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## AFTERNOON PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good
afternoon. Thank you, everyone, for being back right on time. Truth be told, you were all back before I was. We are going to begin again with the next area to cover, but we do have one follow-up from before the lunch break. Mr. Iacopino was asked to take a look at financial-related conditions that had been imposed in other cases, and he went back through and looked at some prior orders.

So if you want to report on what you found, please.

MR. IACOPINO: Sure. I'm going to have to actually correct myself because I may have misspoken about different projects. I'll start with Groton Wind.

In Groton Wind, there was no financing conditions. The Applicant in that case was a subsidiary of Iberdrola. I think before I said Groton Wind did not have a Power Purchase Agreement. But in fact, they did have a Power Purchase Agreement with NSTAR at the time of the adjudicatory
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hearing. And that's referenced at Page 32 of the Groton Wind decision.

Laidlaw Berlin BioPower had a Power Purchase Agreement that had not been yet approved by the Public Utilities Commission, but had apparently been agreed upon between Laidlaw Berlin BioPower and Public Service. In that case, there was a financing condition, and it read as follows from the decision. This is at Page 48 and 49 of the Laidlaw decision. It says, "It plainly appears that financing of the project depends on the approval of the PPA by the PUC. The John Hancock 'comfort' letter" -and I'm going to excise out the internal quotations -- "requires an approved and final PPA as a condition to financing. If the PPA is not approved by the PUC, it is unlikely that the project will go forward. Therefore, as a condition of the certificate, the Applicant is required to demonstrate PUC approval of the PPA prior to commencement of construction. In addition, the Applicant shall: (i) notify the Subcommittee of
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 1 PM SESSION - ONLY] \{02-05-13\}
[DELIBERATIONS]
approval or rejection of the PPA; (ii) if approved, provide a copy of the approved PPA to the Subcommittee; (iii) identify all changes to the PPA made or caused to be made by the PUC; and (iv) provide supplemental documentation demonstrating the Applicant's financial capability to construct and operate the facility based upon an approved but amended PPA. Upon receipt of said information and documentation from the Applicant, the Chairman of the Subcommittee will determine whether an additional meeting of the Subcommittee will be required in order to determine if all conditions of the certificate have been satisfied, such that construction may commence." And again, that was from Pages 48 and 49 of the certificate granting the Laidlaw Berlin BioPower certificate of site and facility. Granite Reliable Power did not
have a PPA when they were before the Committee. Page 31 of the decision there says they were in negotiations for a long-term PPA, but the decision says nothing
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further about that. In that case, with respect to financing conditions, the Committee ordered as follows: "The Applicant has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that it has the financial capability to finance, construct and operate the project. Nonetheless, all parties agree that the current market for financing such projects is challenging. Therefore, the Subcommittee determines that the Applicant must have committed construction financing for the project in place before construction may commence. The Applicant shall provide notice to the Subcommittee when construction financing is in place. Such notice shall contain the name and address of the lender or lenders" -- I'm sorry -- "shall contain the name and address of the lender or lenders. Under R.S.A. 162-H:2,III, 'Commencement of construction' is defined as "any clearing of land, excavation or other substantial action that would adversely affect..." and it goes on to complete the definition of
"commencement of construction." And that was
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at Page 32 and 33 of the decision in the Granite Reliable docket.

Also, in the certificate
itself that the Committee issued, it contained the following language: "Further ordered that, the Applicant shall not commence construction, as 'commencement of construction' is defined in R.S.A. 162-H:2, III, until such time as construction financing is completely in place. The Applicant shall notify the Subcommittee when construction financing is in place and shall generally advise the Subcommittee of the name and address of the lender or lenders providing such financing. Nothing in this condition or in this order shall prohibit the owners of the land on which the project is to be constructed from continuing with logging activities in areas below 2700 feet in elevation."

So those are, at least in the recent years, orders that have contained or addressed either the existence or need for a PPA or a financing condition.
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CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you very much. That's helpful.

MS. BAILEY: Madam Chairman. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Yes, Ms. Bailey.

MS. BAILEY: I reviewed the testimony to answer my own question about whether the PPA was going to help get the -whether the certificate would help get the PPA. And I think the testimony is that it will, because their testimony is basically that they have the ability to raise the capital. Capital providers will depend on many factors, including completion of all necessary development tasks, receipt of a non-appealable SEC certificate, execution of a financial power purchase or financial hedge agreement for the off-take of power.

So I think the testimony is they need the certificate, then they get -they also need the PPA, and then they can get the financing. That's Mr. Cofelice's testimony Exhibit AWE 2 -- 1, the testimony on Page 8 of the prefiled testimony dated
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January 31st, 2012.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
And I think it's been clear as we've been talking about this, that although a number of Committee members felt that a PPA was of particular importance in the success of any of these sorts of projects, it wasn't that there was a requirement that the application be filed with a PPA or that a PPA be a necessary component of a finding of financial viability, but it's one of the pieces that could help in making that finding. And there are other ways of making that finding as well. And what Mr. Iacopino just read demonstrated the mix of different things that have been in the record in various projects. Sometimes there's a PPA; sometimes there isn't. Sometimes there's a lender already committed, sometimes not. Sometimes a significant equity investor, sometimes not. But it's the putting together all the different pieces that may vary from case to case to case, what those pieces actually end up being. But that in working a handful of
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items that each case brings forward, does it add up to giving us a basis to conclude that the financial capability standard has been met?

So it's -- I hope I'm clear.
I'm not looking to say there's one thing, and if I don't see it there, that's the end. It's not -- you know, if it were a requirement that you must have a PPA, then the statute would say you must have a PPA. I don't think it's that, that I'm looking for. And I don't think any of the Committee is looking for just that. It's been one of the items that could have shown, and there are others as well, that could have shown financial capability that we don't yet feel has been demonstrated.

All right. We're going to obviously come back to that issue again later. But let's move on to the next category, which is whether the project will unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region. Ms. Lyons has been given the task of leading us through the key evidence
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in that issue, and then we'll have a discussion about it. Ms. Lyons.

MS. LYONS: Thank you. As I was reviewing the different documents, I went back to the Application, went to testimony, supplemental testimony, and tried to pull together the strings of this section. I have to say that the preceding Commission members did an excellent job. I'm kind of more of a "tip to the wave" kind of person, was hoping for more of a bigger discussion. So, hopefully what I've outlined here will help everybody generate that discussion.

I'm going to first read what the task was for the orderly development section. It says that -- this is Section (b). It says, "Will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region, with due consideration having been given to the views of municipal and regional planning commissions and municipal governing bodies." And I also took that into kind of four sections: First, the views of the municipal and regional planning commissions;
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then to kind of general, some land-use questions that kept coming up, and then also real estate values and economic benefits. So those are how I constructed my comments here. And I'm just going to go through my notes, and I'd appreciate if anybody has any questions, just to stop me.

So, starting with views of
municipal and planning commissions, some of the things I noted as I was reviewing all the documentation is that the Town has a recent master plan. It's from 2010. And it was developed in a collaborative process in their community, and they specifically speak to "orderly development" in the plan. The master plan has several goals. They have about 15 different chapters in the master plan, but $I$ kind of concentrated on the natural resources and conservation, energy uses and conservation use sections, and also the future land use section in the master plan.

In the future land use and economic development sections of the master
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plan, they really talk about keeping the rural character of their community, encouraging small home businesses in the outside areas outside the commercial districts.

And they also talk about energy conservation and encouraging the uses of renewable energy in their community. There was an effort to go -- they have a small wind project ordinance within Antrim, and that was something that was encouraged by the State's planning efforts, to make sure that communities encourage small wind development. So they thought they would go one step further and have a large-scale ordinance on the books. And it went to town vote in two different time periods and it was -- both times it was voted down. And there are differing opinions about why it failed, and I'm just going to hold back on that for a minute. But there was an effort within the community to respond to new and different planning efforts within the community. So there was a response to that.
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MS. BAILEY: Can I ask you a question about that?

MS. LYONS: Yes.
MS. BAILEY: I just want to make sure I'm not getting it confused with something else that $I$ read about a vote that the town took to prevent industrial wind farms or industrial wind energy being built in the Rural Conservation District. Are you talking about a different vote or that one?

MS. LYONS: No, that one.
MS. BAILEY: So that one, the town voted not to prevent it.

MS. LYONS: They voted against the ordinance.

MS. BAILEY: Which the ordinance was to prevent industrial wind development in the Rural Conservation District.

MS. LYONS: NO. There's -okay.

MS. BAILEY: That's why I want to clarify, because I think I'm confused about something.
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MS. LYONS: So in November 2011 -- there are actually warrant articles, and I'll read them out. The first one is, "Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment 1 as proposed by the Planning Board for the Antrim Zoning Ordinance as follows: To adopt a large-scale wind energy ordinance, the purpose and intent of which is to: Establish a process for the planning board to issue conditional permits, in addition to site plan approval for large-scale wind energy wind facilities..." and then it goes on to say, No. 2, "Specify particular standards that address construction, public health and safety, noise, environmental issues and visual impacts; 3) Require as part of the application various impact statements and assessments to help gauge impacts of proposal; 4) Establish a process and requirements following an approval whereby the planning board issues a permit to operate that must be renewed on a regular schedule?" MS. BAILEY: So, just to really summarize that, they were asking the
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voters whether the planning board should have the jurisdiction to set parameters against the large-scale industrial wind project?

MS. LYONS: No. Actually, the ordinance has a whole -- the proposed ordinance has a whole set of conditions that it would be permitted. So if someone met those conditions --

MS. BAILEY: Okay. So it was assuming that there could be an industrial wind project if these conditions were met.

MS. LYONS: It gives a
process.
So then there was a second warrant article that said that -- that was proposed that said, "Wind energy facilities and meteorological towers, as defined below, are allowed to be constructed or operated in any district in the town of Antrim, except for the Rural Conservation District, where the construction and operation of a large-scale wind facilities shall be prohibited after the effective date of this ordinance, subject to all applicable federal,
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state and local ordinances and regulations." MS. BAILEY: So that sounds like it means what I thought it meant.

MS. LYONS: Well, that's the second one. So there was one for process, and then there was one for exemption for the Rural Conservation District.

MS. BAILEY: And so I'm talking about the second one.

MS. LYONS: Yeah.
MS. BAILEY: And the second prong of that was, after that passed --

MS. LYONS: And they all --
MS. BAILEY: No. After they took the vote on that, though, if it had passed, it would have prohibited industrial wind development in the Rural Conservation District. Isn't that what the last thing you read said?

