehearing conference that was held in  
7 Concord on September 18. Now, the prehearing conference  
8 on September 18 was a formal procedure for the purpose of  
9 receiving Petitions for Intervention and for setting a  
10 procedural schedule. Nine Petitions to Intervene have  
11 been filed, and objections have been made by the Applicant  
12 to some of those petitions. The applications to intervene  
13 were made by the Appalachian Mountain Club, Clean Power  
14 Development, Industrial Wind Action, New Hampshire Wind  
15 Energy Association, Kathlyn Keene, Robert Keene, Jon  
16 Odell, Sonja Sheldon and Wayne Urso. A decision has not  
17 been made at this time on the Petitions to Intervene, but  
18 I expect that that decision will be made within the next  
19 ten days.

20 Let me take a second to explain what  
21 "intervention" means. For a Petition to Intervene to be  
22 granted, a party has to demonstrate that it has a right,  
23 duty, privilege, or other interest affected by the  
24 proceeding. If they can prove that they have that

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 interest or that their participation is in the interest of  
2 justice, then intervention would be granted. And, once  
3 intervention is granted, that means you're a formal party  
4 to the proceeding, and you have the right to conduct  
5 discovery, right to file testimony, cross-examine  
6 witnesses, and to file briefs, if briefs are allowed in  
7 the case. And, a procedural order came out of that  
8 prehearing conference, and that procedural order ends in  
9 hearings in Concord in March.

10                   Between now and the hearings in March is  
11 the process known as "discovery". Parties to the  
12 proceeding will be able to ask the Applicant questions  
13 about its petition, they can -- there may be technical  
14 sessions, there may be written questions, but it's an  
15 opportunity to examine the Application, and then for those  
16 parties to prepare testimony, if they want to file  
17 testimony. Once that testimony is filed, then the  
18 Applicant would have its opportunity to ask questions of  
19 those other parties about their testimony. And, that's  
20 how all the information is funneled to preparing for the  
21 hearings in which we will have witnesses be sworn in on  
22 the stand and be subject to cross-examination, and then  
23 that will form the basis for a decision, a written  
24 decision, by the Site Evaluation Committee. And, once

1 that decision is issued, it will be subject to rehearing  
2 and appeal to the New Hampshire Supreme Court.

3 To get a better understanding of the  
4 process, the one thing I would suggest, if you're  
5 interested, to get a feel for how these things work, there  
6 was a docket in 2006 for the Lempster Wind facility. And,  
7 in that case, the Site Evaluation Committee issued a  
8 102-page order that detailed the procedures, the  
9 procedural history, it summarized the testimony, and  
10 explained its decisions. You can find that decision by  
11 going to the PUC's website at [puc.nh.gov](http://puc.nh.gov). There's a link  
12 to the Site Evaluation Committee. And, you can find lots  
13 of documents about previous hearings and documents that  
14 will be filed in this case. But I think the order in the  
15 Lempster docket is very helpful, if you want to get some  
16 more background on how the process works.

17 One other formality I want to address  
18 here at the beginning is the formality of the structure  
19 extends to the Committee as well. We are required to act  
20 like judges in any civil case. Which means that we cannot  
21 talk about the merits of the case with any of the parties  
22 or with the public or with the press. If you have  
23 questions about issues in this case, then you would have  
24 to contact counsel to the Committee, Mr. Iacopino, or go

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 through the Department of Environmental Services to ask  
2 questions about the case.

3 I think that addresses, in a general  
4 way, the process that we use to review a proceeding. Let  
5 me talk a little bit about the purpose of the hearing  
6 tonight. RSA 162-H:10 requires a hearing in the county in  
7 which the project or facility is to be built. The statute  
8 provides that the hearing shall be for public information  
9 on the proposed facility, with the Applicant presenting  
10 information to the Subcommittee and to the public. We go  
11 a step further than is required, actually two steps  
12 further than is required by the statute, because we also  
13 ask for questions from the public and we also provide an  
14 opportunity for public comment.

15 And, let me talk -- And, so, our goal  
16 tonight is to get a better understanding as a Committee,  
17 and hope that the public gets a better understanding about  
18 the proposal. But another goal is for us to hear what you  
19 may be thinking about the proposal. What is said tonight  
20 does not constitute the type of evidence on which we can  
21 make our ultimate decision. And, if you want to speak  
22 tonight, you will not be subject to cross-examination by  
23 us or by the Applicant. But what you do say can be very  
24 helpful to us in identifying areas of concern that we

1       should explore when we're thinking about this case, and  
2       over the next few months reading through all of the five  
3       volumes and getting prepared for hearing, and then when we  
4       see testimony come in, going through the testimony that  
5       comes in. And, it can be helpful to us in formulating  
6       questions that we will ultimately be asking when we get to  
7       hearing in this case.

8                        So, the one area where we are different  
9       from most courts is that the Commission -- the Committee  
10      actively asks questions during the hearings. Where a  
11      judge might simply let two parties debate, ask questions,  
12      cross-examine each other, and not be involved in anything  
13      other than ruling on objections or procedural issues, the  
14      Committee members will be asking, asking their own  
15      questions, and trying to determine whether this project is  
16      ultimately in the public interest. And, I'd also note  
17      that, in addition to the members asking questions, Counsel  
18      for the Public will be actively involved as an independent  
19      party in the proceeding.

20                      So, at this time, I think that covers  
21      both the overall process and the process for this evening.  
22      But, before we hear from the Applicant, I'd like to give  
23      an opportunity to Richard Roach, from the Army Corps of  
24      Engineers, to say a few words about his process.

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1                   MR. ROACH: Can you hear me? Do I need  
2 to go to the microphone?

3                   FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

4                   MR. ROACH: All right. That's unusual.  
5 I'm Rich Roach, with the Army Corps of Engineers. I'm  
6 here tonight because, if this project is to be built, an  
7 Army Corps of Engineers permit will be required. Under  
8 Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act, a permit is  
9 required for the discharge of fill material into waters of  
10 the United States, including wetlands. This project will  
11 require fill for roads, and thus a 404 permit. The  
12 substantive criteria for a 404 permit are the 404-B(1)  
13 guidelines posed by the U.S. Environmental Protection  
14 Agency.

15                   FROM THE FLOOR: Speak up please.

16                   MR. ROACH: Okay. Thank you. The  
17 substantive criteria are the 404-B(1) guidelines. They  
18 require that we consider the avoidance, minimization and  
19 -- they require that we consider the avoidance -- can you  
20 hear me now?

21                   FROM THE FLOOR: No.

22                   MR. ROACH: Okay. Is that better?

23                   FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

24                   MR. ROACH: All right. Okay. The

1 substantive criteria for the 404 permit are the 404-B(1)  
2 guidelines. They require that we consider the avoidance,  
3 minimization, and compensatory mitigation of adverse  
4 effects on waters and wetlands. All right. In issuing  
5 permits, we must also comply with other federal laws, like  
6 the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, the  
7 National Historic Preservation Act, the Endangered Species  
8 Act, etcetera. The National Environmental Policy Act  
9 provides essentially two things. First, that the federal  
10 government, in deciding on permits, will understand the  
11 environmental implications of the things that it permits.  
12 And, second, we will involve the public in the decisions  
13 that we make. And, that's why I'm here tonight, to try to  
14 involve the public, to take advantage of this meeting, to  
15 see what the public has to say about the Application.  
16 There will be other opportunities in our process. Our  
17 process is not quite the same as the SEC's. But there are  
18 a lot of similar things, so that we hope to take advantage  
19 of this and learn what you have to say, so we can direct  
20 our studies of the project. Thank you.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, also, I'd like  
22 to give Peter Roth, from the Attorney General's Office, an  
23 opportunity to explain the role of Public Counsel in this  
24 proceeding.

1                   MR. ROTH: Good evening, everyone. I'm  
2 Peter Roth. I'm with the Attorney General's Office. I'm  
3 Senior Assistant Attorney General. I'm counsel to the  
4 Public in this proceeding, which means I was appointed by  
5 the Attorney General to represent the interests of the  
6 people of New Hampshire as a whole to make sure that the  
7 process ensures that there's an appropriate balance  
8 between the state's need for new energy sources and the  
9 state's need to protect the environment from inappropriate  
10 location of those kinds of facilities.

11                   In this process, I take a fairly active  
12 role. I'm a full party to the proceedings. I  
13 cross-examine witnesses, I look at evidence, I ask  
14 questions. And, in the previous case, and I imagine in  
15 this case as well, I hired an expert, and can and may very  
16 well present testimony in this matter. One of the things  
17 that I also do is I listen to the people in the state who  
18 care to comment about it. And, so, my telephone rings and  
19 I get e-mail, and sometimes a lot of it, about what people  
20 think. And, I got an e-mail just the other day from  
21 someone about this project and representing the people of  
22 Millsfield. And, I pay attention to that stuff. So, if  
23 you have any questions or concerns or something to tell me  
24 about it, if you know something, I'm all ears and my



1 e-mail inbox is always open. And, I have a few cards.  
2 But, if anybody wants to come up to me after the  
3 presentation or drop -- give me a note or jot down my  
4 e-mail address, I'd be happy to communicate with you.  
5 And, I expect to be involved in the process through the  
6 bitter end in March. Thank you.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you,  
8 Peter. So, now, we'll turn to the Applicant, who will be  
9 making its presentation.

10 MR. PATCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and  
11 members of the Committee. My name is Doug Patch. I'm  
12 with the law firm of Orr & Reno, along with Susan Geiger  
13 from Orr & Reno as well. We are counsel to the Applicant,  
14 Granite Reliable Power, LLC. And, making the presentation  
15 tonight is going to be Pip Decker, who is the Development  
16 Manager.

17 MR. DECKER: Thank you all for coming  
18 tonight. I'm Pip Decker. I work for Noble Environmental  
19 Power. I live in Lancaster. I have an office in  
20 Lancaster. I work in the Old Court House. Some of you  
21 I've met before and some of you I'm seeing for the very  
22 first time. So, hello. We're going to talk about the  
23 Granite Reliable Power Windpark tonight, and you want to  
24 go to the next slide. We're going to talk about a few

1 things. We'll talk about the Company. We'll talk about  
2 the project. Talk about how we got here, why we believe  
3 this is a great place for a windpark. We'll talk about  
4 some of the alternatives and how we propose to mitigate  
5 for some of the issues surrounding the project. And,  
6 then, we'll finally finish off with the project benefits.

7 So, Noble Environmental Power was  
8 founded in 2004. Our headquarters is in Essex,  
9 Connecticut. We were founded based on the idea that we  
10 needed to create renewable energy. We are specifically a  
11 wind power company. We have projects across the U.S. We  
12 have projects in construction, operation, and development,  
13 totaling over 1,000 megawatts of power. Our company is  
14 majority owned by JP Morgan Partners.

15 So, why Coos County? Well, the big  
16 thing about wind power and harnessing it is that you need  
17 three things: You need access to transmission, you need  
18 to get roads out there, and you need a wind resource. In  
19 Coos County, I think we found all three basically.  
20 There's also a need among states, including New Hampshire,  
21 to meet the Renewable Portfolio Standards. That was one  
22 of the reasons why we came to New Hampshire.

23 So, we'll talk about the Windpark.  
24 There's no windpark being proposed in Groveton or

1 Lancaster. We're talking about a windpark in the  
2 unincorporated places of Dixville, Erving's Location,  
3 Odell, Millsfield, and the incorporated Town of Dummer.  
4 As we said earlier, we're proposing a 99 megawatt  
5 facility, that's 33 turbines, and each wind turbine can  
6 power up to 1,000 homes.

7 The project, as you can see on the  
8 right-hand side, spans across three privately owned tracts  
9 of land totaling 80,000 acres of commercial forest. We'll  
10 be using approximately 203 acres of that land to install  
11 our facilities. It's a very small footprint on a very  
12 large piece of property.

13 So, how did we get here? This project  
14 represents about two and a half years of intensive survey  
15 experience. We've been working for a long time with local  
16 people, local community leaders, state and federal  
17 agencies. We also hired local. Horizons Engineering has  
18 been doing the civil work, as well as overseeing our  
19 wetland efforts. We hired York Land Services to do our  
20 surveying and Kel-log Logging to do some of our clearing.  
21 This is exciting for us. And, it also shows right here  
22 basically what we've done and what we've been working on  
23 to date. The completed environmental studies, the studies  
24 that we have here, are found in the Application. They're

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 under the appendices. As you can see here, and if you  
2 look, you'll have to have binoculars in the back, we've  
3 done breeding bird surveys for the New Hampshire Audubon  
4 Society. We've done raptor surveys. We've done Pine  
5 Martin surveys. We've done Canadian Link surveys. We've  
6 done archeological, cultural and historical surveys. I  
7 would encourage you to pick up the 106 process brochures  
8 outside or at the table before you leave. We've also done  
9 FAA surveys. There's a lot of work that goes into it.  
10 But, more specifically, we have one example -- you can go  
11 backwards, Mark.

12 MR. LYONS: Okay.

13 MR. DECKER: There we go. More  
14 specifically, when we talk about alternatives, the project  
15 that we're talking about today is 33 wind turbines.  
16 Initially, when we first got there to the property, we  
17 said "This is great. We've got a lot of land." But, when  
18 you've got a lot of land, it can be a blessing and a curse  
19 sometimes. So, what we did was, we decided to study the  
20 property. We put up meteorological towers to study the  
21 wind. And, we found that the wind resource could handle a  
22 gearbox known as a Vestas V-90 3-megawatt machine, and  
23 allowed us to reduce our footprints, while minimizing our  
24 impacts, because the less wind turbine foundations that we

1 have, the less impact we're going to have. This is kind  
2 of one example I want to point out that we did last  
3 summer. There's other work that has allowed us to get to  
4 the final project design that we're proposing, but a lot  
5 of it had been with the help of New Hampshire Audubon  
6 Society or Horizons Engineering, in order to minimize our  
7 impacts and utilize the existing access roads, for  
8 example, or tightened turning radii using specialty  
9 hauling machines.