MS. LYONS: Yes.
MS. BAILEY: So it failed. So that means that people were not completely opposed to allowing it to go into the Rural Conservation District. Okay. That's what
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I -- I think that's what the argument was. MS. LYONS: Okay. MS. BAILEY: Thanks. MS. LYONS: And just to continue, so there was another vote in March of 2012, and it was basically for the first warrant article I read, to have a process in place for a large-scale wind process.

MS. BAILEY: And they voted not to have that process in place.

MS. LYONS: That's correct.
MS. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.
MS. LYONS: Okay. So, back to the orderly development and to municipal and regional planning commissions. One of the key things that was missing is that the regional planning commission was not included in the process or reported to be part of the process in the development of the project.

So, quickly, about land use.
In their application, Antrim Wind states several things: That "the project area has been long used for wood lots and open space"; the location of the wind energy should be" --
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and that's on Page 48 of the Application -"location of the wind project should be consistent with existing land uses" -- which is also Page 48. And to remind you, this is a Rural Conservation District that this is being proposed in. And I also found it very interesting in the Application, there was a report that was inserted in from the Department of Energy, a wind energy report. It's on Page 1. It's one of the appendices. I can find out which one that is and put it in here. But there's a call-out box, and it talks about different -- the major challenges to getting to a 20-percent wind scenario for wind power in the United States.

And they talk about many of the things we're facing here today about those major challenges. And one of the key bullets here was addressing potential concerns about local siting, wildlife and environmental issues within the context of generating electricity. So it's the weighing of the public benefit, you know, of having, you know, adequate wind power, adequate
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electrical power, and also balancing it with those local and environmental issues.

So, some of the issues I had around the land-use side to evaluating the orderliness is, once again, it did not go to the regional planning commission. So it's hard to evaluate this particular project in the context of what's happening in the region and how does it fit into that larger public need for reliable energy.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Ms. Lyons? MS. LYONS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I may be getting my cases confused. I had thought that there had been a reach-out to the regional planning commission, and it either responded with sort of "Thank you, we are aware of it," kind of neutral sort of response, neither supportive nor opposed, although I may be getting that way off. So it didn't actively participate in this process or very strongly in the community, but it was aware of it and didn't raise an issue about being cut out of the process by
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any means. Am I right?
MS. LYONS: Well, that wasn't my direction there. My experience is that regional planning commissions publish all sorts of reports, are willing to give information about their region. And I have no information on what those regional issues are because it wasn't brought forward.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I see. MS. LYONS: So there's lots of public information. So when I say "consult," I don't just say that they have to be an active participant in the process. But it doesn't show that they've actually consulted. I may have missed it, but I don't -- there's no reference to any regional studies or information.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I'm not
sure -- Mr. Iacopino, do you have the actual exhibit that --

MR. IACOPINO: There's not an
exhibit. But around February 9th, 2012, after this Application was filed, a letter was sent to the Southwest Regional Planning
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Commission, inviting them to give their views and positions -- described the project and invited them to make their views or positions known and also informed them of the requirements if they wanted to intervene as a full party in the proceeding. I think there may have been subsequent correspondence to them as well after the Application was accepted. I'm looking for that.

Now, that's pretty much a
standard thing that the Committee does, is we send out those types of letters to the planning -- regional planning commission for that area, as well as the town in which the project is proposed, and the abutting towns as well. I can't find any follow-up letter. I don't believe in this case, and subject to check against the record, that we ever received a response from Southwest Regional Planning Commission in response to that letter. But I would have to double-check our correspondence file to make sure.

And for those who are
interested from the public, the letter is on
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the web site that was sent out to the Southwest Regional Planning Commission.

MS. BAILEY: And it was sent by us?

MR. IACOPINO: Sent by me on behalf of the Committee. It's standard that we do it at the beginning of pretty much every docket.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
MS. LYONS: So, I also found there's some other gaps in the land use, orderly development and land use. And there seemed to be some information gaps, whether they were not stated but were brought up in testimony by many of the other intervenors, that there's some very significant conservation efforts going on in the community that were not addressed at all. The Quabbin-to-Cardigan Initiative was probably the one that we heard the most about. But there's also other conservation efforts going on in the area: The Forest Legacy Program. So that just kind of -there was these information gaps that came
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out in other testimony that should have probably been disclosed about what's happening in the region, part of that orderly development again.

I know we're going to come to the subdivision issue as a separate one, but that also comes to land use. And I'll just let it sit there. But $I$ think that's also part of that orderly development side. But we've reserved subdivision for a separate conversation.

Moving on to Real Estate
Values. That's Appendix 14A in the Application. The consultants, Magnusson \& Gittell, after lots of modeling and other studies, they conclude that in arm's-length transactions there's no support for diminished property values. And I reread all that stuff again, and, you know, it was about as clear as it was the first time. I mean, it's hard when you have competing studies that were done and the ways to model. So, you know, $I$ just kind of let that kind of roll for a little bit.
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The Industrial Wind Action group questioned their analysis of the other studies and, you know, questioned the small sample sizes, especially as it relates to New Hampshire real estate values. And those were really thoughtful questions. I was concerned that the abutters didn't offer independent studies or analysis on the impacts of their properties. We heard a lot about, you know, "What is it going to do to my property?" And it goes back to what Magnusson and Gittell talked about as "anticipation effect" and trying to get at, you know, what is that anticipation effect before the wind farm gets built? And there's not a lot of quantifiable studies that link back to what was the anticipated effect to what the true value was at the end. This one was really hard for me to really think about. Knowing the volatility of the recent real estate market, it's been -- you know, I don't think any of us have homes that are worth more than they were, you know, 10 years ago. It is a tough one, and I'm not really sure how to crack
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that. So I'd be really interested in more of what other people's thoughts are. We don't have a large pool in New Hampshire of looking at data here, and we know that real estate markets are very regional. So it's even hard to compare across regions and like communities. So it is a tough one. Also, the Economic Benefits section. That's Appendix 14B. And the Application and the study cites job creation, short- and long-term, increased tax revenues and lease payments to the local landowners. And that's Page 103 of the Application. The Industrial Wind Action group testimony questions the models in their application, contends that all the calculations are based on positive outcomes, and all financing construction costs are unknown and should be factored into any of the Economic Benefits section. They also are concerned that without a Purchase Power Agreement, pricing is unavailable. So that comes back into the economic benefits or financial side to this project.
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Just take a look at my notes here. So, going back to the creation of jobs, increased tax revenues and lease payments to local landowners, a bulk of the economic benefit -- and there's a total benefit of $\$ 55.7$ million of direct and indirect, you know, the bigger number; there's another number thrown out as 2.3 million dollars annually for indirect and direct. But, really, a bulk of that, those big monies, are up front during construction. The long-term benefits really only come from the taxes that would be paid to the town. There's very few employees who are on site, so there's not a lot of long term. There's going to be a big slug in the first year, and then it's just going to piddle away.

One of the things I had to read really carefully, and it took me a little bit to find, is they talked about local area economy. And we're asking, you know, the Town of Antrim to make, you know, a significant commitment in their community. So I wanted to know what that local area
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economy was going to be. And I was surprised to find that it's basically all the counties in southern New Hampshire. So we're then taking that money and stretching it across all the southern counties, from Rockingham to Cheshire. So that economic benefit dilutes, other than the direct tax revenues that stay within the community. So it really doesn't look like a big number any longer when you realize what is it covering. I don't really think, even with the tax revenue -- and I went back and looked at a lot of the information on the PILOT and the Alt PILOT. And I went back to other recently permitted certificated projects to find out what -because I'm not, you know, a real estate person, I'm not a tax person. So I didn't really know -- you know, I know what a PILOT is because state agencies pay PILOTS to towns. But I didn't really know what the difference between PILOT and ad valorum was and what would be the pluses and minuses. And as far as I can tell -- and I can be corrected, because I had to go back and take
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 1 PM SESSION - ONLY] \{02-05-13\}
a look at this -- but the Lempster project is the only project that has ad valorum, which is based on real value of the investment. So the -- Mike's shaking his head, so I might be corrected --

MR. IACOPINO: I'm just trying to remember. I'm not shaking my head. I'm just cocking it.

MS. LYONS: It's based on real property; whereas, PILOT is an agreement that is something less than real property.

And so the Lempster project is the only one that's ad valorum in the state right now. Everything else has been negotiated into a PILOT. And I'm not really sure what that means. I don't really know how that helps or hinders economic benefits to a community. And the Allen and Brooks panel talked a lot about that and the issue that's ahead of the superior court right now. It's a little over my head, but I wanted -- I don't really understand why the tax model was changed or presented that way. So that is the other thing that's been kind of, you
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know, bothering me. Is it really meeting community needs, the tax structure for the economic benefit? It's put in as an economic benefit, but I don't know what that economic benefit is or is not to the community.

So that kind of summarizes my thoughts. We can see where that brings us. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.

Does anyone have additional evidence, issues that you recall on this subject to put out before we get to discussing it, on economic benefits as a result of the project or on the development of the region? Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: I thought it was interesting, what Ms. Lyons started with, is that we have to look at or take advice from the municipal planning commission and the municipal government body, or something like that. And we have briefs from the Antrim Conservation Commission and the Antrim Planning -- not planning board. We had one from them, too -- the Board of Selectmen. And they come to different conclusions. The board of selectmen say that this goes along
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with the orderly development of the region, and the Antrim Conservation Commission talks about the conservation efforts that have occurred in Antrim, starting with 1989 when they established the Rural Conservation District, the Open Space Conservation Plan. So I think there's a long history in Antrim of conserving land. And notwithstanding that vote where everybody -- the town decided they weren't going to prohibit industrial wind in the Rural Conservation District, I think there is evidence that shows that there is a long history of conservation efforts. And also, the testimony, the oral testimony of Ms. Carey Block, I was struck by that. At least some of the people that we have heard from have developed a record that seems to suggest that Antrim has been very careful about conservation.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I think
that's a good point. I think the flip side is also clear, that there's been a long tradition of use of the land and not conservation in a sort of pristine way where
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it can never be touched, but plenty of logging, plenty of commercial uses of rural properties, and that they both have a place to co-exist. And the town seems to recognize that and to honor both of those traditions, not seeing them as in conflict with one another. I agree. I was struck that it's been many years that there's been a real definition of conservation lands and rural districts and identifying particularly sensitive areas to be mindful of. We're going to get into that, $I$ think, in other sections. But I was struck with a town that seemed to think about this a lot and people who took it seriously and didn't always agree with the conclusions, but were very much embracing the notion of planning and master plans and thinking and visioning their future and how they want it to be as a community, you know, years down the road, as opposed to just kind of reacting to each thing that comes forward.

Other comments?
(No verbal response)
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CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: We have, then, to make sense of the kind of differing points of view that came out. And Ms. Lyons did a nice job of bringing forward -- and some of these are sort of unanswerable questions that we get the job of having to answer.

On the question of the real estate values and the conflicting views that were brought forward, my sense of it was that there were small numbers of data to be able to assess, and because of that, it leads you either to conclude that there isn't enough data to demonstrate a problem, or there isn't enough data to give you comfort that you know what's really going on. I mean, I think you can come to opposite conclusions from the same problem with a very limited data set of real estate transactions in a small area. And in a period of a down economy, there just aren't going to be a lot of examples to work with.

But given that difficulty, did people have a conclusion about whether you
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found evidence to support that real estate properties would be harmed, or evidence to support that there's no indication that real estate properties would be harmed with the project? Or did you find it was an open question that would have to play out, and they didn't have evidence to be able to reach either way? I'm getting some nods on the third alternative. Anybody want to speak to that? Dr. Boisvert.

DR. BOISVERT: I would say I was left with the idea that it's an open question, mostly because the real estate market over the last several years has been very atypical in my lifetime and -- at least in my lifetime when I'm looking at real estate. And I find it hard to separate the noise from the signal.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Anyone
else want to speak to that? Mr. Simpkins.
MR. SIMPKINS: Well, yeah, I
guess the comment you made earlier about a small data set, that was -- I mean, to me, the data set is so small, it's very hard to
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draw any substantial conclusions from that. And the fact that New Hampshire's first commercial-size wind turbine facility went operational in the fourth quarter of 2008, so right when the economy was tanking, it's very hard to say we have sufficient data to draw a conclusion about what will happen to real estate values.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Anyone
else on that?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I
certainly can't conclude that it will have an undue impact on real estate values. I guess I'm not certain $I$ can find that it will have no impact. But if we're asked under the statute, "Will there be undue interference -or unreasonable impact," I guess I don't see that that's been demonstrated, personally.

On the larger question of the development of the region, I didn't see any way in which this project violated any standards of the community or would be in contravention of a vision plan that's been
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 1 PM SESSION - ONLY] \{02-05-13\}
adopted by the community. Again, it seemed as though there is this balance within the municipality to have both preservation of rural characteristics on or all of those that they bring, natural open space, but also to allow uses of that land for commercial purposes. And so I didn't see evidence that would make me conclude that there was an undue interference with that development of the region. There are certainly individuals and certain aspects of it that people didn't like, and we're going to get to more of those specifics and others. But sort of the concept of planning and vision, I guess that's where I came out, that I didn't find undue interference with the orderly development of the region by this Application.

Anyone else who had a view on that and want to speak to that? Ms. Lyons.

MS. LYONS: I agree with you.
I mean, that was broadly -- probably doesn't have -- the project doesn't have an impact on real estate values individually perhaps, but
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still not even quantified that it could have individual effects.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Any other discussions on this? I don't know if that's a yes or a no. Are people comfortable with a straw vote on this question?

All right. This would be on whether we have evidence to conclude that the project would have an undue interference with the orderly development of the region.

All right. Why don't you read that again a little bit louder.

MR. IACOPINO: The issue is whether or not the project -- whether the project will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region, with due consideration having been given to the views of municipal and regional planning commissions and municipal governing bodies.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
And you're reading from the statute itself.
MR. IACOPINO: R.S.A.
162-H: 16, IV(b).
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: For those
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who feel that the evidence presented demonstrates that it will not unduly interfere, as you've read that out, please raise your hands. Will not interfere. (Subcommittee members indicating by show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Anyone who has the opposite view, that it will? All right. Have we got everybody? Anybody else with uncertainty? All right. Thank you.

Anything else on that issue? If not, then let's move to the next one, which is on aesthetics -- again, tracking from the statute. And Mr. Dupee has been asked to lead the discussion on that one.

MR. DUPEE: So, thank you,
Madam Chair.
Starting off where we left in the last discussion, going back to the statute that guides this Committee, under 162-H:16, Findings and Certificate Issuance, under IV we have to find, "after considering available alternatives and fully reviewing environmental impact of the site or route and
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other relative factors bearing on whether the objectives of this chapter will be best served by the issuance of a certificate, must find that the site and its facility" -- I'm only going to read (c) -- "will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air and water quality, the natural environment, and public health and safety." I will be confining my review to the aesthetics piece of this. We've certainly heard from testimony within the record some opposing thoughts as to what sort of aesthetic impact the introduction of wind turbines would have to the area of interest here.

So, going back to AWE 10, the
Guariglia testimony -- it's actually his supplemental testimony -- he was asked if the potential visual impacts to receptors, such as Willard Pond, "would you basically" -- I'm sorry. "If there is a potential visual impact to receptors such as Willard Pond, why have you concluded the project would not have an unreasonable adverse impact?"
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And Mr. Guariglia's answer was, "Generally, there is limited potential visibility of the project within the 5-mile study area, therefore limiting the potential for visual impact. The project will have some impacts on a limited number of resources. However, given the relatively small affected viewshed area, the collective impact of the study area will be low. Taking into account the entire study area, the project will not result in an unreasonable adverse impact to the aesthetics of the Antrim region."

I'd asked Mr. Guariglia in his testimony to elaborate for me on the quantitative method that he used to draw on that conclusion. I don't have that citation for you, but I'm sure we can find it if we look. But his answer back to me was, essentially, it's not like adding two and two and getting four, the mathematical concept that every person who understood mathematics would derive exactly the same answer. It was not that neatly easy to do, which is why I
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think we reached perhaps a separate understanding under one of the other witnesses who spoke to us, which is Ms. Vissering, who was a witness for Counsel for the Public. She was asked a very similar question: Basically, would she believe there would be an impact, based upon her analysis of a more focused viewshed that focused on the Willard Pond area? So, sort of the contrast here is the 5-mile, large, sort of macro view versus a more micro view. And she said, and I quote, "The impacts would be significant because of the existing condition which is entirely natural, with no development currently visible from the pond. Because this is a wildlife sanctuary and Audubon preserve, there's an expectation that one would experience a natural setting that would be different from settings such as Gregg Lake."

I believe Ms. Vissering has made an important point here, and that is the expectation for aesthetics is going to be different in an area which is recognized as a
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wildlife sanctuary from an area where there was other commercial activities undergoing. I'd like to quote again from PC 1, again, Ms. Vissering. She describes a bit about Willard Pond. She talks about it being "a scenic 108-acre pond known for its pristine setting, extremely clean water and excellent fishing. No petroleum motors are permitted, and there's no development on the pond. There's a small put-in for canoes and kayaks, and it's a popular swimming park, even though technically swimming is not permitted. The pond is owned by the State, but is completely surrounded by the dePierrefeu-Willard Pond Wildlife Sanctuary, which consists of 1700 acres owned by the New Hampshire Audubon Society, which abuts the proposed Antrim project to the south. From a well-used parking area set back from the pond, one can access a number of trails." And I want to quote from her, "Nine turbines plus a meteorological tower are visible in the simulation provided by the Applicant from the dam on Willard Pond. This area is a
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popular destination for walkers and swimmers. All 10 turbines will be visible from various points around the pond, and most turbines will be visible from nearly all points on the pond. The turbines will be seen in relatively close proximity, with distances ranging from 1.4 to 3.2 miles away." So, again, contrasting sort of the larger viewshed taken by the Applicant's witness to more of a micro sort of view.

Then she goes on to say, "The impacts will be significant because of the existing condition which is entirely natural, with no development currently visible from the pond. Because this is a wildlife sanctuary and Audubon preserve, there's an expectation that one will experience a natural setting that will be different from settings of Gregg Lake," similar to what I read to you before.

So then she was asked the question about the proposed easements -- in other words, were going to be perhaps less intrusive viewshed -- "will change your
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findings and conclusions as described in your visual assessment report?" She says, "No, they would not.

Please note that additional conservation measures were noted as one of the several recommendations, which together would be necessary for the project to avoid an unreasonable adverse impact on aesthetics. Even with removal of the two southernmost turbines and introduction of most nighttime hazard lighting through radar-activated lighting control, the project would result in an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics."

I'd like to move on now to testimony ASNH 23, testimony of Frances Von Mertens. She sort of reiterates for us the status of this Willard Pond area, which she says "was an original 3,000-acre parcel in 1985" -that's roughly 30 years ago -- "now consists of over 30,000 acres under protection." And the individuals who were party to that protection are numerous. They would be the Harris Center, the Nature Conservatory,
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Audubon Society itself, New Hampshire Fish \& Game, and Society for the Prevention of the New Hampshire Forests. She mentions meeting on the pond a certain individual who worked for EPA, and he asked her -- or she asked him what he was doing there. And he mentioned back to her in an e-mail that Willard Pond is one of a hundred lakes nationally selected by EPA as a reverence site because of the minimal disturbance, no shoreline development that would compromise water quality. A quote from an e-mail she received from Mr. Fabot, quoting, "It is one of the few lakes that has minimum waterfront and watershed disturbance, specifically [sic] in Southern New Hampshire."

I want to turn now to the ASNH post-hearing memorandum, dated 1/14. They make a number of points. I'm going to read not all, but rather some of them, which may be, again, responses what we already talked about.

As part of its mission, Audubon owns in
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fee and currently manages 39 wildlife sanctuaries throughout New Hampshire, with a total acreage of about 7400. Nearly 1700 acres, dePierrefeu-Willard Pond Wildlife Sanctuary is Audubon's largest property. The distance between the property line of the sanctuary nearest the site and the nearest proposed turbine is roughly less than one mile. In addition, Audubon holds conservation easements on about 1300 acres of lands adjacent to the sanctuary, bringing the total of Audubon's protected lands in the region to about 3,000 acres. As we mentioned earlier, the 3,000 acres is part of a larger "Supersanctuary" that totals over 30,000 acres of protected land in the area. Willard Pond lies in the interior of the sanctuary. The pond is a state-designated "Great Pond" and pristine water body of approximately 100 acres, with considerable aesthetic values, including an undeveloped shoreline. So again, sort of a repetition of its value because of the fact it is not developed.

We heard mentioned earlier in a
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Conversation today the Quabbin-to-Cardigan Initiative, the fact that this would be sort of an integral part of that interstate effort.

The Audubon Society's post-hearing memorandum goes on to say that the federal government has invested approximately \$3.5 million in the Forest Legacy Program, and the State of New Hampshire has invested roughly $\$ 400,000$ in matching funds, and that clearly other organizations have spent money to provide this sort of protection.