10 So, the Windpark design combines the  
11 experience of our wind power projects that we've done in  
12 New York. I've personally worked on over 300 megawatts of  
13 operating wind power in New York State. One of the  
14 exciting things about this wind power project here and why  
15 we believe it's raised in Coos County is that we're  
16 utilizing existing resources. Namely, well, there's the  
17 wind, but there's also over 100 miles of logging roads on  
18 the Phillips Brook Tract alone. We're going to be using  
19 19 miles of those. It will be a multiuse. They'll still  
20 be able to use those roads, but what we're doing to do is  
21 we're going to upgrade them. And, then, we will be  
22 building 12 miles of new road in order to make this  
23 project viable. An example of the roadways that we're  
24 using is Dummer Pond Road right here. If anyone drives up

1 to Errol, you'll see them on 16 as you head -- you head  
2 north, that's the entrance, that's where we're going to  
3 talk about entering the project.

4 So, the other things that we studied and  
5 what we try to minimize are wetland impacts. The number  
6 that you see, we have 12.81 acres of wetland impacts.  
7 And, we also proposed mitigation for that. We're  
8 proposing to conserve 660 acres of watershed that forms  
9 the headwaters of the Phillips Brook. It's adjacent to  
10 the Nash Stream Forest. And, it's a very good opportunity  
11 for creating vernal pools and other restoration  
12 opportunities. And, as part of the 404 process, we've got  
13 to demonstrate that we've mitigated for wetlands. One  
14 example, I'm going to step back here, is we've actually  
15 challenged the wind turbine manufacturers to narrow down  
16 the roads to make the switchback less. And, Horizons  
17 Engineering has spent a lot of time working with them in  
18 order to minimize the impacts that we have. So, the  
19 number that you see, 12.81 acres, is drastically reduced  
20 from the original number when we first were laying out the  
21 Windpark. It's just something to note. It's found in the  
22 Application about our alternative, about our design. But  
23 we spent considerable time trying to get our wetland  
24 impact as small as possible. Half of the wetland impacts

1 that we're talking about is upgrading of culverts and the  
2 existing roadways.

3           Next. Another area that we're going to  
4 talk about for what is called "mitigation" is we have --  
5 we're using 58 acres of high elevation forests. We're  
6 proposing to conserve eight times that amount, that will  
7 be permanently set aside by conservation easement during  
8 the life of the project, 460 acres of which we will be  
9 conserving 350 of those acres above 2,700 feet that  
10 represents about 9 percent of the available habitat above  
11 2,700 feet. So, to summarize, we recognize there are  
12 issues, such as Pine Marten and Bicknell Thrush, and we  
13 are addressing them by proposing conservation and ways  
14 that we can mitigate that. So, there's another thing that  
15 we studied, and a lot of people say "Well, what's in it  
16 for me?" And, also, there are benefits associated with  
17 wind power. So, there are the direct benefits, the hiring  
18 for construction, for operation, and for our continuing  
19 work to service the windpark. There are the supporting  
20 services from around the community that allow the  
21 construction workers to go to work, supplies, materials,  
22 everything that we need basically to construct, operate,  
23 and then maintaining that project for the life of it.

24           So, we've calculated that up and we

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 estimate that we'll be employing 180 to 220 construction  
2 workers. We're looking at a two-season construction  
3 period. Basically, we would like to start construction in  
4 May of next year, and we would be finished in 2009 --  
5 2010. We estimate, this is based on our modeling, that we  
6 will be providing \$63.4 million of direct economic  
7 benefits to the county over the course of 20 years.

8 So, we have summarized a lot, and I hope  
9 I didn't go too fast. But, if I did, I recommend that you  
10 come and speak with me at my office. I'm in Lancaster at  
11 the Old Court House, on the second floor. Again, I've met  
12 a lot of people -- I've maybe seen a lot of you before,  
13 but you can also see our Application, which is online. We  
14 also have hard copies of the Application in Lancaster,  
15 Stark, Dummer, Colebrook, and other areas. So, I'm  
16 available. And, I also wanted to also introduce some of  
17 the people that are also available this evening. Mark  
18 Lyons, he works in our Legal Department; and Glenn  
19 Sampson, who does our interconnection work; we have Josh  
20 Brown, whose our Environmental Project Manager for this  
21 project; Sandy Sayyeau is the head of our Environmental  
22 Services for all of Noble; we have Tom Hiester, he's the  
23 Director of our meteorology and wind sites. So, I'm  
24 supported by a very large cast. I know I look young, but



1 I have a great amount of people that are behind me that  
2 have put together this project, and I'm extremely proud.  
3 That's it.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you.  
5 One point I wanted to make in addition is that, in  
6 addition to tonight, and under RSA 162-H:15, there's a  
7 provision that says "Upon request of a community in which  
8 the proposed facility is to be located, or upon request of  
9 the Committee, the Applicant shall provide informational  
10 hearings or meetings to inform the public of the proposed  
11 project." So, if any of the affected communities would  
12 like a presentation or a meeting on these issues for  
13 informational purposes, then the Applicant is required to  
14 satisfy that request. I have a series of questions here  
15 that, and I don't know who's going to jump up from the  
16 Applicant, because there's a lot of different topics. But  
17 the first, I've tried to group them generally in areas,  
18 but the first question: "Will the electric lines run  
19 overhead or underground or both overhead and underground?"

20 MR. BROWN: I am Josh Brown. I am the  
21 Environmental Project Manager for the Company. I worked  
22 with the layout of all the facility components. To answer  
23 that question directly, we will have both overhead and  
24 underground collection system on the ridgeline to deal

1 with problems that can arise with ice. We have designed  
2 -- the current design has underground collection. Once  
3 they come off the ridgelines, we will have overhead  
4 collection that runs along our access roads.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, then, there's  
6 a question about the blade. How much -- several  
7 questions. "How much do the blades on the turbines weigh?  
8 Does the wind's force turn those blades or is the turning  
9 assisted by oil engine? And, how much does it cost  
10 monthly for the oil engines to turn the blades, if, in  
11 fact, they do?" Is there anyone that can address that?

12 MR. HIESTER: My name is Tom Hiester,  
13 and I'm Vice President of Development at Noble, and I'm in  
14 charge of the Linear Source Assessment Group. Each blade  
15 weighs about seven tons. The blades essentially are an  
16 airfoil shape, they're like a wing. And, so, they derive  
17 their motive force of the wind passing over the wing,  
18 which gives it lift, and a portion of that force is in the  
19 direction of rotation, and that turns the main shaft,  
20 which then goes through a gearbox to increase the stage of  
21 the generators and turns the generator. So, the only  
22 force that is moving the blades is the wind. There is  
23 electric motors that will turn the machine to face into  
24 the wind, but the wind itself is the only thing that turns

1 the blade. And, there are no motors required to turn the  
2 rotor itself.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: You might as well  
4 stay here. "Could you please address the kinds of  
5 windmills you would erect in relation to noise. Will the  
6 rotors face into the wind or downwind? Will the machines  
7 be direct something [direct drive?] turbines, no gearbox  
8 to produce noise?" "Direct drive".

9 MR. HIESTER: Okay. I may have to go  
10 through the order of these.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. "Will the  
12 rotors face into the wind or downwind?"

13 MR. HIESTER: Virtually all modern wind  
14 turbines are known as "upwind turbines", which means the  
15 three blades that form the rotor are on the upwind side of  
16 the tower. When the wind direction changes, the rotor has  
17 to be repositioned. And, there's a little motor, it's  
18 called the "out motors", that will move the wind turbine  
19 to face into the wind. But, when it's operating, the  
20 rotor is on the upwind side of the turbine.

21 With the selection of the wind turbine  
22 here, as was discussed by Pip, is partly a matter of the  
23 wind resource characteristics and quality, we have a very  
24 high quality and actually a high wind resource at this

1 project site. And, wind turbines are classified often in  
2 terms of "Class I" and "Class II" turbines, depending on  
3 how strong the wind is. The particular turbine is a Class  
4 I wind turbine.

5 The noise studies have been done and  
6 they're part of the appendices that are in the  
7 Application. This is not a direct drive turbine. The low  
8 speed shaft goes through a gearbox, and the speed of the  
9 rotation goes up to the speed of the -- the high speed of  
10 the generator.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, there's a more  
12 general question about wind turbines, and doesn't appear  
13 directly related to this project, but it sounds like  
14 you're the guy. "What is the status of small roof line  
15 wind turbines, 24 inches or less? When will they be "off  
16 the shelf", available for purchase and installation by a  
17 homeowner? I understand four-foot turbines are available.  
18 Where are they?"

19 MR. HIESTER: These are not in my realm  
20 of expertise. What I would suggest, if you're interested  
21 in that, is go to the American Wind Energy Association  
22 website, which is [awea.org](http://awea.org), and they do have a section  
23 there on small wind turbines.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay, I think

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1       you're off the hook for a while. The next series of  
2       questions: "What guarantee do we have that adequate  
3       manpower will be available to repair quickly any damage to  
4       turbines and disruption of electricity to customers during  
5       and after a storm?"

6                       MR. SAMPSON: Good evening. I'm Glenn  
7       Sampson, Vice President of Technology for Noble  
8       Environmental. And, the expectation is that we would have  
9       approximately 7 to 15 personnel in the area to service the  
10      wind turbines. This is on a routine basis. And, they  
11      would ensure that turbines were available and to maintain  
12      their availability throughout the year. A windpark is  
13      somewhat different than a conventional power plant, in  
14      that generation is always available, even if one generator  
15      or several generators are out of service. So that the  
16      electrical supply is always going to be there, even if a  
17      given turbine or a set of turbines is damaged or is out of  
18      service for some routine repair.

19                      Major repairs for damage, which might  
20      occur from a lightning strike or something else, beyond  
21      the capabilities of the personnel on-site would be  
22      arranged by contract maintenance, and would be  
23      accomplished in a similar manner as any utility would  
24      maintain their generating facilities.

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1                   VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: This may be to you  
2 as well. "I would like to know what arrangements would be  
3 made to protect safety of workers within the towers during  
4 construction of these sites. How would medical help and  
5 evacuation be handled if a worker fell in the tower and  
6 dangled from his safety equipment, what equipment would be  
7 standing by? Would there be landing space for medical  
8 helicopters?"

9                   MR. SAMPSON: If I could refer to that.  
10 Okay. Noble maintains a very well-established safety  
11 office and safety procedures. Some of the concerns that  
12 are listed in this question, such as a worker falls from  
13 heights, are a particular item of concern, and one which  
14 has been addressed by our safety program, is with respect  
15 to training of personnel and with coordination with local  
16 first responders. I judge from the question that the  
17 questioner is familiar with the nature of high-elevation  
18 falls and some of the unique concerns associated with  
19 that. And, the Noble Safety Program would indeed ensure  
20 that local first responders are made aware of the unique  
21 characteristics of high altitude fall recovery and that  
22 procedures will be coordinated to address these.

23                   With respect to the specific safety  
24 precautions, all OSHA-required harnesses and fall

1 protection equipment are mandated for use by contractors  
2 and Noble personnel and are provided within the towers.  
3 Anything else?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: The next series of  
5 questions are about the power purchased and generated.  
6 "What amount of the electricity generated will remain in  
7 Coos County?" Do we have any takers? "Will this project  
8 reduce the cost of electricity for Coos residents? What  
9 benefit, if any, will the county realize from this  
10 project? How much of the grid does Granite Reliable Power  
11 control?" And, "Will New Hampshire residents have  
12 exclusive access to the power generated?" Do we have a  
13 taker?

14 MR. LYONS: Sure. The electrons flow to  
15 the load. So, we can't control where the electrons flow.  
16 It is our plan to interconnect -- my name is Mark Lyons,  
17 by the way -- to interconnect the project to the 115 kV  
18 system. That's a relatively high voltage system, but not  
19 the highest voltage system in New England. The electrons  
20 will flow initially to the closest load to the plant. But  
21 we can't, as I say, they follow the laws of something,  
22 physics, and rather than by contract.

23 In terms of the contract of the power  
24 sales, we haven't finally determined our power sales

1 program. We may sell it to a utility, we may sell it into  
2 the market as a whole through a third party broker. So,  
3 we're still working on that.

4 But, physically, the short answer on  
5 where the electricity will flow is where the load exists.  
6 When you turn on appliances in your house and your lights,  
7 you essentially attract the electricity to you. I suspect  
8 that some of that electricity will remain in Coos County,  
9 and the rest of it will flow out as needed.

10 In terms of the benefits, I think Pip  
11 talked about the benefits of the project to the county.  
12 The good news is that we have a lot to say about where the  
13 dollars flow, and some substantial economic benefits will  
14 accrue to the county and regional economy, first and  
15 foremost by the issue of our hiring people and by the  
16 payment of payments in lieu of taxes. This project is  
17 contracted with the county to pay \$495,000 a year to the  
18 county as an equivalent of a tax payment. That's a  
19 substantial economic benefit to the county. And, unlike  
20 other economic development opportunities, that may also --  
21 may also bring with them burdens on local services. We  
22 will not require the building of a new schoolhouse, for  
23 instance, to house children of employees. And, so, --  
24 And, we will not create a significant burden on local



1 services. So, it's a very high value economic development  
2 opportunity. Substantial amount of tax-type revenues,  
3 with minimal impact on local services. And, I hope that  
4 responds to the question.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you.

6 MR. LYONS: Thank you.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: I have a question  
8 regarding the valuation of the wind farm. "Why is the  
9 valuation of \$80 million at the county level and not at  
10 the state level? My understanding is that the valuation  
11 of hydro dams is only at the state level, and not at the  
12 local or county level. Why would wind turbines be treated  
13 differently?" Is there anyone that can address that  
14 issue?

15 MR. PATCH: Again, my name is Doug  
16 Patch. I am counsel to the Applicant. It's my  
17 understanding that the valuation of the project will  
18 actually be done by the State Department of Revenue  
19 Administration. And, that's primarily for the purposes of  
20 the statewide Utility Property Tax, which is a state tax  
21 that's imposed on all generating facilities. I think it's  
22 \$6.60 per thousand dollars of value. And, so, there will  
23 be a state valuation done by the Department of Revenue  
24 Administration.

1                   The pilot agreement may have a somewhat  
2                   different value of the property that was used as the basis  
3                   for that. But there is a separate valuation that will  
4                   actually be done as part of the state process.