So I note, going back to the record, the Willard Pond Wildlife Sanctuary area has been in existence from a time well predating the application that we have before us today. 1985 I believe is when it began. The Audubon Society has openly and publicly during that period of time made the Willard Pond area one of its sanctuaries well known to anybody who comes and visits that area, that that's what it is used for. I believe that the fact that it was a wildlife sanctuary was known to the Applicant, as I believe the record shows that
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it reached out to the Audubon Society. I don't have the cite in front of me, but I'm sure we can find it.

So I guess it goes back, to me, that it's important to reiterate that the Applicant was aware of the existence of the sanctuary and that it was clear to the Applicant what type of sanctuary it was and that it is an uninhabited wilderness area designed to attract a clientele whose aesthetics are focused on the beauty of nature in its natural state.

So the question, I guess to me, and I've been wrestling with this one a little bit, is: Aesthetically, can there be a co-location of an industrial wind facility with a pre-existing wildlife sanctuary that was built over the years for the expressed purpose of providing a wild and natural environment? And I struggled with this, because on one hand it seems to me that these concepts are antithetical, like light and dark or wet and dry; if one condition exists, then the other cannot. But I'm hoping my
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fellow Committee members will weigh in on this, as maybe there's some things here I've not thought of or not seen that would help me understand how these could be considered compatible uses. So I would stop there, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
Thank you very much. That's helpful as a starting point.

Additional comments people want to make as sort of the factual basis before we get into what to make of all of it that we want to bring forward? Ms. Bailey.

MS. BAILEY: Can anybody
summarize the testimony of Mr. Guariglia, who took the position, I think, that Willard Pond wasn't significant enough to consider it -consider the visual impact on it? I think, and this is what $I$ want people to tell me if I'm right or wrong, that his position was that, since Willard Pond wasn't a state-designated regional something or other, then we couldn't find that the aesthetic impact on that pond had an unreasonable
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adverse effect on aesthetics because it didn't really matter. Is that what his testimony was?

MR. DUPEE: Certainly the idea that it wasn't a state park was part of his testimony. I don't recall that he thought that because -- he certainly indicated it was not a state park. But whether it meant they could never be considered aesthetically significant, $I$ don't recall that part of his testimony.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I agree.
I think there was a hierarchy in his mind that, if it had been designated by a government entity, federal or state government, it was a higher-value property warranting more concern. And if it was designated by a municipality, as in the case of Gregg Lake, or just by a private entity such as Audubon, it doesn't seem, in his mind, to rise to that level of concern. And as I recall, when pushed on where those standards came from, why he ranked them the way he did, or what tests he used to decide
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what kind of government entity was on one side of the line and what was on the other, it seemed not to be all that clear. Although he had taken issue with Ms. Vissering's use of more subjective criteria, I had the sense it was fairly subjective in his mind of what to put in the category of sort of singled out by the government entities and wasn't all that cut-and-dry a standard that he had presented. That was my take on it. And the more questions that were pushed on it, the less clear those lines seemed to be, by my read of it. Mr. Simpkins.

MR. SIMPKINS: Yeah, this is
an area that kind of bothered me, too. So I went back and looked at -- I have the transcript open from the afternoon of Day 5. And I was asking some questions of Mr. Guariglia. I'll just read just a brief section here.

I was questioning him about this issue of if it's owned by the State or whatever, it has a higher significance. So I asked him specifically about privately owned
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lands that have an easement held by the State. And his answer was, "Well, if the easement is owned by the State, then that would level some sort of look at."

So then I -- and I'm kind of paraphrasing here. I asked specifically about conservation easements held by the State of New Hampshire, but the ownership is still in private lands, and his answer was, "Well, that could be. I know we have considered stuff like that." Then he says, "In our experience, a lot of times it has to do with hunting, you know, where the State goes in to a farm and... they make a deal, and then they open it up to hunting." So then I asked if he was familiar with the federal Forest Legacy Program and the ranking, both the state and national ranking that they go through. His answer was, "I'm aware of the concept. I didn't know the specific name of the legacy... So that's something that we'd look at, too."

So I said, "Is that an example
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of something that may rise to the level of state significance?"

And his answer was, "Again, the easement is owned by the State, so it would be considered a statewide." Then he goes on to talk about the purposes of it. "But it would at least warrant an additional look."

So my last question was, "Did you find any of those when you were reviewing this area?"

His answer was, "From my recollection, all the easements that I remember were more of not-for-profits. Or there may have even been like Boston University or Boston College had some sort of easement, too. I don't remember seeing that come across."

So the issue I had was, in questioning about easements, specifically in this case, Forest Legacy easements, where both state and federal money was put into it, he seemed to indicate that, yes, that would be certainly something we would look at, and
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that could have statewide significance. But he never identified those when he was doing his review, and there's at least two of them in close proximity, within 5 miles, let alone 10 miles. So I think that was very inadequate for him to really talk about that, because he didn't even identify them. So he couldn't talk about whether they were of statewide significance or not, because he missed them. So that's a concern.

The other comment I would
have, as far as, you know, whether something is more important because it's a State property or federal property versus local property, is I think that's very subjective. There could be an area that has very substantial statewide importance.

But speaking as a state agency, when we look at something whether to invest money in to, you know, put an easement or conserve it, if someone has already gone through that process and it's already conserved, we don't need to do it. So that doesn't mean it's not important to us. It
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means someone else has already done it. So it could have very important statewide significance. Just the fact that the State isn't the one who owns the easement does not mean it's not significant. It's just that someone else happened to have the funds to purchase that easement before us. So this whole section about statewide significance and the -- those things troubled me. I didn't find it very satisfying.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Other
comments?
MS. BAILEY: Can I ask? CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Ms.

Bailey, yes.
MS. BAILEY: Does the
designation of the pond as a "Great Pond" have any significance? Is that something that the State does?

MR. SIMPKINS: That would probably be a question more for Mr. Stewart, because I believe, under law, if a pond is more than 10 acres in size, it's
automatically a "Great Pond" and falls under
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a state jurisdiction.
DIRECTOR STEWART: That's right. It's really based on the size of the pond and has nothing to do, you know, with the --

MS. BAILEY: The significance.
DIRECTOR STEWART: Well, the amount of development or anything of that sort. And there's no criteria other than size that establishes a pond as a "Great Pond."

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Ms.
Bailey.
MS. BAILEY: I was also
troubled by Mr. Guariglia's testimony. To say that Willard Pond is not significant, I think that there's a lot of testimony that refutes that point, and that's why I brought it up. I think that Willard Pond does seem like a significant area, that we should consider whether this project would have an unreasonable adverse effect on its aesthetics, despite the fact that it's not, in his definition, "of statewide
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significance."
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Ms. Lyons.
MS. LYONS: The other issue
that was brought up, I believe in the post-hearing briefs, is about cumulative effects. And when I was -- when we were going through the testimony -- and I was thinking, a lot of us always think from the forest floor, you know, looking up. But we also have lots of high peaks, and so it's also getting on top of those peaks and looking around. And I think it was a little weak in that aspect, to not get to the mountaintops and see what we could see out there as aesthetics also. And there's -- we have Pitcher Mountain, which is a conserved area, which you can see another wind farm from there. So I think we were kind of land-based, ground-based, valley floor, but we have to think about all different elevations when we think about aesthetics.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Although,
we certainly had some visual simulations from some vistas. There's the Bald Mountain photo
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sim that was, I think, Exhibit 16.
Attachments 7A and 7B was the Bald Mountain one. And I think what I've got up right now is another one of those... the Gregg Trail Overlook, another kind of higher elevation looking out at a fairly distant ridgeline, with barely discernible turbines there. That's at Attachment 13 A and B to Mr . Guariglia's testimony.

But I think your point was the cumulative impact of multiple sites and even multiple projects in the region; is that correct?

MS. LYONS: Right. And it goes back to my constant concern that we don't have a regional context for it. So I'm speculating: What can I see? What can I not see?

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Other comments on the aesthetics issue? Dr. Boisvert.

DR. BOISVERT: I, too, had problems, very clearly, with his testimony. And I took issue with the public ownership
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being the yardstick for significance. I would point out that in the realm of historic preservation of cultural resources, that's completely irrelevant, and made a point there. But in pursuing it further, and I don't have it front of me right now, but $I$ believe I asked, "So what would be an unreasonable adverse visual impact?" And he conceded that there wasn't much. Possibly if you put something right on top of a pyramid right there, something like that, right on a very significant property, that would be the visual trigger. And I found that to be a standard that was no standard all. By his reckoning, it would be virtually impossible, under his system, his methodology, to find there was ever any unreasonable adverse effect in the aesthetics. And for me, that is such a prejudged, prejudicial approach, that I could not find much utility in what he had to offer. It was such an extreme position, from my point of view. And that leaves me with my position and my judgment, which I have, anyway, obviously, in this
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hearing. But $I$ did not find a way that you could fairly and equitably use his methodology to determine that there were, indeed, any possible cases of adverse -- or unreasonable adverse effect, and that troubled me.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Mr. Dupee.
MR. DUPEE: Thank you, Madam
Chair. I did find testimony from Day 5 of John Guariglia, where I asked him a question about the quantitative nature of his method of doing his evaluation, with the intention of being able to understand how it was used and could apply it towards this situation and perhaps others. So, my question was: "What could I take from your testimony that would give me a way to say $I$ can apply a reasonable set of principles and guidelines that would allow me to distinguish between an unreasonable adverse effect and a reasonable effect for this particular site, recognizing you can't speak to the Committee's broader authority?" And his response to me... "Well, I think there is no true definition for where
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you go from no adverse effect to, you know, an impact."

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: So as sort of an analytical model, that wasn't very helpful.

MR. DUPEE: Correct.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I also
found this issue to be very troubling. And my starting point was the context that these turbines would be in. It is in a small community with a ridgeline that sort of runs throughout and around the community, as opposed to a remote area. You know, you think of things like Granite Reliable, where you've got a ridgeline that's in a fairly remote part of the state. Roads don't go near there. It's hard to find those turbines from a lot of vantage points. And these are the same size as that. They're the largest models that we have yet to see proposed in this state, and yet in a very, very small community setting, ringing around the willard Pond and rising up over Gregg Lake, which is part of the community recreation area. It
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seemed very, very different to me than other projects that I'd seen before, where you may have some impacts, but they're away from kind of the majority of the community, and they don't overwhelm the location. And my sense in looking at some of the photo simulations were that they really overwhelmed the location. The Willard Pond photographs, 8A and 8 B of his testimony in particular, was just -- it's just radically different from any of the simulations that I'd seen in other contexts, and $I$ found it very troubling.