5                   VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: There's another  
6                   question regarding payment in lieu of taxes. "Can the  
7                   county guarantee that taxes received from payment in lieu  
8                   of taxes will first be used for property taxes before  
9                   being spent on anything else?"

10                  MR. PATCH: I can just tell you what I  
11                  know. Obviously, I don't speak for the county, and there  
12                  are other people here who may want to do that tonight.  
13                  But it is our understanding that the payment in lieu of  
14                  tax revenues will be credited toward the unincorporated  
15                  area to which they are attributable. In other words, if  
16                  75 percent of the value, as determined by the Department  
17                  of Revenue Administration, is for portions of the facility  
18                  that are located, say, in Millsfield, then Millsfield  
19                  would see 75 percent of those revenues.

20                  And, I know Sue Collins is here, and  
21                  there are other people here who may, if I have stated  
22                  anything incorrectly, I'm sure they could correct me.

23                  VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: I think we now have  
24                  a rhetorical question. I'm not going to ask anybody to

1 answer: "Why are there over 200 anti-wind turbine groups  
2 in the United States?"

3 FROM THE FLOOR: That's a valid  
4 question.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Now we have a  
6 series of wildlife-related questions. And, so, if you  
7 have someone who is going to handle the wildlife,  
8 bats/birds issues. The first issue is "Has the siting of  
9 turbines been done in consultation with wildlife experts?"

10 MR. GRAVEL: My name is Adam Gravel, I'm  
11 with Stantec. I worked on this project to assess impacts  
12 to wildlife and the natural environment. What was the  
13 question again?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: "Has there been  
15 consultation with wildlife experts in the location of the  
16 turbines?"

17 MR. GRAVEL: Yes. Prior to any of the  
18 pre-construction work being conducted up there, we sent  
19 out agency letters to identify resource concerns in the  
20 area, as well as had technical meetings with them as well  
21 to further address concerns and discussed additional  
22 studies needed. Does that answer the question?

23 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: There's a few.  
24 Hang around. "If bird and bat migration surveys were

1 done, how many days were included in the survey period and  
2 days included during actual migration period, also  
3 included nocturnal migrants? Have there been any studies  
4 done on this project comparing pre- and post-construction  
5 data on birds and bats?"

6 MR. GRAVEL: Yes. There's been actually  
7 a number of surveys that were conducted to address these  
8 concerns. And, they're also posted in the appendix of the  
9 Application. For nocturnal migrants, we did -- we  
10 conducted three seasons of nocturnal radar studies to  
11 identify the number of birds that pass over the ridgeline  
12 on a given night and during the season, their flight  
13 heights and flight direction. Let's see. These were --  
14 The survey data we conducted, we conducted 30 days of  
15 surveys each season. We conducted two fall seasons, one  
16 spring. The 30 days were spread across what's thought of  
17 as the typical migration season. During spring, it's  
18 thought that 45 days is the migration window. So, we  
19 sampled 30 days within that 45 days. And, in the fall,  
20 it's considered to be 60 days, and we surveyed 30 days  
21 spread across the 60-day window. And, we also conducted  
22 daytime raptor surveys for hawk migration, as well as  
23 breeding bird surveys.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. And,

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 following up on that: "How many Bald Eagles nest within  
2 an "as the eagle flies" distance of the turbines, 5 miles,  
3 10 miles?"

4 MR. GRAVEL: I believe, without having  
5 the data right in front of me, I believe we only saw one.  
6 There are a number of nests, but I guess it depends on how  
7 close you're talking. Eagles nest in open water or near  
8 open water, which is pretty far from the summit. The  
9 closest one I believe is Dummer Pond and Millsfield Pond,  
10 and I'm not sure if there's an eagle's nest on that.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, the question  
12 is "How will these turbines not violate the Migratory Bird  
13 Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act  
14 and/or the "Endangered Species Act?"

15 MR. GRAVEL: Well, pre-construction  
16 surveys aren't very good at telling you how many birds  
17 would be impacted by the project or the turbines. So,  
18 there's no real -- I can't really answer that question.  
19 Studies were conducted to address potential impacts, but  
20 the -- it ends up coming down to certain weather  
21 conditions that may cause a collision event. But, based  
22 on pre-construction data alone, we couldn't put a number  
23 to that or even determine whether there would even be a  
24 violation that would occur.

1                   VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, then asks,  
2 "Because of the proximity to Canada and the number of  
3 migratory birds assumed killed by wind generation, do you  
4 have international bonding?"

5                   MR. GRAVEL: I don't know if I can  
6 answer that question.

7                   MR. BROWN: I don't believe we have  
8 anybody with us that can answer that question. I'm sorry.  
9 I'm Josh Brown, with Noble.

10                  VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, I think that's  
11 all we have for how on the bats, birds and wildlife.  
12 There may be a couple more in here. There's a general  
13 question about unincorporated towns. "Do they have Master  
14 Plans in regards to the protection of wildlife and natural  
15 beauty? Do any of the towns impacted by this wind project  
16 have Master Plans? If they do have Master Plans, what do  
17 they say in regards to alternative energy projects?" I  
18 don't know if there's anybody who can address that from  
19 the Applicant?

20                  MR. DECKER: The unincorporated places  
21 -- Pip Decker again. The unincorporated places does have  
22 a Master Plan where it does specifically reference wind  
23 power. Dummer has -- they also have a Master Plan, and I  
24 believe that there's a selectman here from Dummer this

1 evening that can answer that question, as well as there  
2 are representatives from the Coos Planning Board that  
3 oversee the unincorporated places to more specifically  
4 address where wind power and how it's referenced in their  
5 Master Plan later. Is that okay?

6 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: If anybody from the  
7 county or any of the towns or unincorporated places want  
8 to make a comment later or address any of these issues,  
9 then we'd be more than happy to have you come up and  
10 complete our understanding of these issues.

11 MR. DECKER: But, also, just to  
12 reiterate, that also found in the appendices are copies of  
13 the Master Plans for both Dummer and the unincorporated  
14 places.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, this may be  
16 another one that you might be able to handle. "What  
17 assurances will be made for continued recreational access  
18 to ridgeline and road systems?" And, "Will there be times  
19 during operation when areas are closed to the public?"

20 MR. DECKER: Yes, that's a great  
21 question. We've been working with both the landowners in  
22 the Town of Dummer to address recreational activities. We  
23 have a letter from the people that manage Phillips Brook  
24 saying that these recreational activities will continue

1 after operation. We've been working with the other  
2 adjacent landowner, Bayroot, to ensure that ATV access  
3 continues. We've also been working with the snowmobile  
4 people with trails, to ensure that snowmobile access will  
5 continue where there is access on these properties.

6 In terms of operation, there's going to  
7 be an operations manager of those. You know, for the most  
8 part, when wind turbines are operating, they're pretty  
9 benign. Unless there is a severe icing condition, and we  
10 will dispatch our operators, we'll make sure that people  
11 are aware. We'll be developing these kind of safety  
12 mechanisms, in addition to the ones that Glenn Sampson  
13 discussed, and incorporate that into our maintenance  
14 procedures, to ensure that the public is safe in any kind  
15 of events that is rare.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, how will this  
17 project affect the \$1.1 billion segment of New Hampshire's  
18 forest industry that is attributed to open space?

19 MR. DECKER: That's a great question. I  
20 believe that wind power actually helps keep open spaces  
21 open. If you think about this, you know, these are very  
22 large parcels. The landowners receive an income from the  
23 generation of wind power revenue, a percentage of that  
24 will go to them. I believe that it can help them keep



1 those parcels together. If you're not making a lot of  
2 money in those down years when you can't sell timber, then  
3 what are you going to do? You're going to have to sell  
4 off some of those parcels, and eventually the pieces get  
5 smaller. Now, I'm not saying that they're going to do  
6 that, but that's just an opportunity. We found that has  
7 been successful in New York with some of the farmers, you  
8 know, when they had the dairy prices go down, they had a  
9 second income coming in. So, I think it's a way actually  
10 to preserve some of the forests here.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, "Will the  
12 noise disrupt deer hunting, fishing, hikers, owl nests and  
13 some other kind of nests?"

14 MR. DECKER: We've done a lot of noise  
15 surveys for this. We've put out receptors in eight  
16 locations around the perimeter of the project area and  
17 you'll find them in the appendices. And, we found that  
18 noise will not negatively impact any human beings or the  
19 public.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Says "Regional  
21 economic development agencies, with the help of federal  
22 economic development funds, have been working hard to  
23 bring biomass forward as a way to support the forest  
24 economy. How will this project's use of the remaining

1 transmission capability affect those plants?"

2 MR. DECKER: Well, I think what we're  
3 discussing here is a specific windpark. We're going to be  
4 using access or we're going to be bringing megawatts onto  
5 this loop. There has been a lot of discussion on  
6 upgrading this loop, of which we're an active participant.  
7 In terms of, I mean, this is -- the issue with wind power  
8 is that it's a locationally constrained resource, and we  
9 need to get it out to the grid. And, so, you know, again,  
10 our aging infrastructure electrically, as well as on the  
11 highways and roads, needs to be upgraded. And, we will be  
12 trying to work and contribute towards that.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: I guess, and not  
14 really my place to be testifying on behalf of the  
15 Applicant, but I think this question raises a general  
16 issue about transmission capacity in the North Country, an  
17 issue that the Legislature has been following very  
18 closely. The Legislature created a Transmission  
19 Commission, I am a part of that commission as Chairman of  
20 the Public Utilities Commission, and Michael Harrington is  
21 very active in that, as is Jack Ruderman. And, the PUC  
22 issued a report last year, last December, that explains  
23 generally about how the transmission system works in the  
24 North Country and what the rules are with respect to it.

1 And, I think the question is generally asked. And, the  
2 answer, in a general way, is that PSNH has determined that  
3 there's in the neighborhood of 100 megawatts of capacity  
4 available on the Coos County loop. With an investment of  
5 10 to \$15 million by Noble, which is the first company in  
6 line in the interconnection queue that's handled by the  
7 Independent System Operator, they basically are first in  
8 line to have studies done and to interconnect to that  
9 line.

10 So, the general understanding is, if  
11 this project is built, and it's built to its capacity,  
12 then there will be very little remaining room on the  
13 existing transmission loop to interconnect other, other  
14 large generation projects. There are at least two  
15 wood-burning projects that are in the ISO queue that are  
16 also participating in this Transmission Commission  
17 undertaking by the Legislature. And, there have been  
18 questions raised from time to time, under ISO rules,  
19 whether they can interconnect under a process called the  
20 "Minimum Interconnection Standard". And, under that  
21 approach, basically, some other facility, if it  
22 interconnected, would be at risk of being bumped by  
23 someone earlier in line who could also produce power at a  
24 lower cost. So, that's the general outlines of how the --

1 of the capacity that remains on the line.

2 Preliminary estimates of an upgrade to  
3 the Coos County loop to accommodate approximately 300 or  
4 more additional megawatts of generation, that that  
5 investment would be 150 to 200 or more million dollars.  
6 And, that's a preliminary estimate. They have not done  
7 the fine engineering estimates of what the cost would be  
8 of expanding the capacity of that line. And, you have to  
9 understand, with these types of projects, that you would  
10 be -- you would be expanding them in big chunks. It  
11 doesn't just go up by 10, 20, 30 megawatts. You have to  
12 expand the transmission line to take on large additional  
13 generation capacity.

14 And, there's another, seems to be a  
15 related question: "If it will take the Federal Energy  
16 Regulatory Commission rules to change to force Maine,  
17 Mass., Vermont, and the rest of the ISO New England power  
18 grid to share the cost to beef up the closed transmission  
19 loop that runs through Littleton, Berlin, and Whitefield,  
20 which would take years, how will those receiving the  
21 energy contribute financially to the North Country's  
22 expense and usage permanently of New Hampshire land?"

23 Well, let me address part of what also  
24 is going on in terms of expanding the transmission line in

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 Coos County. Two approaches that are recognized under the  
2 ISO rules: One for reliability projects and, if it's  
3 determined to be a reliability project, then all the  
4 states in New England share in the cost in proportion to  
5 their load. If that is a reliability project, or a  
6 project that other states should support, then New  
7 Hampshire residents would pay for approximately 9,  
8 10 percent of the cost of the investment. The other  
9 general alternative, if a project is not for regional  
10 reliability, if it's considered a localized project, then  
11 the other states don't contribute, and the customers in  
12 New Hampshire would pay for all of the cost of that line.

13                   What we are doing, through the PUC, is  
14 pressing the issue that investments in transmission for  
15 renewable projects meet another subsection of the ISO  
16 rules called an "Economic Transmission Upgrade". And, our  
17 position we're taking is that there will be regional  
18 benefits from renewable power, and that there are benefits  
19 to the other states. And, there's an existing process,  
20 unfortunately, it's not very closely defined at the ISO,  
21 but we believe there's a strong argument that there is  
22 this other category of upgrades called "Economic  
23 Transmission Upgrades" that can qualify for sharing among  
24 the states.

1                   Northeast Utilities has filed a proposal  
2 with the ISO asking for a study, and asserting that the  
3 sharing of costs should take place among the states. We  
4 are actively involved in negotiations with the other five  
5 states, in fact, we will be having a meeting in Holyoke  
6 next week to press this issue. Like anything that there's  
7 a big debate about, and Massachusetts is very strong in  
8 its position that these costs should not be shared,  
9 because they would be picking up 50 percent of the costs.  
10 So, there's a lot -- there's a strong dispute among the  
11 states. And, at this juncture, it's Maine, New Hampshire,  
12 Vermont, and Rhode Island taking a position about economic  
13 upgrades being shared, while Massachusetts and Connecticut  
14 are taking the opposite position, that they should not be  
15 shared among the states.

16                   And, the next question is "Would Granite  
17 Reliable Power be willing to drop to Number 3 or 4 in the  
18 ISO queue, so that Coos County could have two biomass  
19 plants erected for more jobs. After the update of the  
20 Coos loop, the wind project could reapply, asking to  
21 postpone for Coos to provide more jobs?