And I found his testimony to
be -- you know, similar frustrations I think that you had, Mr. Dupee, that he didn't seem helpful in finding an analytical method to make it make sense of it. It seemed more reaching conclusions and then defending the conclusions, rather than something that was a more thoughtful approach to the reality of a community like this that's going to have significant construction of turbines very close at hand. And that didn't seem to be in his thinking at all. It was just, well, is
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it owned by the State or not, as if that's really the -- to me, it wasn't -- I just couldn't understand why that should be so significant. And when asked if that was some sort of standard that people in his profession used, it didn't sound as though it was. It's something he uses sometimes, but it wasn't like it was a requirement or the way everyone's taught to do these sorts of analyses. So it just did not come together for me, for a community that's -- that the ridgeline is really an integral part of the community as it's grown up. So I couldn't conclude that there would be no unreasonable impact on the aesthetics. There's a lot of negatives in that. But I was not persuaded by Mr. Guariglia that this was an appropriate level of impact for this community.

Other comments? Ms. Lyons.
MS. LYONS: And building on your comments there, it really kind of -- I think it focuses on there's some mitigation that needs to be applied here. It is really the most public thing, I guess, that every --
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because it can be focused -- be seen from many locations. I think there's some mitigation that could be thought about here.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: FOX
example?
MS. LYONS: Well, I think the conservation easements are too little. They basically conserve land that furthers their business. So it's whole lots of land that they're leasing from people, and it's really whatever is in conservation, the remainder is not needed for the project.

So, to get at the larger
aesthetics or conservation values, we need to look at what is the context of -- there seems to be a community who is dedicated to conservation. What are their conservation goals in the community? And so I think that there's some mitigation that needs to be offered on this one.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Mr. Dupee.
MR. DUPEE: Madam Chair, I was
just wondering if there was any way one can mitigate the visual impact of those towers on
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an area that's been set aside as a wildlife sanctuary. I understand the concept of you can't save everything, and there may be reasons why, for example, when building a highway you may need to set aside wetlands for commercial business reasons. But if one has a wildlife sanctuary of longstanding that's been the effort of many, many people, when people go to that pond -- there's actually been members of this Committee that did stand down at the water and looked up at those hill points. If your intention was to go there to have a wildlife original experience, $I$ guess I'm not positive how a mitigation strategy could work.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Any other comments? Mr. Green.

MR. GREEN: I don't want to be the skunk at the end, but $I$ just want to be fair that we're treating this like we've treated other wind turbines. And this is my first time on this, so if I'm stepping out of line, just let me know.

One of the things that was put
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in the Applicant's post-hearing brief regarding Mr. Guariglia's testimony, they noted that the SEC has similarly noted that turbines are tall structures that will extend beyond tree-top level but has nonetheless concluded that the evidence does not support a finding that turbines themselves are aesthetically displeasing. And that's in the Application of the Granite Reliable Power, LLC, Docket 2008-04. This is granting of certificate of site and facility with conditions.

I don't know that I support one way or the other on this position. But I just want to make sure we have that in front of us so that we're not -- I haven't been -I also haven't visited the Granite Reliable Power, so I don't know what was involved in that particular discussion.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: It's a good reminder, and I appreciate you doing that. I mean, there is no question that anything standing, you know, nearly 500 feet tall is an imposition on the location that
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it's in. And we have cited many of those and are not saying that the fact of a turbine alone must mean an adverse impact, because that would make no sense in the context of all the other projects that have been approved. I think what we've been hearing in the discussion here is a combination of two things: The scale in the context of the community, as opposed to those towers in a remote ridgeline and higher elevations and that sort of thing, which is what you have in Granite Reliable; and the other is the conditions or the circumstances of the land on which those towers are being erected and that the location of Willard Pond in particular being different from some other situations where it might be a ridgeline that is beautiful, but it's simply a ridgeline, and in some cases owned by the person who's consenting to the location of many of the towers, as we saw in the Lempster case, and that it's not quite so deeply embedded into the community itself, the way it seems to fall in this context. Those are my concerns.
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A big, tall structure in and of itself isn't the problem. You know, to me, it's sort of the context in which it appears. And I grant you, that is a subjective analysis.

Other discussion of this, or do people feel ready to take a straw vote on the aesthetics question? Mr. Simpkins.

MR. SIMPKINS: Just one thing I did want to add for the record since it was brought up was about the Quabbin-to-Cardigan. That certainly is beyond a state; that is a regional. When I say "regional," not within the state, but among the states project by definition, includes two states. But I would also mention that there are already two approved wind projects within the $Q$-to-C. Both the Town of Groton and Town of Lempster are within the Quabbin-to-Cardigan area. So I just want to put that on the record since it came up. But it is certainly a regionally significant initiative.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
All right. If people feel
ready to have a straw vote show of hands, the
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10-minute break before we do that.
And also, I just want to
remind people. A number have asked, "Are we going to go all night?" No, we're not, because we don't have the need to get through witnesses before they have to get back on the plane and things like that, and there's no hurricanes bearing down on us. We will conclude somewhere between 4:00 and 4:30, depending where the issues break.

So let's take a 10-minute break right now, and then we'll pick up again with historic resources issues. Thank you. (Whereupon a recess was taken at 2:45 p.m. and deliberations resumed at 3:00 P.m..)

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
We're going to resume, please. The next category we're going to take up is addressing historic resources, and Dr. Boisvert is going to lead us in that discussion.

DR. BOISVERT: Thank you.
Hopefully this will be relatively short.
Historic resources, for our
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 1 PM SESSION - ONLY] \{02-05-13\}

## [DELIBERATIONS]

purposes here, fall into two fundamental categories. They're investigated in different ways and are evaluated in different ways. The archeological resources, the archeological sites, are, with rarest of exceptions, very low to ground and are not seen. And in order to identify them, people have to go out and do a close inspection of an area. Prior to that, there's a general inspection to determine whether or not the area in question has any reasonable possibility of having archeological sites on them. In our jargon, it's "Phase 1A and 1B surveys" to discover if something is there. The Phase 1A and 1B were
executed. Personnel went out and looked at the areas of direct physical impact. And this is because the significance of archeological sites, again with rare exceptions, is their ability to yield data that are significant, and it is what is contained within the site that is important.

Visual impacts on archeological sites generally do not apply. The only ones that
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might be relevant would be, say something like a petroglyph, where the visual -looking at a rock carving, that visual impact on a piece of art is -- one can understand how that could be an impact. There were no rock carvings found.

The area was surveyed. A determination was made and agreed upon by the Division of Historical Resources that there were no significant resources present and no further work needed to be done. So that portion of the project vis-a-vis compliance with Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act was completed. The Army Corps of Engineers need to issue a permit. That invokes a separate process that runs parallel to and independent of this process.

The other half of the
resources are the built environment, or the above-ground, as archeologists like to look at it. And that is different because the setting for historic properties can be a major component of why that property is significant. You can take an extreme example
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and look at Monticello. Putting something like a wind turbine onto the front lawn of Monticello would be a visual intrusion. It's historic, but it has no aesthetic meaning. The survey for the above-ground resources was initiated. Results from that survey was presented. However, that process is not complete. I mentioned that the Phase 1A and 1B was completed for the archeological sites. There are indeed Phases 2 and 3 that need to follow as well for other cultural resources in addition to archeological sites. And the determination of effect has not yet been made. The process of compliance is longer, more complicated for the built environment, and it's ongoing.

The Applicant has proposed that completion of the Section 106 process could be undertaken as a condition of the permit. And this has been done and accepted in other projects. Groton Wind is an example. And it is a process that historic preservation often accepts, in that projects
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are allowed to be initiated before the historic preservation compliance is completed, so long as there are firm agreements that it will be complete and that there will be no adverse effect. There is a different standard for historic resources. We are charged with identifying and treating "adverse effects," not "unreasonable adverse effects." So the standard is different, and in a certain sense lower. So, arguably, if the adverse effects are all mitigated or treated in some fashion, then that would subsume the unreasonable adverse effects. So, that is the status. There's still work to be done. There's no effects judgment that's been offered yet to DHR, and there's been no viewshed mapping for the impacts on the historic structures. That still needs to be done. If there are determined to be significant properties present and the impact is considered to be adverse, then there will be mitigated measures. And that's it. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
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Can you -- I get a little bit lost on the terminology, I guess, and where things are in the evaluation. You said that on the below-ground, sort of natural non-built environment, there's no pending issues remaining; right?

DR. BOISVERT: Correct.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And on the
built environment, there's no finding of anything adverse, but there is not yet a full report on all --

DR. BOISVERT: Right. They're not at the point yet in the process where they could make a finding of adverse effect. They're not there yet.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Any
expectation for how long that will be before a conclusion on whether there is or there is not anything adverse will be?

DR. BOISVERT: No, I don't
have any expectation. And I'm somewhat surprised that there has not been more movement coming in. I asked my colleagues, "What have you seen coming in?" They have
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not seen anything coming in. Unlike archeology, it is actually a little bit easier to do evaluations in the wintertime for above-ground resources because there are fewer leaves in the way and you can actually photograph things a little easier, et cetera; whereas, for archeology, frozen ground gets to be a problem. So, to be perfectly honest, I have not been given a sense of the completion, when this will be completed.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And can you remind us again? Let's assume that there are a couple of locations where there is a finding of adverse effect. What might the response be to resolve that problem?

DR. BOISVERT: Mitigated
measures have varied. They may be something along the order of the town center has not yet been fully evaluated for its eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places and preliminary determination that it is; therefore, the Applicant would go forward and make that nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. I believe this was done
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in Rumney for Groton Wind. So that would be another measure executed that will be viewed as being a mitigation to adverse effect. There are situations where there may be attempts at screening, that certain vegetative areas might be in place, such that the view to the historic resource, if it happened to be, if you will, in front of the intrusion, you might put something behind it to screen it so that you wouldn't notice it anymore. This is a little problematic because one needs to have an understanding of what vegetation will be appropriate to that resource. If in the 1880 , if this is a period of significance, the area was completely cleared because it was an active dairy farm, then putting in a row of vegetation, something that would never have been there to begin with, might not be appropriate. But vegetative screening is a hypothetical kind of mitigation measure. Developing historic context for the community -- and historic context is a specific kind of document held by our office,
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where it would be appropriate to develop a context on fulling ponds, a pond where you put the sheep skins in and you process them chemically, pull them out and turn them into wool for felting -- it occurs -- it was economically a very important thing in some areas. The Town of Gilmanton has one. The pond is virtually intact. It was an important activity at a point in time forgotten now in modern day. It may be appropriate to develop a written document, a monograph, if you will, a small one, that would outline why these ponds are important, and so that context could be used if another one was identified in another community. It would make it that much easier to say, yes, this is significant; this is why we go forward. It would become a useful tool in preservation. There are other kinds of mitigated measures. But basically, it's adding to our fund of knowledge about these various portions of the past that we didn't have before, so that they can be there to be used, intellectually somewhat similar to
\{SEC 2012-01\} [DAY 1 PM SESSION - ONLY] \{02-05-13\}

## [DELIBERATIONS]

creating or purchasing a wetland to mitigate the loss of another wetland.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: But
excepting your example of a turbine right smack in the middle of Monticello, these findings aren't likely to lead to a prohibition against building a turbine.

DR. BOISVERT: Correct.
Prohibition against building or "introducing visual, audible or atmospheric intrusions," which is the technical phraseology, are rare. They do occur, but they usually occur on something that is demonstrably, unequivocally significant. An example would be Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial on South Bass Island in Lake Erie. It's a 300-some-odd tall Corinthian column that was placed there to be a point of contemplation and peace because it was the last arm of conflict between the United States and Canada, and it's dedicated to peace after that. Putting a marina at the foot of it introduced visual and audible intrusions up against the memorial, and that Corps of
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Engineers permit was eventually denied for that reason.

But it needs to be something that is a very dramatic situation for it to be large enough to be a prohibition.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Other questions? Ms. Bailey.

MS. BAILEY: So, Dr. Boisvert, you would know, then, by now -- or the agency would know by now if there was something that was going to have that amount of impact.

DR. BOISVERT: I would expect so. There's always that surprise out of nowhere that one can have as the "never say never" business. But it is -- I do not anticipate there would be that level of discovery at this stage of the game, because there has been a review of the history of the community and so forth and there has been an inspection of the community. While there are some questions about accuracy here and there that could be resolved, none of them rise to that level.

MS. BAILEY: Thank you.
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CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Anything else? Are people comfortable with moving to a straw vote on -- yes, I'm sorry. Before we do that, Mr. Iacopino?

MR. IACOPINO: I would just point out one thing. It's in your record. It is Committee Exhibit 11. It is a letter from the Department of -- actually, it's a memo from the Department of Historical Resources. And the pertinent part I just want to point out to the Committee is the DHR requests that the SEC condition approval to include completion of the 106 process. "This will include the finalization of the identification of resources, assessment of effects, and avoidance, minimization or mitigation of impacts to historic resources if adverse effects to historic properties result from the undertaking." I just wanted to point that out, that we do have the request from that agency to condition any approval on the completion of the 106 process.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And we've
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done that in a number of other projects as well.

DR. BOISVERT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: So, with
that reminder of a possible condition as requested by the agency, are people comfortable with a determination that this project does not have an unreasonable adverse impact on historic resources? If we're ready for a straw vote on that, all who conclude that there is no evidence of unreasonable adverse impact to historic resources as a result of this project, with the understanding that any ultimate certificate would be conditioned on the finalization under the 106 section that Mr . Iacopino just read, please raise your hand? (Subcommittee members indicating by show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Any of you find there is an unreasonable adverse effect? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Appears
not. All right. Thank you.
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DR. BOISVERT: Oh, excuse me.
I apologize. I should have mentioned that, in our conditions to that effect, there's also the unanticipated discovery of archeological artifacts, sites and so forth, because they are buried and things that are found that are completely unanticipated, that is written in there. It simply depends upon the good luck and the integrity of the people in the construction area to let us know if something's been found.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And that's a good reminder. If someone in the field discovers something, they're excavating for, say a turbine pad, and they come across something, they are instructed to stop immediately; correct?

DR. BOISVERT: They are
instructed to contact the Division of Historic Resources so that we can do some evaluation. There are provisions in the Historic Preservation Act for unanticipated discoveries during construction. The specific wording is available. It's used
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rarely, but it does occur. And we attend to them very quickly. Again, they tend to be very dramatic situations. The African Burial Ground in Portsmouth would be an example. There was also human remains, so that puts it on a totally different plane. But it is there. There's a response. There are procedures for it.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: How about a 16th Century King of England?

DR. BOISVERT: Well, we would have to check into his descendants. Yeah, I think if we find a 16th Century King of England over here, I think we would stop. But it's also a reminder that just because an area is developed, there can be something under the pavement or next to the road. Some prior disturbance is no guaranty there's nothing left.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Okay.
Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Madam Chair, do
I understand that it's the sense of the Committee, then, at least at this point, that
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 So, basically with regard to air emissions. First of all, it's pretty clear that AWE will not produce air emissions. There's no need for an air permit in this case. So the next level of question is what might be avoided in annual air emissions if this wind energy facility were put online, should it be approved. And basically what the avoided emissions report determined was, assuming a mix of gas, coil -- excuse me -- coil? My God -- gas, coal and oil -- 80 percent gas, 11 percent coal and 10 percent oil -- of the facilities that would be avoided in terms of energy production, and assuming 102,000 megawatt hours per year of generation by the facility, that the carbon dioxide emissions that would be avoided would be on the order of 60,000 tons per year. There's also some smaller amounts of sulfate compounds and methane and nitrogen compounds that also would be avoided.So, basically, the overall
assessment is that there will be -- if the
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facility is approved -- air emissions would not occur due to the displacement caused by the wind energy facility.

Now, Ms. Linowes, in IWAG 1, basically disputed, $I$ think, not so much that there would not be any emissions, but the amount of benefit that might occur from putting this facility online. She questioned the percentage of the energy mix of the facilities that would be displaced and also whether the benefit would be as much as claimed, because wind tends not to blow as much in the summer; hence, the ozone days that would be -- have a -- where the facility would have a positive effect, which is in the summer, would not be so great. So those are really the challenges. And ultimately -- and capacity factor, you know, how much -- how many megawatt hours are ultimately going to be generated.

So, at the end of the day, $I$
think that it's a question of how much benefit there is and whether there would be a benefit, in terms of whether the Applicant's
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analysis or Ms. Linowes' critiques and assumptions are correct. So I guess that completes my presentation on air.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
Any questions, clarifications, additional factors to include? Obviously, in a wind project, the air emissions, air quality issues are a lot more straightforward. So your summary really helps us to see that you see no evidence to support any deterioration of air quality, and, in fact, improvement to air quality because of avoided emissions.

DIRECTOR STEWART: Right. The question is how much benefit, I think. Should I go on to water?

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well,
let's hold off for a second. Mr. Iacopino, the language on the air quality finding is -help me with this.

MR. IACOPINO: "Will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on air and water quality."

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
Why don't you go to water then. I didn't
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remember that they were joined. We'll do one vote together.

DIRECTOR STEWART: NOr did I. I was just trying to get my part behind me. The water issue really has multiple components. Again, I think it's fairly straightforward relative to some of these projects. The question of erosion and sedimentation control -- in other words, the potential impacts to water during construction from movement of sediment, the blasting, and storm water management after the fact and during construction -- as we discussed earlier today, those issues are addressed through the alteration of terrain permit that the department issues. That permit and the recommendations for conditions to the Committee have fairly extensive specifications, in terms of applying "best management practices" to address all of these issues, and importantly, having a monitor on site during -- a professional engineer monitor on site during the construction to ensure that the practices are being
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implemented during construction.
The other element of the water
issue is -- I'm back to the avoided emissions report by Resource Systems Group, RSG. And basically along the same lines as the air analysis, they've provided an analysis that shows that when these oil, gas and coal facilities are not generating electricity, they're not using water for cooling, and it's not going up the stack as vapor. So the estimate, in terms of the savings for water consumption, is -- well, they did it two ways: It's either 20.8 million gallons per year or 17.5 million gallons per year of avoided water consumption if this facility were put in place. That's basically based on some assumptions from the literature as to how much water is required for those types of energy generation.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: So is that the range, that there was somewhere between 17 and 20 million gallons per year not used? DIRECTOR STEWART: Yes, that's -- exactly -- from the other
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facilities.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
Thank you.
DIRECTOR STEWART: Assuming megawatt hours for each of the gas, oil and coal.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Anything else on water quality? You've already said your understanding of the permits that were in place and the conditions that were imposed were reasonable, from your understanding, even though you didn't participate in those particular permit applications.

DIRECTOR STEWART: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: That they, together with those conditions, will protect the water quality in the construction area.

DIRECTOR STEWART: Yes. There were three permits -- alteration of terrain, wetlands and subsurface disposal, which is the septic system -- that are issued by DES. And there were conditions recommended for each of those in the DES response with a
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final decision and conditions, dated August 31st, 2012.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. And any other comments? Ms. Bailey.

MS. BAILEY: Just a question.
I don't remember if it was specifically addressed or not. But was there anything having to do with wetlands and the impact on wetlands, and does that have to do with water?

DIRECTOR STEWART: Yes. And there actually is a wetlands permit -- or recommendations related to the wetlands permit application, which I'm looking for.

MR. IACOPINO: Committee 12.
DIRECTOR STEWART: Yeah, I'm in there. I'm just flipping the pages. The wetlands impact was 9,755 square feet of palustrine forested and scrub-shrub wetlands So, basically, there was an impact in the fill. And the impact -- I'm interpreting now, I apologize -- was during construction. And there's permanent fill of 452 square feet. It's a pretty small number, actually,
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for a project of this order. And then the project's specific conditions for the wetlands permit.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: As I
recall, there was also discussion of benefits of keeping the road as natural as possible by having an area that could be revegetated, not maintained as an impervious surface, which would be to the advantage of the area as well. Less runoff and all, so that the built road, both to be able to withstand heavy construction during the road building and delivery of the turbine units phase, but then allow it on a longer term basis to be not fully paved after that extent and keep it as natural as possible with more natural drainage.

DIRECTOR STEWART: Yeah, I think that's correct.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Anything else before a straw vote on the issues of air and water quality then? If not, the question would be: Is there evidence to find that the project as proposed would not have an adverse
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impact on the air and water quality of the area? And all those who find that evidence that it would not have an adverse impact, please raise your hands.
(Subcommittee members indicating by show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Anyone concluding that it would have an adverse impact?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Anyone
uncertain of a vote at this point?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
Thank you.
The next item that we were going to take up is the natural environment. But Mr. Robinson, who was going to head that section up, is not back, and we haven't heard yet from him whether he's going to be back tomorrow. Fortunately, we had a quorum without him, so we're lucky there. So we'll put that off.