22                   MR. LYONS: Hi, I'm Mark Lyons again,  
23 still. Just want to clarify that we're not talking about  
24 a situation here where we're competing wind energy against

1 wood energy. Both are great renewable resources. The  
2 North Country here is blessed with both types of  
3 resources. I should point out that we, ourselves, have a  
4 queue slot, you know, down the road as well. So, we and  
5 other wind energy developers, just like other wood energy  
6 developers, are waiting for the transmission upgrades that  
7 need to be done for the North Country, will help boost the  
8 entire infrastructure and economy in the North Country,  
9 and we're confident that they will be done. But it's not  
10 a question of wood versus wind.

11 The ISO has rules for ordering the  
12 market for transmission capacity. And, we and everyone  
13 else that's in the queue have followed those rules. We  
14 think we have a very, very beneficial project, for the  
15 economy, for the environment, for the whole region. And,  
16 you know, we will look forward to and participate and help  
17 support the upgrades, just as I hope all subsequent  
18 projects will. It's simply a question of following the  
19 rules for ordering the transmission capacity market. And,  
20 for all of us to contribute to getting the transmission  
21 upgrades that are necessary to tap all of the resources up  
22 here. Thank you.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: "How large are the  
24 bases that hold the turbine? Are they concrete or rock

1 anchor bases?"

2 MR. BROWN: The base of the turbine, the  
3 turbine pedestal at the base is approximately 16 feet in  
4 diameter. The foundation of the tower has not been fully  
5 engineered yet. Based on preliminary studies that we've  
6 done, we are expecting these to be a rock anchor style  
7 foundation.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, "What  
9 percentage of time will the turbines produce power based  
10 on the data collected from the meteorological towers?"

11 MR. HIESTER: Tom Hiester again. The  
12 turbines will be generating something approximately  
13 75 percent of the time, and likely to be at full output  
14 around a thousand hours a year. There's 8,760 hours in a  
15 year, and will be generating at some intermediate level of  
16 output much of the rest of the time.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, "How many tons  
18 of carbon dioxide, the major greenhouse gas, will be  
19 avoided each year by this project?"

20 MR. DECKER: The Application actually  
21 has both sulfur dioxide and nitrous oxide in CO2  
22 emissions. And, we estimate that we will offset  
23 approximately 303 million pounds of CO2 each year from the  
24 installation of the windpark. It's also found in our



1 Application and you can double check my math.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, this may be  
3 for you again. "When you speak of "roadways", are you  
4 also referring to skid trails? Are you planning on paving  
5 any or all roads?"

6 MR. DECKER: We will not be paving any  
7 roads. Skid trails and roads are very distinct. There  
8 are skid trails that are on the property. But we need to  
9 have, and it's also in the Application, the proposed  
10 roadways, where we are allowed to drive a truck on, and  
11 then roadways that we will build which you do not. So, 19  
12 miles, as I said, those are existing roadways, those are  
13 not skid roadways.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Another  
15 road-related question. "You talk about upgrading current  
16 roads, as well as constructing new ones. Some of these  
17 current roads are in bad shape. What is the estimated  
18 amount of fill and gravel needed for this?"

19 MR. DECKER: We're going to need a lot  
20 of gravel.

21 MR. LaFRANCE: My name is Steve  
22 LaFrance. I'm with Horizons Engineering. Just to speak a  
23 little bit to the new versus proposed roads. We assumed  
24 about 19 miles of existing roads will be used. Those

1 roads are in various conditions now. Some are actually  
2 used daily, some are used infrequently. But we haven't  
3 actually done what we call a "cut and fill analysis" to  
4 determine the amount of material, but we were looking at  
5 numbers of upwards of 300,000 cubic yards of gravel to  
6 resurface these existing roads. They won't be paved, but  
7 they will get new gravel surfaces.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, probably  
9 related: "Also, maintenance of dirt roads in this area  
10 can be severe and erosion is a huge issue to many wild  
11 brook trout streams. What are your plans for minimizing  
12 gravel erosion to these water bodies, since all this high  
13 elevation work will run downhill?"

14 MR. LaFRANCE: We spent actually quite a  
15 bit of time working through some of the details of the  
16 erosion control plan. It's our intent to use a variety of  
17 what we call "BMPs", Best Management Practices, to address  
18 those issues. Essentially, the goal is to not concentrate  
19 runoff, but to try to disperse it, distribute it as  
20 frequently as we can back into the environment. We  
21 anticipate actually an improvement on the existing roads,  
22 because we're going to be removing and replacing existing  
23 culverts with larger open-bottom structures in some  
24 locations. And, on the higher elevation roads, which are

1 steeper, we'll have water bars, diverters, stone-lined  
2 ditches, and plunge pools to divert that water and get it  
3 back into the undisturbed areas.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, another  
5 bat/bird question: "A recent study estimated over 2,000  
6 bats were killed during a one-year period at wind power  
7 facilities and, in another, 38 bats per turbine per  
8 six-week study period, which raises the question, will  
9 this not result in a taking of bats and other species?"

10 MR. GRAVEL: Adam Gravel again. These  
11 estimates are based on Central Appalachian states, where  
12 there are far more bats than up here. We also -- we did  
13 one full year of acoustics studies up on the site. And,  
14 we used the on-site met towers to get detectors up in the  
15 air to try to sample the areas near the rotor zone. We  
16 documented overall pretty low activity.

17 This "38 bats per turbine per year" is  
18 also generated nationwide. We have recent studies in the  
19 Northeast that have showed far fewer bats. For example, a  
20 study at an existing Mars Hill wind project in Maine, we  
21 found only six bats over I believe it was a year and a  
22 half period.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. This  
24 question asks or says "Noble Environmental is under

1 investigation by the New York Attorney General's Office  
2 with allegations of bribery and other questionable  
3 business practices." It asserts that Noble is "in debt  
4 and attempting an IPO. What assets does Granite Reliable  
5 Power have Noble goes belly-up?"

6 MR. LYONS: Mark Lyons again. It's true  
7 that Noble Environmental was served with a subpoena asking  
8 for information regarding our business practices in New  
9 York. That subpoena is publicly available, and I invite  
10 you to read through it yourself, and I think you'll find  
11 an absence of any specific allegations of wrong-doing. We  
12 had been cooperating with the Attorney General's Office,  
13 you know, extensively since receiving that petition or  
14 subpoena. And, you know, I can't report on any specific  
15 outcomes, but we have been fully cooperating. And, again,  
16 it's not as if we were told we did anything in particular  
17 wrong. So, we have attorneys who are talking with them  
18 and trying to clarify what concerns, if any, they have.  
19 We're fully cooperating. And, beyond that, I really don't  
20 have any specific information.

21 The project itself will be  
22 project-financed. There's a great deal of value in the  
23 project itself. And, given that it's an excellent wind  
24 resource, we expect it to be a profitable project for some

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 time to come. And, you know, it's not infrequent that  
2 projects get sold to new buyers. But I think it's  
3 important to recognize that, when that happens, and in the  
4 course of the process, it will be clear that any new owner  
5 will be bound by the same permits and agreements that we  
6 are. And, we fully expect that the wind will continue to  
7 blow up on the ridge and the project will remain in  
8 operation. And, there's a good old profit motive to make  
9 sure that that remains so.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, there's a  
11 question that appears to be in regard to mitigation  
12 efforts, asks "How does listing wetlands and mountain tops  
13 you are not destroying make up for those that are  
14 destroyed?"

15 MR. BROWN: Josh Brown. Mitigation is  
16 to conserve potential loss of wetlands. So, we have  
17 mitigated as much as we can by avoiding and reducing the  
18 amount of impact to wetlands. For projects, to build  
19 roads, the roads you drive on every day, there is an  
20 impact. So, to mitigate for the impact that this project  
21 will have, we will protect other wetlands and other areas  
22 from being able to be impacted later. And, I think it's  
23 very important to realize that both of these parcels, all  
24 this land that we are working with is a commercial forest

1 at this point. So, the impact of the wetlands and the  
2 high elevation forested area that we are protecting are  
3 currently susceptible to different forms of impact.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, a question  
5 asks "Are you prepared to face litigation which could  
6 cause your project to be stopped on grounds related to  
7 economic harm, habitat disruption, endangered species,  
8 habitat or other issues?"

9 MR. LYONS: Mark Lyons. What we're  
10 prepared to do is do a thorough job of describing and  
11 mitigating all potential impacts from the project. And,  
12 participate vigorously in the SEC process and in the Army  
13 Corps of Engineers' process, which both provide full  
14 opportunity for the public and all experts to analyze this  
15 project thoroughly and make sure that every potential  
16 impact is identified and investigated and fully mitigated.  
17 And, that's the way we do projects everywhere we do  
18 projects. That's the way good wind developers operate.  
19 And, hopefully, thereby minimize any basis for litigation.  
20 We can't control what other people do. But our job is to  
21 make sure that every issue is identified, investigated,  
22 and fully discussed, and every impact is fully mitigated  
23 to the satisfaction of the Committee. And, thereby,  
24 hopefully avoid the need for any challenge later on.

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 We're not cutting any corners here.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, I have two  
3 other cards that are really comments, not questions. The  
4 first says "Wind power is 30 percent reliable and biomass  
5 is 100 percent reliable, and wind power will employ more  
6 people long term, while bio energy plants" -- well, it's  
7 kind of hard to read this -- but, basically, the point is  
8 that more people would be employed in biomass facilities  
9 than in wind facilities, and asks "why are we even  
10 discussing this?"

11 And, then, there's another card that  
12 speaks to "Habitat conservation and incidental take  
13 permits in compliance with the federal Endangered Species  
14 Act. To avoid penalties and possible project shutdown  
15 later, you are assuming a huge business risk by not  
16 obtaining an incidental take permit. Don't destroy the  
17 environment to save it." And, a follow-up on mitigation:  
18 "Would mitigation ever include putting a conservation  
19 easement on the entire property in perpetuity?"

20 MR. BROWN: The mitigation for this  
21 project would not be able to reach those levels. We work  
22 with the landowners. This is a commercial forest. They  
23 have their needs in mind. We need to find a way that we  
24 can mitigate and create a positive benefit from, you know,

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 more positive benefit from this project. But, these are  
2 commercial forests, and it is a business operation, and it  
3 is a landowner concern.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, the last card  
5 I have is really to the Committee. It says "To what  
6 extent will future submitted written comments be  
7 considered in the overall approval process?" And, RSA  
8 162-H:10, Section III, says, in part, that "The Committee  
9 shall consider and weigh written information and reports  
10 submitted to it by members of the public before, during,  
11 and subsequent to public hearings." So, if you have  
12 additional written comments, then submit them when you  
13 have them.

14 Next, I'll turn to Peter Roth. Peter,  
15 do you have questions that you'd like to ask of the  
16 Applicant?

17 MR. ROTH: Yes. Should I come up there?  
18 In light of the fact that there will be lengthy hearings  
19 on this in the adjudicative process, I'm not going to ask  
20 a lot of cross-examining questions, and really I'm going  
21 to be fairly general and brief tonight.

22 In respect to the last comment that was  
23 made, I will say that I participated in the Lempster Wind  
24 Project, and the hearings there lasted three or four days.



1 And, probably every day of the hearings there were  
2 comments that were received by members of the Site  
3 Evaluation Committee, by myself, by the project  
4 developers, that were submitted into the record, read, and  
5 made part of the record during the hearing and afterwards.  
6 I don't know -- there's no way to know for sure what  
7 weight any of those comments had in the decision making,  
8 because that goes on in the head of the people who make  
9 the decision. But they were certainly considered and put  
10 in the record.

11 I have a very few questions to ask. One  
12 thing, with respect to the fish and wildlife impacts, and  
13 whether the project, in conducting studies on birds, in  
14 particular, followed the United States Fish & Wildlife  
15 Service guidelines in producing and planning those  
16 studies?

17 MR. GRAVEL: My name is Adam Gravel. We  
18 -- First of all, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife guidelines are  
19 recommended guidelines, and are not -- nothing holds you  
20 to it, I guess. In this instance, we actually did more  
21 than what's typically conducted in New Hampshire,  
22 especially one we did three seasons radar surveys, which  
23 is more than what we have seen. But the major point is  
24 that we consulted state and federal agencies prior to

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 conducting any of these surveys. So, a lot of the study  
2 designs were discussed and agreed upon prior to conducting  
3 them. Does that answer your question?

4 MR. ROTH: Yes. Thank you. An issue  
5 came up during -- going back to the Fish & Wildlife,  
6 sorry, I shouldn't have let you sit down so quickly. Are  
7 there any special considerations because of the high  
8 elevation or the high latitude of the facility with  
9 respect to Fish & Wildlife?

10 MR. BROWN: Specifically with concerns  
11 of the Fish & Wildlife Department, they did not identify  
12 particular species of concern, both threatened species or  
13 endangered species, for the project. We have addressed  
14 the high elevation impact of the project. That is part of  
15 why we have a high elevation mitigation package for the  
16 project.

17 MR. ROTH: With respect to the forest  
18 resources on the site, has the project identified any old  
19 growth forest or forest that was not previously disturbed  
20 or harvested that's going to be impacted by this project?

21 MR. GRAVEL: Was old growth forest on  
22 the project there going to be impacted?

23 MR. ROTH: Have you identified any old  
24 growth or other forest that hasn't been disturbed? And,

1 if so, what do you plan to do with it?

2 MR. GRAVEL: We have identified some,  
3 and that's part of the reason why we're doing the  
4 mitigation plan. But, in New Hampshire, there's nothing  
5 restricting, or as far as I know, no regulations  
6 restricting harvesting above 2,700 feet. It's definitely  
7 in the best interest and part of good management  
8 practices. But we did identify maybe one spot on Kelsey,  
9 Kelsey Ridge, that was old growth.

10 MR. ROTH: And, what's going to happen  
11 to that?

12 MR. GRAVEL: What's going to happen to  
13 the old growth forest?

14 MR. ROTH: Right.

15 MR. GRAVEL: Well, without having a map  
16 in front of me, I don't know exactly the amount. But  
17 there will most likely be a turbine -- a turbine road and  
18 turbine pads along that ridge.

19 MR. BROWN: Josh Brown. I'd just like  
20 to continue on what Adam said. A portion of the  
21 identified area that is old growth will be impacted by a  
22 road or a turbine of the project. And, I think it's a  
23 good time to point out that the high elevation mitigation  
24 package that we have submitted is to conserve a 500-foot

1 buffer all the way around our facilities on Owlshead and  
2 Kelsey, which would protect a large portion of the rest of  
3 that old growth forest.

4 MR. ROTH: Okay, moving to another  
5 topic. This one is maybe sort of out there, but I have  
6 personally experienced in the North Country low-altitude  
7 training missions by Air National Guard and Air Force,  
8 fighter jets. Have you had any consultation with Air  
9 National Guard or the Air Force concerning their usual  
10 flight and training paths and that kind of stuff, to see  
11 if you're going to be building within their path? And, if  
12 so, what do you know about what that's going to do to  
13 those flights?

14 MR. DECKER: As part of our process, in  
15 terms of siting the windmills, we do what's called a  
16 "Communication Search Study", which identifies flight  
17 paths and FAA restrictions. And, we are not aware that we  
18 are impacting any flight path restrictions. But we are  
19 aware that there is a flight path north of this project  
20 site. We are not going to be impacting that. And,  
21 that's, I believe, in the Application.

22 MR. ROTH: Okay. Now, my experience  
23 with the Lempster Project was that there was some  
24 controversy over the size of the road that was being

1 constructed for purposes of bringing in the equipment and  
2 the construction, particularly, the cranes that are needed  
3 to lift the tower sections and the nacelles into place.  
4 Do you expect the road construction to be equal to what  
5 was done up in Lempster or less? And, in addition, what  
6 will you do to restore the roads to their original  
7 dimension, their original geometry, after construction is  
8 completed?

9 MR. BROWN: The project has a couple  
10 varieties of roads. We have the roads necessary to bring  
11 in the equipment. There are -- We have a smaller width  
12 road, they have a large turning radius, to get the  
13 equipment in, and then up to the ridge line. Once we're  
14 on the ridgeline, we have a wider road. And, the reason  
15 for that is we have a 30-foot wide crane that needs to  
16 walk along that road to each of the turbine sites. So, we  
17 are going to be 34-foot wide along the ridgeline.

18 How this compares to Lempster, I'm not  
19 entirely sure. It's my understanding that they have a  
20 different crane technology than we're utilizing. But, to  
21 meet our project schedule, these are the cranes that we  
22 need to use, and these are the roads that you need to be  
23 able to build to safely move along the ridgeline.

24 MR. ROTH: Don't go away yet, I have

1 another as a follow-up. One of the things that impressed  
2 me about the Lempster Project was not so much the width of  
3 the road pathway, the roadway itself, but the cut along  
4 the side of the road and the amount of crushed rock and  
5 other material, like grading, that was done. Both -- So,  
6 you have removal of the forest cover to a significant  
7 extent on either side of the road, and particularly around  
8 curves, you then have grading and cutting and banks and  
9 such to make that happen. Do you expect to do that sort  
10 of work? And, if you do, are you going to bring it back  
11 to its original dimension simply for purposes of  
12 operation?

13 MR. BROWN: There will be cut and fill  
14 associated with this project. And, we have minimized the  
15 amount that we can do by employing specialty hauling  
16 equipment that can handle a steeper grade and tighter  
17 turning radiuses, to minimize, to the extent we can, the  
18 impact of these roads. But there will be cut and fill.  
19 There will be, you know, there are places where we will  
20 have to remove bedrock to install our road. And, after  
21 the construction of this project, the road that we are  
22 installing will remain in its construction dimensions.  
23 Removing, you know, it's hard to put road back, after you  
24 remove, you know, remove bedrock.

1                   MR. ROTH: Now, I understand that there  
2                   is an offer to people in the community to tour one of your  
3                   facilities in New York. Has that tour happened? If not,  
4                   when is it going to happen? And, if people are interested  
5                   in going, what do they have to do to join?

6                   MR. DECKER: In my second life, I will  
7                   be a tour guide. So, we'll -- actually, if no one has  
8                   ever been to a windpark, they should go. I always feel  
9                   like, before you buy the car, drive the car. Before you  
10                  leave tonight, I guess we can put out a sign-up sheet.  
11                  What we will do is we will organize a tour. We don't have  
12                  a date set for a tour yet. But we do have, you know,  
13                  windparks in operation. You can go speak with the local  
14                  selectmen over there and about their experiences with us.  
15                  We can help coordinate on that, but there is -- no date  
16                  has been set yet. We can coordinate with our facility  
17                  managers over in New York to assist in that. But we will  
18                  make it available. And, you know, there will be a sign-up  
19                  sheet in my office, if you guys want to stop in and say  
20                  "hi".

21                  MR. ROTH: Okay. All right. Another  
22                  issue that was of great interest in Lempster was noise --  
23                  One of the issues that was very controversial in the  
24                  Lempster Project was noise. And, that was in large part

1 because of the proximity of the project to people's  
2 year-round residences and summer residences. I know the  
3 Application speaks to the nearest residence to the  
4 project. And, I'm not going to specifically ask about  
5 that, I don't believe anybody commented on that in the  
6 presentation. So, perhaps it would be helpful. But one  
7 of the things that surprised us, I think, was that the  
8 developer in that case never presented a study showing the  
9 actual noise that one of these projects installed actually  
10 produced. And, instead, the noise experts relied upon  
11 laboratory data and engineering information modeling. Do  
12 you have anything that would indicate or evidence of a  
13 study of the noise that one of these projects actually  
14 produces in its installed condition and operate -- and  
15 under normal operation at a site?

16 MR. BROWN: Josh Brown. Our noise study  
17 was performed by Hesler Associates. They're responsible  
18 for many, many noise modeling scenarios for windparks all  
19 across the country. They also go back to the sites after  
20 complete installation and spot check to confirm that their  
21 information was correct, and to address any potential  
22 issues.

23 MR. ROTH: So, I take it that the answer  
24 is "yes", such studies are available?

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}



1 MR. BROWN: Yes.

2 MR. ROTH: And, you will make them  
3 available to me?

4 MR. LYONS: Yes.

5 MR. BROWN: Yes.

6 MR. ROTH: Thank you. Are there any  
7 future plans for developing the site, beyond its wind  
8 usage, either recreational, residential, anything like  
9 that? You can just shout out "no", if the answer is "no".

10 MR. DECKER: No.

11 MR. ROTH: Okay.

12 MR. DECKER: I mean, just to reiterate,  
13 we have very limited rights to the property. Again, wind  
14 power is three things: Harnessing the wind, transmitting  
15 the power, and maintaining the turbines during its  
16 operational life. You know, this small sliver of land  
17 that we're using, that's what we have the access and the  
18 rights to. The landowner owns the rest of it.

19 MR. ROTH: And, I heard mention of  
20 further projects in the queue for Noble, wind projects in  
21 Coos County. How big are they? When do you expect to  
22 have them come up in the queue and be developed? And,  
23 where are you contemplating putting them?

24 MR. DECKER: The second project is in

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 the queue for Noble. It's 146 megawatts, is to the  
2 northeast of this project site. But, again, you know, the  
3 transmission situation is what it is. So, we don't have  
4 an exact date that we would like to propose and say that  
5 that would be on line. But I would reiterate that there  
6 are wind resources available up here, and I think you  
7 would want to get as many megawatts to market that you  
8 can. And, the first 99 megawatts, that's what we're  
9 hoping to deliver here.

10 MR. ROTH: And, my penultimate and  
11 ultimate questions, which are related: Is this project  
12 for sale now? And, I understand that the project is owned  
13 and majority shared by JP Morgan Partners, I think is what  
14 you identified, owned by a New York investment house.  
15 And, everybody is painfully aware of what's going on in  
16 New York these days. Are there any issues with the  
17 current financial crisis with respect to this project's  
18 financeability or developability?

19 MR. LYONS: Hi, I'm Mark Lyons. This  
20 project is not currently for sale. And, we're all  
21 familiar with the problems, the general credit problems in  
22 the world economy, frankly. We don't intend to finance  
23 this project until just prior to beginning construction,  
24 which is sometime off. We all hope that the credit

1 markets will improve by then. I don't have a crystal  
2 ball. If I did, I'd be calling you for my vote. But, you  
3 know, we're hoping for the best. It doesn't create any  
4 specific problem for this project at this time.

5 MR. ROTH: That covers all of my  
6 questions now. Thank you very much.

7 MR. PATCH: Thank you.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: One important  
9 question. Mr. Patnaude?

10 MR. PATNAUDE: Keep going, I guess, for  
11 now.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. We'll turn  
13 to public comments. Councilor Burton.

14 COUNCILOR BURTON: Good evening, ladies  
15 and gentlemen. And, thank you all for coming out tonight.  
16 It's now the people's time to have their say. I'm Ray  
17 Burton. I serve 98 towns and four cities, 250,000 people  
18 spread across the five northern counties. I can tell you  
19 this Site Evaluation process works. I've seen it work  
20 with the Pontook Project many years ago. All of those  
21 major projects that come and have a significant impact, it  
22 does work. These people are experts in their field. They  
23 know what they're doing, and I also appreciate the federal  
24 side being here today as well.

1                   I appear in support of this project. I  
2                   can tell you that this company didn't come swooping in in  
3                   the cover of darkness. They set up an office down here at  
4                   the Old Court House. And, throughout the entire process  
5                   of this project, I've had only one inquiry that reached my  
6                   desk, if you will. And, Pip was right on it, got right  
7                   back, and I would commend you people in the outstanding  
8                   job you did in presenting your project tonight. I think  
9                   this fits well with our culture here in the north, in the  
10                  Northeast, and also in the North Country of New Hampshire.

11                  You reached out to people who live here.  
12                  Steve LaFrance, a very well known and respected experts in  
13                  their field. Coos County needs this kind of economic  
14                  stimulus, if you will. It isn't going to create a  
15                  thousand jobs, it isn't going to create another mill, but  
16                  it is a step, I believe, in the right direction. So, I  
17                  appear in support of it. I'm going to sit down and listen  
18                  to you, the people, as to what you have to say. But I  
19                  want to be on the record as in support of this project. I  
20                  think it fits well in the overall picture and scheme of  
21                  things as we move life forward here in northern New  
22                  Hampshire. Thank you.

23                  VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Representative  
24                  King.

1                   REP. KING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,  
2                   thank you to the Committee, I thank everyone for turning  
3                   out tonight. I'm Representative Fred King, I live in  
4                   Colebrook, and I represent Coos District 1. I especially  
5                   do want to thank the Committee for coming here to  
6                   Groveton. I had not intended to speak this evening, but  
7                   late this afternoon I received a call from Representative  
8                   Theberge, our Chairman, who is ill and cannot be here, and  
9                   asked me to speak on his behalf. So, that's what I'm  
10                  doing.

11                   Let me begin by discussing how the --  
12                  how the county elected officials get involved in a project  
13                  such as this. An energy project is going to effect not  
14                  only the county, but the entire state, and probably New  
15                  England. In Coos County, there are 23 unincorporated  
16                  places. Grafton and Carroll County each have one, and  
17                  there are no other counties in New Hampshire with  
18                  unincorporated places. The unincorporated places in this  
19                  county have always been our economic bread basket. Much  
20                  of the wood for our pulp mills came off these industrial  
21                  lands. They have always been and always support a haven  
22                  for sportsmen, hunters, fishermen and snowmobilers, among  
23                  others. These are privately owned, investor-owned  
24                  properties. They have always been opened to the public,

1 and they will continue to be open to the public if this  
2 project is built. About 25 years ago, and, unfortunately,  
3 I was involved in it at the time, and still am, the  
4 governance of how these incorporated places were going to  
5 be governed became an issue. And, at that time, about  
6 half of the management of these unincorporated places was  
7 done by the State, and the other half was done by the  
8 County. The half that the State did was basically school  
9 issues, children that had to be educated, were all dealt  
10 with in Concord. The other thing, the State collected all  
11 of the timber tax, that severance tax (inaudible) was  
12 collected by the Treasurer of the State. The State used  
13 some of that money to run their own operation, and, if  
14 there was anything left over, it went to the County.

15 This became an issue for the  
16 Commissioners at that time. And, in 1989, the laws were  
17 rewritten. And, I want to make it clear, so everybody  
18 understands, and especially the Committee if you're not  
19 familiar with it, at that time RSA 28:7-a was written.  
20 And, what that says is, it talks about services to  
21 unincorporated towns and unorganized places. And, it  
22 says, "For each unincorporated town or unorganized place,  
23 the county in which it is located and its commissioners  
24 shall have the same responsibilities for providing

1 services as a town and its governing body. County  
2 conventions", and county delegations, which I'm one of,  
3 "may at any legal meeting grant and vote such sums of  
4 money as they judge necessary" for the purposes of this  
5 county budget.

6 So, essentially, it said, from now on,  
7 in unincorporated places, in Coos County, county  
8 commissioner is going to function as a selectman. Other  
9 statutes were changed, where it defined "selectman" in the  
10 statute, it says, "in the case of unincorporated places,  
11 it's the selectman", where it talks about the governing  
12 body, which, in organized towns, is a town meeting, it  
13 says it's the county delegation. It also established a  
14 planning board for the unincorporated places. And, since  
15 1989, we've had a planning board. Planning board members  
16 are appointed by the Commissioners, and approved by the  
17 county delegation.

18 The big issue was timber taxes, as I  
19 said. And, when the county took over control, the county  
20 started collecting the timber tax. And, what it did, if  
21 timber was being in X unincorporated places, the revenue  
22 went to offset the expenses in that place. And, as a  
23 result of that, for many, many years, and most of time,  
24 there have not been any more property taxes in

1 unincorporated places. The commissioners at the time were  
2 very interested in making sure that these large industrial  
3 lands were kept open. If you'll recall, there had just  
4 been a major sale of land in the Coos County area. And,  
5 my Commissioners at that time, being paranoid, were very  
6 concerned that these lands were going to be sold and split  
7 up and developed, and the wood resource, which supported  
8 if pulp mills, was going to be gone. And, the feeling  
9 was, if they could keep the taxes down or at a minimum or  
10 no taxes at all, it would encourage the industrial  
11 landowners to keep their land in timber protection.