We have three remaining
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issues: Public health and safety, which in turn comprises 9 or 10 different issues; the question of decommissioning, and then the subdivision land-use authority issue.

Would you be prepared to take on the decommissioning issue at this point? I know you were probably assuming it was tomorrow. So if not --

DR. BOISVERT: I was assuming it was tomorrow. And if we do it, it will be very clumsy. I may not do a better job tomorrow, but I would hope to.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: That's
fine. See, now the pressure's on.
And public health and safety, are there any of those issues we should start on, or do we want to put all of that off?

MS. BAILEY: I was thinking I was going tomorrow. So I think I'd be better prepared tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: That's
fine. Let's go off the record for one minute.
(Off-the-record discussion among
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Committee Members.)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Let's go back on the record. I think we are going to have to call it quits at this point now and resume tomorrow morning. The areas remaining are: Natural environment, which includes the avian and wildlife issues, habitat fragmentation, plants, natural communities, threatened species and easements -- it's obviously it's a big one; then public health and safety is sort of the broad category that would cover noise, shadow flicker, construction issues, turbine safety, fire issues and protection, hazardous waste control, stray voltage and aviation issues; and then the decommissioning and subdivision questions.

So I think rather try to pick them up piecemeal and jump into them before we're quite as organized as we should be, let's call it a day on these and begin tomorrow at 9:00. And hopefully Mr. Robinson will be back. And if not, we will have someone else designated to lead that
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discussion. So unless there's anything else Committee members have questions or comments -- anything, Mr. Iacopino?

MR. IACOPINO: I was just
asking Mr. Simpkins, if Mr. Robinson cannot be here tomorrow, if he could pick up on leading the natural environment.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
We'll work that out. Or we may subdivide it and share it among some others.