12 And, that's one of the few things that  
13 the government's every did that I can remember worked.  
14 There's been very few towns that had a timber tax, I think  
15 -- or had a property tax. I think last year was the first  
16 time in years there was property taxes in some of these  
17 towns. So, we were stuck with the problem of governing  
18 these towns, and I think we've done it very well.

19 At the County Business Office in West  
20 Stewartstown, there are 23, that all of these records of  
21 these towns are kept in a special place. The County  
22 Administrator, who is here tonight, is the Administrator  
23 for each of these 23 unincorporated places. She is also  
24 the Superintendent of Schools, because we have a school



1 district for the unincorporated places. And, every dollar  
2 that comes in in revenue from an unincorporated town goes  
3 into their budget, and their expenses are in there. Each  
4 unincorporated place has its own separate budget.

5 Any revenue that accrues to the  
6 community from this project will be accredited to that  
7 community. That's the way it works. And, those are  
8 audited -- the County's auditors go through those every  
9 year to make sure everything is fine. So, I think it's  
10 very, very important, as we think about this, and it's  
11 important for you to visualize why the County is involved  
12 in making decisions that normally would be made in the  
13 town.

14 I would say that, since this project  
15 started, the company came to the Planning Board in Coos  
16 County. They kept us well involved, well informed of what  
17 they're doing. The County has no approval process in this  
18 at all. We're just sort of the place they come to make  
19 contact. This board here is going to make a decision on  
20 whether this is going to be built or not, not the County.  
21 The County delegation has been kept well informed. We've  
22 had meetings, we've discussed this project. I think we  
23 understand what the intent is. And, we respect the  
24 process that's taking place.

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1                   On December 8th, 2007, at a delegation  
2 meeting in Berlin, the County delegation passed a  
3 resolution. And, it said "The County delegation members  
4 indicate by this resolution that they affirm the vote  
5 taken on April 27, 2007 to support Governor Lynch's goal  
6 of having New Hampshire generating within the state  
7 25 percent of the state's electrical energy needs from  
8 pollution-free sources by 2025." That resolution also  
9 requested the Governor to expedite the process of  
10 upgrading the electrical transmission lines that serve  
11 Coos County. Without increased transmission capacity, the  
12 currently proposed additional wind and biomass generation  
13 facilities, that could provide hundreds of much needed  
14 good-paying jobs, will not be constructed. And, the  
15 delegation believes that in Coos County there are  
16 sufficient, sustainable natural resources to meet the  
17 state's total requirements for all of its green power  
18 commitment. It is those same natural resources that have  
19 always been the life blood of the County's economy, and  
20 can again be its economic future.

21                   And, the second part of that resolution  
22 was this: "The delegation, by this resolution, further  
23 indicates that the undersigned members support the  
24 development of the Granite Reliable Power wind power site

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 in the County's unincorporated places of Dixville,  
2 Erving's Grant, Millsfield and Odell." That motion was  
3 made, duly seconded, and passed unanimously by the County  
4 delegation.

5 So, the County is on the record of  
6 supporting this project. We think it will be beneficial  
7 to the County. You also need to understand that this  
8 delegation is working very hard on the transmission line  
9 issue, myself and another delegation member, Bill Remick  
10 is part of this commission studying this issue. And, we  
11 think that, if we stick with it, that we have a good  
12 opportunity to be able to get our transmission line  
13 problem solved. There's no reason why Coos County can't  
14 supply all of the green power for the state that the  
15 Governor wants to take place, and do it here and promote  
16 jobs, promote the economy. Thank you.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you,  
18 Representative. Bing Judd.

19 MR. JUDD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
20 will be very brief. I was hoping to see Commissioner  
21 Burack here, because I know him very well. He's my  
22 Commissioner, too, I'm on the Water Resources Board. I  
23 have a letter that was mailed in on September 10th to him  
24 regarding the Granite Reliable Power. And, I would like

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 to read it for the record. And, I'll give -- pass a copy  
2 to each one of you.

3 Mr. Thomas S. Burack, Chairman of the  
4 New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee, New Hampshire  
5 Department of Environmental Services, 29 Hazen Drive, Post  
6 Office Box 95, Concord, New Hampshire. Application of  
7 Granite Reliable Power, LLC for a Certificate of Site and  
8 Facility to construct and operate the Granite Reliable  
9 Power Windpark, Docket Number 2008-04.

10 Dear Commissioner Burack: The Coos  
11 County Commissioners wish to go on record in full support  
12 of the Granite Reliable Power Windpark. Officials from  
13 the Noble Environmental have kept the Board of  
14 Commissioners well informed of this project during the  
15 lengthy planning phase -- phase.

16 The wind turbines and other components  
17 of the Windpark, as proposed, will be located in the  
18 unincorporated places of Dixville, Millsfield, Odell, and  
19 Erving's Grant. The Board of Commissioners functions as  
20 the local governing board for these unincorporated places,  
21 and in that capacity have met with the folks from Noble  
22 Environmental periodically during the past two years. The  
23 Coos County Commissioners, with the support of the Coos  
24 County Delegation, approved and signed an Agreement for

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1        Payments in Lieu of Taxes on March 12, 2008. Based on  
2        this Agreement, the project will have economic benefit to  
3        the host unincorporated places.

4                        The Board supports development of wind  
5        power in Coos County. The wind supply here is abundant;  
6        it is also a renewable and nonpolluting resource. The  
7        ridgelines being considered for the wind turbines are on  
8        privately owned property that has historically been used  
9        for timber harvesting and the landowners are clearly  
10       supporting this project. There are no private residences  
11       in the vicinity of the proposed wind park.

12                      For these reasons, and based upon the  
13       studies and data collection provided by the Applicant, our  
14       support is without reservation.

15                      Sincerely, Burnham A. Judd, Chairman;  
16       Paul R. Grenier, Vice-Chair; and Thomas M. Brady, Clerk.  
17       And, I have a copy for each one of you for the record.

18                      MR. IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

19                      MR. JUDD: Thank you very much.

20                      VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hasen Burns.

21                      MR. BURNS: I'm Hasen Burns. I'm one of  
22       the Board of Selectmen in the Town of Stewartstown. And,  
23       I just want to go on record as being in support of this  
24       project. If it's good for the county, it's good for us.

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 And, we fully support it. Thank you.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Laura Richardson.

3 MS. RICHARDSON: Good evening. Thank  
4 you. I'm Laura Richardson. I am representing the New  
5 Hampshire Sustainable Energy Association. We're a  
6 nonprofit organization representing about 2,200 people in  
7 the state. It's a diverse group of people, with a lot of  
8 different backgrounds. But they also have interest in  
9 either renewable energy, energy efficiency, or green  
10 buildings. We, the New Hampshire Sustainable Energy  
11 Association, are in full support of this project. We  
12 think it should go ahead. It's a fantastic opportunity  
13 for the state to take the next step in renewable energy.  
14 And, wind projects are fuel-free, they are emissions-free,  
15 they are safe. There is no evacuation zone needed. We  
16 didn't have to talk about any of those issues tonight,  
17 because this is a really safe project.

18 Because it is renewable, we get to take  
19 advantage of a lot of different positive factors. The  
20 Renewable Portfolio Standard and the Regional Greenhouse  
21 Gas Initiative are both policies that the state feels  
22 really strongly about. And, we are -- we, NHSEA, is very  
23 excited that this project is going to come on line.

24 So, the last point I wanted to make was

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 that, you know, this is really about Yankee frugality,  
2 too. And, you know, we really shouldn't be wasting this  
3 great resource. The wind is blowing all the time.

4 So, I thank you very much. And, thank  
5 you all very much on the Committee.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Rick Samson.

7 MR. SAMSON: My name is Rick Samson.  
8 I'm from Stewartstown, New Hampshire. My wife and I were  
9 born and raised and educated in Lancaster, which is about  
10 10 miles south of here, as many of you know. We've raised  
11 three children in this state and lived in this state for  
12 all but five years of our lives, which I spent in Norfolk,  
13 Virginia, in the Navy from 1964 to 1969. First off, I'd  
14 like to thank the Committee for coming here this evening  
15 and for hearing this testimony. I also would like to at  
16 this time urge anybody else in the future that wishes to  
17 speak at any of these forums or meetings or hearings, to  
18 make sure that you put your testimony in writing and hand  
19 it to the committees or the people holding the hearings,  
20 of which I have done and I will give them a copy when I am  
21 done speaking.

22 I'm here this evening to point out  
23 several facts and to bring attention to several other  
24 points of interest in this proposed project. I

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 respectfully ask those here in attendance this evening to  
2 not only give very careful consideration to this issue,  
3 but to study, ask and demand that questions raised be  
4 truthfully, factually, and fully answered.

5 I asked four questions here this  
6 evening. I will repeat the questions, I do not need an  
7 answer now, as I did not get it when I asked, and I didn't  
8 think that I would. The first that I asked was "what  
9 amount of the electricity generated will remain in Coos  
10 County? And, will the rest of it go into the grid and be  
11 given to the highest bidder?" And, that answer was not  
12 answered. "Will this project reduce the cost of  
13 electricity for Coos County residents?" What benefit, if  
14 any, will the County realize from this project?" And,  
15 "How much of the grid does Reliable Power own, control, or  
16 have options on?"

17 It's been stated that \$420,000 per year  
18 will be given to the County. But there was no mention of  
19 the projected rate of return on this project or what the  
20 annual projected profit would be per year. It was also  
21 mentioned noise studies have been done and are in the  
22 appendices, and we can look there for the answers, but no  
23 mention has been made of the levels of the noise. I would  
24 suggest that every town in Coos County consider submitting



1 a warrant article in 2009 to require the County  
2 Commissioners and Delegation to strictly follow the wishes  
3 of the residents.

4 In the past approximately 18 months, I  
5 have traveled from Colebrook to Keene to Hampton, and  
6 everywhere in between, to attend meetings, informational  
7 seminars, and hearings to testify at my own expense. The  
8 most important point I have learned from all of this is  
9 that most of the elected officials in our county and state  
10 government think, and I emphasize the word "think", that  
11 they know what is best for us, the residents and  
12 taxpayers. They repeatedly ignore the voice of the voters  
13 and do their own thing. Representative King mentioned  
14 tonight that the County Delegation and the Commissioners  
15 are in full support of this project. If that is their  
16 personal opinion, they're entitled to it. But, if that is  
17 not the wishes of their constituents, then I strongly  
18 question how much emphasis should be placed on their  
19 opinions. They represent not only the unincorporated  
20 towns, but they represent every town, every voter, and  
21 every taxpayer in this county. And, if this is a case of  
22 the minority benefiting instead of the majority, I  
23 strongly suggest that this Committee consider their  
24 testimony.

1                   I respectfully ask that we, the people,  
2                   are not only heard, but our wishes be understood and  
3                   adhered to. I firmly believe that any elected official  
4                   that is running for re-election be defeated and removed  
5                   from office. I intend to show here this evening, by past  
6                   examples, just what is at stake by this project and  
7                   exactly who will benefit from this project.

8                   As a lifelong Republican, I am not only  
9                   ashamed of the Republican Party, but I am also extremely  
10                  ashamed of the Democratic Party and New Hampshire's  
11                  governor, John Lynch. Almost all of these officials have  
12                  neglected our basic rights and fundamental needs. For any  
13                  of them to take credit for simple, frivolous programs and  
14                  projects and try to buy votes with grants and money is  
15                  only self-serving. Wasting our tax dollars on ridiculous  
16                  issues, such as gay rights, impeaching the President, and  
17                  other illegal, unnecessary, and unrelated items is an  
18                  insult to the residents of this state.

19                  How many people involved in this wind  
20                  power project are residents of our state? Where do the  
21                  lawyers come from that are representing this project?  
22                  Compare these people to a majority of the New Hampshire  
23                  elected officials in our state and you will find that many  
24                  were from out of state and educated out of state. That is

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 not to say that they all do not cherish our state and its  
2 way of life. There have been some outstanding non-natives  
3 that have been a very positive contributor to our state,  
4 they also try to maintain our way of life.

5 The Portland Natural Gas Pipeline is a  
6 perfect example of what can happen when outside interests  
7 take control of your elected officials and your resources.  
8 We were told it was cheap fuel for Wausau Papers, Groveton  
9 Paperboard and the Berlin mills. Three of these mills are  
10 now closed. The gas is being shipped through Coos County;  
11 we only get the property taxes on the facilities and  
12 realize no cost benefit. The DC power transmission line  
13 in Vermont is another example of this.

14 Our Commissioners and Delegation are  
15 being sold a similar bill of goods from clean energy  
16 speculators who now hold approximately 99 percent of the  
17 transmission rights for this project. How did this  
18 happen? The elected representatives as usual think that  
19 they know what is best. Be assured, it may not be in our  
20 best interest.

21 It would only benefit Coos County if  
22 power were kept local. If the power is shipped elsewhere,  
23 it is not in our best interest at all. It will not reduce  
24 our costs or benefit us.

1                   So, I ask you people here this evening,  
2                   ask the questions, demand the answers, and then and only  
3                   then let us make the right decision.

4                   VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: The next name is  
5                   Kathleen Keene, is --

6                   MS. KEENE: I'm right here.

7                   VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, let me ask  
8                   you a couple questions before, I just want to make sure.  
9                   You're the same Kathleen Keene who's moved to intervene?

10                  MS. KEENE: It's Kathlyn, K-a-t-h-l-y-n.

11                  VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Kathlyn?

12                  MS. KEENE: Kathlyn Keene.

13                  VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Kathlyn Keene.

14                  And, you petitioned to intervene in this proceeding?

15                  MS. KEENE: I did. And, I spoke with  
16                  Mike Iacopino before and --

17                  VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, I just wanted  
18                  to make sure you were the same person.

19                  MS. KEENE: -- asked if it would be okay  
20                  if I would speak, and he said it would be fine.

21                  VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, it indicated  
22                  that you wanted to speak for 25 minutes, is that correct?

23                  MS. KEENE: No, I didn't give a time  
24                  frame to it, but I promise I won't go on and on.

1                   VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, what I was  
2 going to offer you the option, it says "25 minutes".

3                   MS. KEENE: No.

4                   VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: If you really want  
5 to talk 25 minutes, I was going to move you to the end of  
6 the line.

7                   MS. KEENE: No.

8                   VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay.

9                   MS. KEENE: That's fine.

10                  VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Please.

11                  MS. KEENE: First, I'd like to thank Pip  
12 Decker and all of the Noble representatives for coming  
13 this evening and trying to enlighten us about your project  
14 and what you're proposing in Coos County. It's nice to  
15 see young people so excited about their work, and I  
16 appreciate that. And, the Committee, I would like to  
17 thank you for coming this evening. But I will let you  
18 know that the Coos County people are pretty casual and you  
19 didn't need to suit up to come here this evening.

20                  I just have a couple of things that I  
21 would like to say and I would like to read. I've been  
22 following in the newspaper and I have been trying to  
23 educate myself about a project that is probably the most  
24 difficult, and I will let everybody know this evening that

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1       it was my intention to be for wind, until I've spent two  
2       years finding out the effects of what it can cause. And,  
3       what you need to realize here this evening is this -- this  
4       should not be compared to Lempster, New Hampshire, and I  
5       ask you to please not do that. Because this is the  
6       biggest project that is being brought before New England.  
7       It's huge. One of the things, as a taxpayer of Coos  
8       County, I don't hold any title, I'm a retired person that  
9       pays taxes as a resident in Coos County. And, I came this  
10      evening because I truly thought it was going to be a forum  
11      for the public. And, I'm so tired now that I don't even  
12      know I can get through this, but I will try. It's past my  
13      bedtime. The roads -- The roads around here roll up about  
14      9:00.

15                               But I have an article that was in the  
16      New Hampshire Sunday News September 28th, and it says  
17      "Balsams/Town of Colebrook partner to host green expo."  
18      And, I'm just going to read an excerpt from it. "The  
19      Balsams Grand Resort Hotel and the Town of Colebrook are  
20      partnering to host the Third Annual Green Path Exposition  
21      to celebrate the efforts of the people of the Great North  
22      Woods for their contributions to sustaining the pristine  
23      nature of one of the few true wilderness areas left in New  
24      England." This Windpark will destroy that. It will

1       destroy that.

2                       I also want to refer to an article that  
3       was written by Chelsea Conaboy in an article that was in  
4       the Concord Monitor, which, obviously, we're not going to  
5       have access to unless we get Concord papers. But I'm just  
6       going to read an excerpt from that. And, Mr. Fred King,  
7       our representative, which I guess represents us, I'm not  
8       quite sure about that, he reads -- he had done this  
9       article by the reporter, and what he says is that "It's  
10      safe to say if we did not -- if we did get to vote on it,  
11      and we have the two to pick from, versus biomass or wind,  
12      my guess is we would probably vote for biomass plants."  
13      Now, he is standing here this evening trying to tell us  
14      that he's for this. I'm standing here this evening that  
15      says that somebody, that some state representative, some  
16      senator, some person with authority that can connect  
17      themselves to the proper officials should be representing  
18      the public. We're tired of the public not being heard.  
19      We're never heard. We're just bulldozed, and we're tired  
20      of it.

21                      And I am using this forum this evening  
22      to say this, because I want it to go be transcribed and  
23      brought into testimony. It's vitally important.

24                      There are bears in that area that could

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 not survive, because of the beech trees that would be cut  
2 down. They only survive with wilderness, contiguous large  
3 tracts of land. I recognize that this is privately owned.  
4 And, I would want to do with what I want to do with my  
5 land. But I also want to tell you that the Coos County  
6 people of this area have been good to those two lumber  
7 companies, have worked with them. And, there's been an  
8 unwritten rule that nobody speaks about, because it's not  
9 in writing, a lot of handshakes are done up here and  
10 things are done verbally because we trust people. And,  
11 one of those things is, when they were done with the mass  
12 production of what they wanted to do utilizing their land,  
13 they would file for conservation. And, they did do that  
14 two years ago. But what sparked their interest is the  
15 wind companies that are pouncing on these wilderness areas  
16 and telling them "you can make a buck." And, I've read  
17 articles that said that this company is a billion dollars  
18 in debt.

19 I left watching the news this evening  
20 with our Governor telling us that we are \$110 million in  
21 state debt. We know where our federal government is.  
22 And, you know what? If you could see my pockets, I pulled  
23 them out to tell you they're empty. There isn't any left  
24 to give.



1                   So, when you put this into consideration  
2           to do this windpark, I will tell you that we couldn't have  
3           a better place to have this forum this evening, because  
4           Groveton lost a mill. Groveton had a company, a biomass  
5           company that was looking into coming here, that would have  
6           employed people, employed people so that they could stay  
7           here. Do you know the people that have to pack their bags  
8           and leave that were born and brought up here? And, we  
9           have somebody coming in saying how wonderful they are  
10          going to do us, what a service they are going to do us,  
11          and all of this money that is supposedly coming in for  
12          this proposed windpark, Dixville, the Town of Dixville,  
13          which is an unincorporated area, which has 21 residents,  
14          21 residents, will receive \$120,000 by a pilot program  
15          that we don't even know if money will come in, because  
16          they're in a billion dollars debt, who's to know what will  
17          happen?

18                   And, I can speak as a retired assessor  
19          on pilot programs, and I've read their contract, and I  
20          hope that the Committee will read that contract, because  
21          it's scary. It protects the Company, it does not protect  
22          us.

23                   Millsfield's Windpark, 18 people, they  
24          don't pay real estate taxes, Dixville and Millsfield do

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 not pay real estate taxes, they're unincorporated. They  
2 don't pay like we do in incorporated areas. They will  
3 receive \$375,000. Of course, they're going to be the most  
4 impacted by it, so I understand why they would receive  
5 some of the money. But don't tell us that all of Coos  
6 County is going to receive money, because we are not.

7                   And, another thing I want to mention is  
8 this whole project, when it's finished, they will blast,  
9 they will bulldoze, they will tell you that the trees will  
10 grow back. Yes, they do. But, when you blast to make  
11 flat surfaces to put wind turbines on, you cannot grow  
12 mountains back. Tourism is how we thrive up here.  
13 Tourism is 90 percent of how we derive our income. If you  
14 do this and tourists stop coming to look at the moose,  
15 which it sounds like, you know, when we live up here they  
16 irritate us, but they produce a lot of income for us, and  
17 we recognize that, and we like the tourists. If the moose  
18 go into the -- and wind turbines provides a low frequency,  
19 and nobody got into this tonight, but low frequency  
20 penetrates buildings. You don't think it's not going to  
21 penetrate the wildlife. We are going to see a stampede of  
22 wildlife running out of this area saying "what have they  
23 done to us now?"

24                   So, we live up here in the North

1 Country, above the Notches, and we have people that come  
2 from Concord that we are pleading to to save us, to save  
3 the taxpayer, to think of the businesses that will be  
4 devastated by this project. We have moose tours that come  
5 from the motels in Gorham. They put up a prison and they  
6 gated the prisoner -- the prisons. We are now going to do  
7 a third prison, and they have gated Success off. And,  
8 they used to go and see the moose there, now they go to  
9 the 13-Miles Woods, which is where we're talking about.  
10 So, you will affect our daily lives.

11 I'm green. I'm for green. But I think  
12 that we need to look at Coos County in "Well, how can we  
13 help the people and still meet our obligations for, you  
14 know, for renewable energy?" And, I don't think wind is  
15 the answer. And, this one public hearing for the public  
16 to try to educate them that it took me two years.  
17 Granted, I'm older, maybe it takes me a little bit longer  
18 because I'm older, but it isn't something that you can  
19 educate yourself overnight about. And, I'm going to stop  
20 now. And, I just hope that every Committee member please  
21 hear my plea about -- and, please, I hope you're staying  
22 overnight, so you can go tomorrow and look at this area,  
23 because you will understand, you can only understand when  
24 you've walked it. Thank you for your time.

1                   VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: I just wanted to  
2 respond to one issue. Glenn Normandeau is the head of  
3 Fish & Game, he can dress casually. I went to Catholic  
4 school, and I'm a lawyer, and my mother would be very  
5 disappointed if I didn't come up here with a shirt and tie  
6 and a jacket on. Our next is Mary Sloat.

7                   MS. SLOAT: Good evening. I'm Mary  
8 Sloat, the Chair of the Coos County Unincorporated Area  
9 Planning Board. And, we are submitting a letter to  
10 Commissioner Thomas Burack, New Hampshire Site Evaluation  
11 Committee Docket 2008, 29 Hazen Drive, P.O. Box 95,  
12 Concord, New Hampshire.

13                   Dear Commissioner Burack: The Coos  
14 County Planning Board voted in favor of the development of  
15 wind power by Granite Reliable Power, LLC, at its meeting  
16 September 23rd, 2008, in Lancaster, New Hampshire.

17                   The Coos County Planning Board has been  
18 following the steps taken by Granite Reliable Power, LLC,  
19 in preparation of its application to build wind turbines  
20 in four unincorporated places, Odell, Dixville, Erving's  
21 Grant, and Millsfield. We made requests during the  
22 process when they applied for building permits for the  
23 meteorological towers necessary to measure wind at high  
24 elevations. Our Zoning Ordinance requires special

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 attention to wildlife and birds, as well as thin soils,  
2 when there is construction at elevations over 2,700 feet.  
3 The Company has been very cooperative.

4 Our Master Plan favors wind power  
5 generation, as well as wood-burning generators. I mention  
6 the latter as we have received letters and comments about  
7 wood-burning generators, and we feel there needs to be a  
8 mix to help get away from imported oil and gas. We have  
9 the opportunity in areas remote -- we have the opportunity  
10 in areas remote from residential areas to test the  
11 generation of wind power and promote green energy.

12 The income from wind power generation  
13 should help the owners of large blocks of timber land  
14 continue to grow high quality timber without feeling  
15 pressure to develop their land. This is this business of  
16 cutting up into pieces that we are concerned about.  
17 Again, our Master Plan addresses the need to maintain  
18 large blocks of timber land for timber growth, wildlife,  
19 and recreation. We have been assured that traditional  
20 recreation will continue to be permitted in forested lands  
21 by the landowners when the wind turbines are installed.

22 Thank you for the opportunity to address  
23 your group. Sincerely, Mary Sloat, Chair, Coos County  
24 Planning Board. And, thank you all for coming. And, I

1 know you're missing prime time TV tonight.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Jeff Elliott.

3 MR. ELLIOTT: Jeff Elliott, from  
4 Lancaster, New Hampshire. And, my background is in  
5 environmental biology --

6 FROM THE FLOOR: Speak up.

7 MR. ELLIOTT: Jeff Elliott, from  
8 Lancaster, New Hampshire. My background is in  
9 Environmental Biology and Conservation Biology. I've  
10 worked locally and nationally on quite a few of these  
11 issues. There's a project in Hawaii on geothermal. It's  
12 a fabulous idea. I'd love to see a lot more geothermal.  
13 New Hampshire has some potential, especially south, a  
14 geothermal project. And, then, the geothermal project I  
15 worked on in Hawaii, which I was in favor of until I  
16 landed, turned out to be in the only low-lying rainforest  
17 in the United States. Dead center. Miles of road,  
18 hundred foot towers, deep wells, generating facility  
19 destroyed the rainforest. Habitat fragmentation reduces  
20 biological diversity by about 10 percent with a 50 percent  
21 fragmentation. And, these people chose to put their  
22 roadway directly through the middle of the only low-lying  
23 rainforest in the United States. Done deal.

24 There was a project in Yellowstone where

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 people from away [sic] wanted to use geothermal, which,  
2 again, I'm very much in favor of, to generate electricity.  
3 And, they would have shut off Old Faithful without a huge  
4 outcry from national and local people. What an idiotic  
5 idea? Can't imagine that.

6 So, as someone that's very concerned  
7 about global warming, climatic change is obvious today,  
8 someone who is watching our ecological system unravel, I  
9 managed to lose a petition to have the Atlantic Salmon  
10 listed as an endangered species in 1993. And, it was  
11 listed in 2000. And, I know that my failure will cause  
12 the extinction of that salmon in the long run.

13 And, here we are. We can't restore the  
14 Atlantic Salmon to the Connecticut River, because where it  
15 reaches the ocean is too warm. That's climatic shift. As  
16 the climate continues to shift, the tops of our mountains,  
17 our ridges, are getting smaller. Of course, the physical  
18 geology doesn't change, but the bio-community, the  
19 opportunity for those high elevation creatures that have  
20 been living here for 11,500 years, those little islands  
21 get smaller and smaller and smaller, and continue to be  
22 more and more fragmented. And, similar to the Galapagos  
23 [sic], our local islands, the "sky islands" they're  
24 referred to, are dependent upon the size and the distance

1 between the islands. And, again, as the top of Mount  
2 Washington, as that ecological community is getting  
3 smaller and smaller, those creatures that have evolved and  
4 co-evolved, as part of a unique, very fragile community,  
5 is getting so small that they're starting to show signs of  
6 symptoms of extinction.

7                   If you look at the map of the wind tower  
8 potential in New Hampshire, it's the same map that we use  
9 to evaluate the sky islands. The link we have between  
10 central New Hampshire, up through the Presidentials,  
11 through Coos County, and fragmented up into Canada, it  
12 eventually comes very close to reaching that Subartic  
13 Alpine community that's up in the north. Those fragmented  
14 islands, those little tiny spots that we're speaking of  
15 tonight are the link between New Hampshire's sky islands  
16 and the Subartic community from whence these creatures  
17 come. The Melissa Artic, the Bog Lemming, the Mt.  
18 Washington Fritillary [sic], I can never say that word  
19 with my tooth missing, and several other species, and the  
20 Master Species on soil organisms, they're so fragile, and  
21 so much threatened by our misbehaviors in the woods. And,  
22 here we are.

23                   This is the largest potential breakup  
24 through this area in the continental U.S. The Northern



1 Forest Land Study involved an area 12 and a half times the  
2 size of Yellowstone. And, this is in the dead center of  
3 it. If we fragment this habitat, there's a ratio,  
4 50 percent fragmentation results in a 10 percent decrease  
5 in biodiversity. That's not on these little tiny islands.  
6 This is 100 percent destruction of those islands. This  
7 will result in some type of extinction. These people are  
8 going to court. They are going to be sued. They're going  
9 to be sued under the Endangered Species Act and several  
10 other, if you want to play the cards. The Center for  
11 Conservation Biology will be on their pants soon if they  
12 proceed.

13 But we can't succeed without your input.  
14 Every one of you needs to stand up. If you don't care  
15 about the wildlife, you have chosen to live here. It's a  
16 hard place to live. We're poor. We have very little  
17 security. Our economics are on the edge. And, this isn't  
18 going to help us. What it's going to do is take away our  
19 cultural identity. Don't let them do that.

20 Pick up a little book, Power Line [sic],  
21 a group of farmers in the Midwest faced, the people become  
22 aware of a huge power line coming through their community,  
23 and the farmers finally got themselves together and  
24 revolted. It got ugly. I don't think this needs to get

1 that ugly. The comments about the politicians, let's act  
2 on it. Comments about the Coos County Commission, let's  
3 act on it. We have to stand up for ourselves, folks.  
4 Don't let these people from away take this away from us.

5                   There are 10 miles to the eagle nests.  
6 There are three eagle nests in New Hampshire that have  
7 three chicks, very unique, and this is within 10 miles.  
8 Where I stand in the Androscoggin River, spending hundreds  
9 of dollars to go fishing in one of the best fishing spots  
10 in the United States, I'll be able to feel the vibrations.  
11 They're subsonic. I won't probably be able to hear them.  
12 We communicate subsonically. Bats, obviously, you all  
13 know this, they communicate and locate themselves  
14 supersonically, above our hearing range. They're  
15 attracted to these blades. That's why so many of them are  
16 impacted. They don't run into the blades. They come near  
17 the blades and the impact is so strong it rattles their  
18 brain and kills them. They bleed out their noses and  
19 their ears before they hit the ground. I don't think we  
20 need this.

21                   There's an energy problem in the United  
22 States, and it has nothing to do with us. This isn't  
23 going to displace Exxon. It's going to give free and  
24 cheap electricity to people from away that are too damn

1 lazy to change their light bulbs. And, I mean it. This  
2 is producing an insignificant amount of electricity. And,  
3 it's not for us. Look at all we're wasting. It's for  
4 people from away.

5 I flew out of Quebec from Hudson Bay  
6 with some native people, working to try to slow down  
7 Quebec Hydro. And, we landed in New York City. And, the  
8 shaman, the shaman that I was traveling with, had spoken  
9 with me all the way down from Quebec how wonderful we were  
10 as Americans, and he would give up everything for our  
11 culture, for us. We're such a wonderful people who had  
12 given so much to the Canadian natives. And, we landed in  
13 New York City and he used an F-bomb [sic], "not one drop,  
14 not one inch of my land."

15 Let's do it, folks. Goodbye.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Dave Dubey.

17 MR. DUBEY: I'm Dave Dubey. I'm a  
18 Selectman from the Town of Dummer. We've known about this  
19 proposed wind energy project for a couple of years now.  
20 Only in recent months have we been informed that some of  
21 the proposed construction in our town will not conform to  
22 our zoning ordinances, and that we are not going to have  
23 the final say in whether or not this project moves forward  
24 in our town. The final decision on what is going to be

1 built in our town will be made by the Site Evaluation  
2 Committee. We don't like this very much. But, after  
3 reviewing the project very carefully, we actually do like  
4 almost everything else about it.

5 Therefore, the Town of Dummer is not  
6 going to oppose this project out of hand. We do have some  
7 concerns that are based on our experiences with another  
8 clean energy project that was built in our town just over  
9 20 years ago. We asked the Site Evaluation Committee to  
10 hear our concerns and to endorse them in the form of  
11 conditions to be placed on the permits that have been  
12 requested. If you are going to make this decision for us,  
13 then do it as if the project were going to be built in  
14 your community and you were the ones who were going to  
15 have to live with it.

16 Number one: Exterior lighting. We  
17 understand and accept the need for aircraft beacons at the  
18 windmill sites. But we do not want excessive light to  
19 emanate from the collection and switching stations to be  
20 located in our town. In fact, we see no need for these  
21 facilities to be lit up all night, every night. We would  
22 like the exterior lights to be controlled by a motion  
23 sensor, so that they're only going to be used when needed.

24 Two: Public access. The Dummer Pond

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 Road is used extensively for access to recreational areas,  
2 including the Dummer Ponds, hunting areas, and a network  
3 of snowmobile and ATV trails. We want a written guarantee  
4 that public access to these areas will not be restricted  
5 or impeded by the current or future owners of these  
6 facilities. We understand that these owners control only  
7 a limited amount of the land, and that they cannot  
8 guarantee the actions of the landowners themselves.

9                   Three is future construction. This  
10 project has been exempted from applying for building  
11 permits and zoning variances for the present. We will  
12 accept this for now, but it has to be a one-time deal.  
13 The value of the facilities that are built in our town  
14 will be assessed at the proper time so they can be taxed  
15 appropriately. That, if the owners of these facilities  
16 are allowed to make future improvements without applying  
17 for building permits, then we will have no means of  
18 ensuring that their assessments are kept up-to-date.  
19 These landowners must be held to the same standards as any  
20 other property owner in our town.

21                   To date, the proponents of this project  
22 have presented and conducted themselves in a commendable  
23 manner. But we should not be so naive as to assume that  
24 this will continue indifferently. Granite Reliable Power

1 is a corporation, and its purpose is to make money. Not  
2 that making money is a bad thing. One of the things we  
3 like most about this project is the tax revenue we expect  
4 it to provide to our town. But we must bear in mind the  
5 benefits of this project to the environment, the economy,  
6 and to the Town of Dummer are purely coincidental. It  
7 would be negligent of us to fail to plan for a future in  
8 which our interests and those of these facilities' owners  
9 do not coincide so neatly.

10 We are not looking for a conflict with  
11 Granite Reliable Power. But our concerns are not born of  
12 paranoia or fear of the corporate boogie-man. Our  
13 concerns are born of experience. We already have one  
14 autonomous utility in our town that does as it pleases and  
15 ignores our laws. Please do not saddle us with another  
16 one. Endorse our conditions, make them binding on Granite  
17 Reliable Power, and any future owners of this facility.  
18 Thank you.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Art Jarrett.

20 (No appearance.)

21 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Lynn Correnty.

22 MS. CORRENTY: I'll move my time,  
23 because my concerns have been stated.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you.

1 Rick Tillotson.

2 MR. TILLOTSON: Good evening, public,  
3 Commissioners. I don't really have anything written.  
4 Good evening, Kathlyn, Jeff, and Lisa, and people that  
5 have raised good points for us all to think about on the  
6 other side of whether this should be sanctioned or  
7 established as a project in our communities.

8 I do want to make a disclaimer when I  
9 start that I'm really speaking with two hats here. One,  
10 my hat as Vice President of Tillotson Corporation, owner  
11 of the Balsams. Tillotson Corporation has leased property  
12 to Granite Reliable Power for two of the turbines to sit  
13 on. So, I would ask you to keep that in mind in  
14 consideration of any of my remarks. My other hat is, if  
15 you'll look over there at the view that's second from the  
16 right, that's called "View 10", it's actually quite an  
17 interesting view, if you look at it closely. It's the  
18 closest or the largest looking turbines that you'll see  
19 from any place with a residence. And, that happens to be  
20 my driveway. So, and as a matter of fact, my bedroom  
21 window looks out at the ski area and Dixville Peak behind  
22 it. So, that will be my view in the morning when I get up  
23 for a long time to come. Now, that may affect my house  
24 price. I'm sorry?

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 FROM THE FLOOR: Money. It's all about  
2 money. My house is the one --

3 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Excuse me, ma'am.  
4 Excuse me.

5 FROM THE FLOOR: No. You know why?  
6 Because that is my house.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: I'm sorry.

8 FROM THE FLOOR: And, I'm going to look  
9 at --

10 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: You'll have an  
11 opportunity to speak, if you would like. We'll let the  
12 gentleman complete --

13 FROM THE FLOOR: But he's going to get  
14 paid for it, I'm not. That's the difference.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: He'll have an  
16 opportunity to make his comment. If you would like to  
17 make a comment, you'll have that opportunity.

18 FROM THE FLOOR: Okay. Go ahead,  
19 Mr. Tillotson.

20 MR. TILLOTSON: Thank you. The price of  
21 my home may be affected in the future, if I ever wanted to  
22 sell it. It will be something I will be seeing probably  
23 for the rest of my life looking in that -- out at that  
24 view, of the turbines spinning.



1                   However, on the other side of that, it  
2                   is going to enable, when the Balsams Hotel doesn't have  
3                   any guests and it has 90 employees, year-round employees  
4                   to support, it will be providing some lease income to the  
5                   Balsams. It will be a percentage of the revenue gained by  
6                   those turbines spinning. It will provide an economic  
7                   benefit to the Balsams. And, just to correct one thing,  
8                   Tillotson Corp., the Balsams, or Dixville does pay about  
9                   \$240,000 in property taxes.

10                   The further benefit of this project to  
11                   the county, from the pilot agreement, is of significant  
12                   importance not only to the Balsams' operation, but  
13                   certainly to the landowners that will continue to keep  
14                   their land in large tracts. It is a very important factor  
15                   to those who have only wood to sell as an alternative,  
16                   when the pulp mills are closing until perhaps 20 or 30  
17                   years from now, when some more pulp mills or some more  
18                   local use of our timber is available.

19                   The Balsams and the Tillotson  
20                   Corporation have operated a biomass generating facility  
21                   since 1975 on our property. We have operated a hydro  
22                   facility on our property since 1913. We are stewards for  
23                   the land, we care about our animals, we care about our  
24                   communities. And, we believe that this project is good

{SEC Docket No. 2008-04} {10-02-08}

1 for our communities and our region. Thank you.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: The next person,  
3 I'm having trouble reading, Jason Morse? Jackson? 228  
4 Blackmore -- Okay.

5 MR. MOORE: I just want to speak  
6 briefly. I'm a neighbor of Mr. Tillotson's, and I own  
7 several properties in the area. And, I also will be  
8 looking at the wind turbines. And, nobody has consulted  
9 me on them. And, I really feel my property value is going  
10 to go way down. And, that's kind of a selfish look at it.  
11 But I also, from the hearing tonight, realize it's going  
12 to have a much bigger impact on the whole area. And, I  
13 don't know if anybody has been addressing property values  
14 of the neighbors, and the lights that will be on the  
15 mountain that we'll be looking at, things of that nature.

16 That's all I have to ask. Is there  
17 somebody who can tell me about the lights, at night, how  
18 bright they're going to be?

19 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, I would  
20 suggest that this is the opportunity for public comment.

21 MR. MOORE: Oh, I'm sorry.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: If you have  
23 specific question about your specific property, I'm sure  
24 they will be happy to answer.

1 MR. MOORE: Okay. I guess that's all  
2 then.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, I'm sorry,  
4 your name for the record is?

5 MR. MOORE: John Moore [sic].

6 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: John Moore. Thank  
7 you. Ma'am, would you like an opportunity to make a  
8 comment?

9 FROM THE FLOOR: Me? Yes. I would like  
10 to ask Pip a question.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Ma'am, if you could  
12 come up and identify yourself.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I bring that  
14 picture up with me? Can I bring the picture? This is my  
15 home. I didn't know it --

16 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Ma'am, come to  
17 microphone please. We're recording --

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want to  
19 show them my home. You see what's in the background now.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Our court reporter  
21 is trying to transcribe this transcript.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: So, if you could  
24 please speak into the microphone.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Pip, this my  
2 home. Would you like to buy it? It's for sale.

3 MR. DECKER: It's a nice house.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would you like  
5 it, because this is what you'll be looking at? See, I  
6 didn't realize it --

7 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Excuse me. Ma'am,  
8 if you would like to have that conversation in private,  
9 then we can do that after the hearing. If you would like  
10 to make a public comment, this is your opportunity.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My public comment  
12 is, this house is for sale, if one of you people who works  
13 for Noble would like to buy it.

14 FROM THE FLOOR: Can I hear your name?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay? That is my  
16 public comment. It's a beautiful place. The stars, at  
17 night, it's unbelievable there. Unbelievable. But, you  
18 know what, I'm going to be looking at this, and the lights  
19 on that. And, I don't know what else, you know? So, it's  
20 up for sale, if you guys want to buy it. Maybe you could  
21 use it as your headquarters or something.

22 And, can I have this?

23 MR. IACOPINO: No.

24 MR. ROACH: It's not mine.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No? I can't have  
2 that?

3 MR. IACOPINO: It's evidence.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

5 MR. ROACH: Might be able to get you a  
6 copy.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. That's the  
8 last of the public comments that were indicated for this  
9 evening. Let me close, before we adjourn the meeting,  
10 saying something about the process. And, I think I speak  
11 on behalf of all of the members of the Committee when I  
12 say this. First, it's five months from this week the  
13 hearings in Concord will start. Over the next five  
14 months, there's going to be a lot of production of  
15 evidence, discovery, additional testimony. There will be  
16 most likely several days of hearings, where all of the  
17 witnesses from any of the parties will provide their  
18 testimony, will be subject to cross-examination. We take  
19 this very seriously. We do not have a position on whether  
20 this project should be built, that it should not be built,  
21 whether it should be built with conditions. It would be  
22 premature and wrong for us to have such a position at this  
23 time. Our job is to take all the evidence, hear from all  
24 of the interested parties, weigh the evidence, and

1 deliberate and make a decision based on that evidence.  
2 That process will complete five and a half months from  
3 now. And, then, that will result in a written opinion.  
4 As I indicated to you before, if you want to get a good  
5 feel for how seriously this Committee takes its  
6 obligation, go to the Site Evaluation Committee website,  
7 look at the order that was issued in the Lempster case. I  
8 think that the Committee in that case did a very thorough  
9 job. Listened to all of the parties and considered all of  
10 the evidence. So, that's our obligation and we intend to  
11 do the very best job we can in fulfilling that obligation.

12 I want to thank you all for coming out  
13 this evening. And, as I had said earlier, written  
14 comments will be accepted any time they're submitted to  
15 the Committee. So, thank you very much, everyone.

16 (Whereupon the hearing ended at 10:00  
17 p.m.)

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