So with that, we'll suspend
until tomorrow at 9:00. And I appreciate all of the hard work of the Committee in getting ready for this, and we'll look forward to seeing everybody tomorrow morning. Thank you.
(Whereupon the Deliberations Day 1
Afternoon Session adjourned at 3:35
p.m.)
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| 33:12;49:24;92:7 | slug (1) | 54:21;79:24;85:24; | 46:17;76:14 | subjective (4) |
| side (5) | 29:16 | 95:2 | statute (5) | 53:5,6;56:15;70:4 |
| 22:4;26:9;28:23; | smack (1) | specifically (6) | 12:10;37:17;39:21; | subsequent (1) |
| 33:21;53:2 | 81:5 | 14:14;47:16;53:24; | 40:14,20 | 24:7 |
| signal (1) | small (14) | 54:6;55:20;94:6 | stay (1) | subsidiary (1) |
| 36:18 | $15: 3,10,13 ; 27: 3$ | specifications (1) | 30:7 | 5:20 |
| significance (12) | $35: 11,19 ; 36: 23,24$ | 91:19 | step (1) | substantial (3) |
| 53:23;55:2;56:1,9; | 42:8;44:10;63:10,21; | specifics (1) | 15:15 | 8:21;37:1;56:17 |
| 57:3,8,18;58:6;59:1; | 80:12;94:24 | 38:13 | stepping (1) | subsume (1) |
| 61:1;73:18;79:15 | smaller (1) | Specify (1) | 67:22 | 76:13 |
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| subsurface (1) | 56:6,8 | 65:6;93:12 | 13;70:17,17;78:18; | 84:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 93:21 | talked (4) | thought (7) | 80:7 | ultimately (2) |
| success (1) | 27:12;29:20;31:19; | 15:14;19:3;22:14; | towns (2) | 89:17,19 |
| 11:6 | 47:22 | 32:14;51:3;52:6;66:3 | 24:15;30:20 | unanswerable (1) |
| sufficient (1) | talking (3) | thoughtful (2) | tracking (1) | 35:5 |
| 37:6 | 11:4;16:10;19:9 | 27:6;64:20 | 40:13 | unanticipated (3) |
| suggest (1) | talks (3) | thoughts (3) | tradition (1) | 85:4,7,22 |
| 33:18 | 21:13;33:2;44:5 | 28:2;32:7;41:13 | 33:23 | unavailable (1) |
| sulfate (1) | tall (4) | threatened (1) | traditions (1) | 28:22 |
| 88:20 | 68:4,24;70:1;81:17 | 98:9 | 34:5 | uncertain (2) |
| summarize (2) | tanking (1) | three (2) | Trail (1) | 71:16;96:12 |
| 17:24;51:15 | 37:5 | 93:20;96:24 | 60:4 | uncertainty (1) |
| summarizes (1) | task (2) | throughout (2) | trails (1) | 40:10 |
| 32:6 | 12:24;13:15 | 48:2;63:12 | 44:20 | Under (11) |
| summary (1) | tasks (1) | thrown (1) | transactions (2) | 8:19;37:16;40:20, |
| 90:9 | 10:15 | 29:8 | 26:17;35:19 | 22;43:2;46:21;57:22, |
| summer (2) | taught (1) | times (2) | transcript (1) | 24;61:16;84:16; |
| 89:13,16 | 65:9 | 15:18;54:12 | 53:17 | 86:17 |
| superior (1) | $\boldsymbol{t a x}$ (7) | tip (1) | treated (2) | undergoing (1) |
| 31:20 | 28:11;29:3;30:7, | 13:10 | 67:21;76:12 | 44:2 |
| Supersanctuary (1) | 11,17;31:22;32:2 | today (4) | treating (2) | understood (1) |
| 48:15 | taxes (1) | 21:17;49:1,16; | 67:20;76:7 | 42:22 |
| supplemental (3) | 29:13 | 91:14 | tree-top (1) | undertaken (1) |
| $7: 5 ; 13: 6 ; 41: 18$ | technical (1) | together (6) | 68:5 | 75:20 |
| support (6) | 81:11 | 11:21;13:7;46:6; | tried (1) | undertaking (1) |
| 26:17;36:1,3;68:6, | technically (1) | 65:10;91:2;93:17 | 13:6 | 83:19 |
| 13;90:10 | 44:12 | told (1) | trigger (1) | undeveloped (1) |
| supportive (1) | tend (1) | 5:4 | 61:13 | 48:21 |
| 22:19 | 86:2 | tomorrow (11) | troubled (3) | undue (5) |
| Sure (10) | tends (1) | 96:21;97:8,10,12, | 57:9;58:15;62:6 | 37:14,17;38:9,16; |
| 5:14;15:12;16:5; | 89:12 | 19,20;98:5,22;99:6, | troubling (2) | 39:9 |
| 23:19;24:22;27:24; | term (2) | 12,15 | 63:8;64:12 | unduly (4) |
| 31:16;42:18;50:3; | 29:15;95:14 | tons (1) | true (2) | 12:22;13:17;39:15; |
| 68:15 | terminology (1) | 88:19 | 27:17;62:24 | 40:2 |
| surface (1) | 77:2 | took (7) | Truth (1) | unequivocally (1) |
| 95:8 | terms (4) | 13:22;16:7;19:15; | 5:4 | 81:13 |
| surprise (1) | 88:14;89:24;91:19; | 29:19;34:15;51:16; | try (1) | uninhabited (1) |
| 82:13 | 92:11 | 60:24 | 98:18 | 50:9 |
| surprised (2) | terrain (2) | tool (1) | trying (3) | United (2) |
| 30:1;77:22 | 91:15;93:20 | 80:18 | 27:13;31:6;91:4 | 21:15;81:20 |
| surrounded (1) | testimony (35) | top (2) | turbine (9) | units (1) |
| 44:14 | 10:7,10,11, 19,23, | 59:11;61:10 | 37:3;48:8;69:2 | 95:13 |
| survey (2) | 23,24;13:5,6;25:15; | total (3) | 75:2;81:4,7;85:15; | University (1) |
| 75:5,7 | 26:1;28:14;33:14,14; | 29:5;48:3,12 | 95:13;98:13 | $55: 16$ |
| surveyed (1) | 41:12,17,18;42:15; | totally (1) | turbines (13) | unknown (1) |
| 74:7 | 46:15,16;51:15;52:3, | 86:6 | 41:14;44:21;45:2, | 28:18 |
| surveys (1) | 6,11;58:15,17;59:7; | totals (1) | 3,5;46:10;60:7; | unless (1) |
| $73: 14$ | 60:9,23;62:9,16;64:9, | 48:15 | 63:10,17;64:22; | 99:1 |
| suspend (1) | 13;68:2;87:21 | touched (1) | 67:21;68:4,7 | Unlike (1) |
| 99:11 | tests (1) | 34:1 | turn (3) | 78:1 |
| swimmers (1) | 52:24 | tough (2) | 47:18;80:4;97:2 | unlikely (1) |
| 45:1 | Thanks (1) | 27:23;28:7 | two (10) | 6:18 |
| swimming (2) | 20:3 | towards (1) | 15:17;42:20,20; | unreasonable (22) |
| 44:11,12 | Therefore (4) | 62:14 | 46:9;56:3;69:7; | 37:18;41:6,24; |
| system (2) | 6:19;8:9;42:4; | tower (1) | 70:14,15;73:1;92:12 | 42:11;46:8,13;51:24; |
| 61:16;93:22 | 78:22 | 44:22 | type (1) | 58:22;61:8,17;62:5, |
| Systems (1) | thinking (4) | towers (5) | 50:8 | 20;65:14;71:3,5,11; |
| 92:4 | 34:18;59:8;64:24; | 18:17;66:24;69:9, | types (2) | 76:8,13;84:8,11,21; |
|  | 97:18 | $14,21$ | 24:12;92:18 | 90:21 |
| T | third (1) | Town (15) | U | up (24) |
|  | 36:9 <br> though (5) | 14:11;15:16;16:7, <br> 13.18•19:24.14. | U | 11:24;12:2;14:2; $25: 14 ; 29: 11 ; 54: 15$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { talk }(6) \\ & \quad 15: 1,6 ; 21: 16 ; 55: 6 ; \end{aligned}$ | $19: 15 ; 38: 2 ; 44: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 ; 18: 19 ; 24: 14 ; \\ & 29: 13,22 ; 33: 9 ; 34: 4 \end{aligned}$ | ultimate (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 14 ; 29: 11 ; 54: 15 ; \\ & 58: 19 ; 59: 4,9 ; 60: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
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| 67:11 | Victory (1) |  | whose (1) | 27:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 70:10,20;72:12,19; | 81:15 | W | 50:10 | wrestling (1) |
| 81:23;87:8;92:10; | view (9) |  | wild (1) | 50:14 |
| 96:17,19;98:19;99:6 | 35:3;38:19;40:8; | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { walkers (1) } \\ 45: 1 \\ \text { warrant (4) } \\ \text { 17:2;18:15;20:7; } \\ 55: 7 \end{array}$ | 50:19 | written (2) |
| upon (6) | 43:11,11;45:10; |  | wilderness (1) | $80: 11 ; 85: 8$ |
| 6:7;7:8,9;43:7; | 61:22;79:7;87:5 |  | 50:9 | wrong (1) |
| 74:8;85:8 | ```viewed (1) views (7) 13:20,23;14:8; 24:1,3;35:9;39:17``` |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { wildlife (14) } \\ \text { 21:20;43:16;44:1, } \end{array}$ | 51:20 |
| use (10) |  |  |  |  |
| 20,21,23;20:20; |  | warranting (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 14,23 ; 50: 17 ; 67: 1, \\ & 7,13 ; 98: 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 53:4;62:2 |  | $52: 17$ <br> waste (1) |  | yardstick (1) |
| used (10) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { viewshed (5) } \\ & 42: 8 ; 43: 8 ; 45: 9,24 ; \end{aligned}$$76: 17$ | $98: 14$ | Willard (17) | $\begin{gathered} 61: 1 \\ \text { year (6) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 20:23;42:16;49:22; |  |  | 41:20,22;43:9; |  |
| 52:24;62:13;65:6; |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { water (21) } \\ 41: 7 ; 44: 7 ; 47: 12 ; \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 5,24 ; 46: 18 ; 47: 8 \\ & 48: 16 ; 49: 14,19 \\ & 51: 16,21 ; 58: 16,19 \end{aligned}$ | year (6) 29:16;88:16,19; |
| 80:14,24;85:24; | violated (1) | 48:19;67:11;90:15, |  | $92: 14,14,22$ |
| 92:22 | 37:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 22,24 ; 91: 5,10,12 ; \\ & 92: 2,9,11,15,18 ; 93: 8, \\ & 18 ; 94: 10 ; 95: 22 ; 96: 1 \end{aligned}$ |  | years (7) |
| useful (1) | virtually (2) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 16,21 ; 58: 16,19 \\ & 63: 22 ; 64: 8 ; 69: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 22 ; 27: 23 ; 34: 8, \\ & \text { 20;36:14;46:20; } \end{aligned}$ |
| 80:18 |  |  | willing (1) |  |
| uses (7) | vis-a-vis (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { waterfront (1) } \\ & 47: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 23:5Wind (43) | 50:18 |
| 14:20;15:7;21:3; | 74:12 <br> visibility (1) |  |  | yield (1) |
| 34:2;38:6;51:5;65:7 |  | watershed (1) | 5:17,18,21;6:2; | 73:20 |
| using (1) | $\begin{gathered} 42: 3 \\ \text { visible (5) } \end{gathered}$ | $47: 15$ | 15:10,13;16:7,8,17; | Z |
|  |  | wave (1) | $16,22 ; 19: 17 ; 20: 8,21,$ |  |
| 81:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 15 ; 44: 22 ; 45: 2, \\ & 4,14 \end{aligned}$ | $13: 10$ |  |  |
| Utilities (1) | vision (2) |  | $37: 3 ; 41: 14 ; 50: 16$ | $17: 6$ |
| 6:5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 37:24;38:14 } \\ \text { visioning (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $36: 8 ; 37: 22 ; 52: 24$ |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { utility (1) } \\ 61: 20 \end{gathered}$ |  | 62:1,17;65:9;66:23; <br> 68:14;69:23;78:5 <br> ways (5) | 59:17;67:21;70:16; |  |
|  | visited (1) |  | 88:7;89:3,12;90:6 | 1 (7) |
| V | 68:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 13 ; 26: 22 ; 73: 3, \\ & 4 ; 92: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wintertime (1) } \\ & 78: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 10:23;17:5;21:10; |
|  | visits (1) |  |  | 44:4;87:19;89:4; |
| valley (1) | 49:21 | $\begin{array}{r} 4 ; 92: 13 \\ \text { weak (1) } \end{array}$ | within (13) | 99:17 |
| 59:19 |  | 59:13 | 15:10,22,23;21:21; | 1.4 (1) |
| valorum (3) | 43:4,21;44:4 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 8 ; 38: 2 ; 41: 12 \\ & 42: 3: 56: 4: 70: 12.16 \end{aligned}$ | 45:7 |
| 30:21;31:2,13 | Vissering's (1)$53: 4$ | $25: 1$ |  | 1/14 (1) |
| value (3) |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 3 ; 56: 4 ; 70: 12,16, \\ & 18 ; 73: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 47:19 |
| 27:17;31:3;48:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { vistas (1) } \\ & 59: 24 \\ & \text { visual (16) } \end{aligned}$ | weigh (1) | without (2) | 10 (8) |
| values (10) |  | weighing (1) | 28:21;96:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 23 ; 41: 16 ; 45: 2 \\ & 56: 5 ; 57: 23 ; 87: 24 \\ & 88: 13 ; 97: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 14:3;26:13,18; |  | $21: 22$ | withstand (1) |  |
| 27:5;35:9;37:8,14; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { visual (16) } \\ & \text { 17:16;41:19,21; } \end{aligned}$ | well-used (1) |  |  |
| 38:24;48:20;66:14 | 42:5;46:2;51:18; | 44were | 95:11 witness (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 13 ; 97: 2 \\ & \mathbf{1 0 0 ( 1 )} \end{aligned}$ |
| vantage (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 23 ; 61: 8,13 ; 66: 24 \\ & 73: 23 ; 74: 2,3 ; 75: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | 43:4;45:9 | $\begin{gathered} 48: 19 \\ \mathbf{1 0 2 , 0 0 0} \end{gathered}$ |
| 63:18 |  | 33:10 | witnesses (2) |  |
| vapor (1) | $\begin{gathered} 81: 10,23 \\ \text { volatility (1) } \end{gathered}$ | wet (1) | 43:3;72:6 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 102,000 (1) } \\ 88: 15 \end{array}$ |
| 92:10 |  | $\begin{gathered} 50: 23 \\ \text { wetland (2) } \end{gathered}$ | wondering (1)$66: 23$ | 103 (1) |
| varied (1) | 27:20 <br> voltage (1) |  |  | 28:13 |
| 78:17 |  | 81:1,2 | wood (1) | 106 (5) |
| various (4) | $\begin{gathered} \text { voltage (1) } \\ 98: 15 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 20: 23 \\ \text { wool (1) } \end{array}$ | 74:13;75:19;83:13, |
| 11:16;17:17;45:2; | Von (1)$46: 16$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { wetlands (9) } \\ 67: 5 ; 93: 21 ; 94: 8,9, \\ 12,13,18,19 ; 95: 3 \end{gathered}$ | wool (1) | $22 ; 84: 16$ |
| 80:22 |  |  | 80:5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 108-acre (1) } \\ 44: 6 \end{gathered}$ |
| vary (1) | $\begin{array}{\|c} 46: 16 \\ \text { vote (16) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,13,18,19 ; 95: 3 \\ & \text { what's (3) } \end{aligned}$ | wording (1) |  |
| $11: 22$ vegetation (2) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:17;16:6,10; } \\ & \text { 19:15;20:5;33:9; } \\ & \text { 39:6;70:6,24;71:16; } \end{aligned}$ | $22: 8 ; 26: 2 ; 35: 16$ | $85: 24$ words (2) | 10-minute (2) |
| vegetation (2) $79: 13,18$ |  | whereas (2) | words (2)45:23;91: | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 1,11 \\ & \mathbf{1 1 ( 2 )} \end{aligned}$ |
| 79:13,18 vegetative (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 3 ; 84: 10 ; 87: 2 \\ & 91: 2 ; 95: 21 ; 96: 12 \end{aligned}$ | whereby (1) |  |  |
| 79:6,20 |  | $17: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { work (6) } \\ & 35: 21 ; 67: 15 ; 74: 11 ; \end{aligned}$ | 12 (1) |
| verbal (2) | voted (4) | Whereupon (2) | $76: 15 ; 99: 9,13$ | 94:15 |
| 34:24;37:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 18 ; 16: 13,14 \\ & 20: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $72: 14 ; 99: 17$whole (4) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { worked (1) } \\ 47: 5 \end{array}$ | 121 (1) |
| versus (2) |  |  |  | 87:21 |
| 43:11;56:14 | voters (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 5,6 ; 57: 8 ; 66: 9 \\ & \text { who's (2) } \\ & \text { 69:19;71:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { working (1) } \\ & \text { 11:24 } \\ & \text { worth (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13(\mathbf{1}) \\ 87: 23 \\ \mathbf{1 3 0 0}(\mathbf{1}) \end{gathered}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {viability }}^{\text {(1) }}$ (11 |  |  |  |  |
| 11:11 |  |  |  |  |
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| 48:10 | 23 (1) | 88:19 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13A (1) | 46:16 | 64 (1) |  |  |
| 60:8 | 2700 (1) | 87:20 |  |  |
| 14A (1) | 9:19 | 7 |  |  |
| $26: 13$ 14B (1) | 3 | 7 |  |  |
| 28:9 |  | 7400 (1) |  |  |
| 15 (1) | 3 (2) | 48:3 |  |  |
| 14:17 | 17:16;75:11 | 7A (1) |  |  |
| 16 (1) | 3,000 (2) | 60:2 |  |  |
| 60:1 | 48:13,14 | 7B (1) |  |  |
| 162-H16 (1) | 3,000-acre (1) | 60:2 |  |  |
| 40:21 | 46:19 |  |  |  |
| 162-H16IVb (1) | 3.2 (1) | 8 |  |  |
| 39:23 | 45:7 |  |  |  |
| 162-H2 (1) | 3:00 (1) | 8 (1) |  |  |
| 9:8 | 72:15 | 10:24 |  |  |
| 162-H2III (1) | 3:35 (1) | 80 (1) |  |  |
| 8:19 | 99:18 | 88:12 |  |  |
| 16th (2) | 30 (1) | 8A (1) |  |  |
| 86:10,13 | 46:20 | 64:8 |  |  |
| 17 (1) | 30,000 (2) | 8B (1) |  |  |
| 92:22 | 46:21;48:15 | 64:9 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 17.5(\mathbf{1}) \\ 92: 14 \end{array}$ | 300-some-odd (1) 81:17 | 9 |  |  |
| 1700 (2) | 31 (1) |  |  |  |
| 44:16;48:3 | 7:22 | 9 (1) |  |  |
| 1880s (1) | 31st (2) | 97:2 |  |  |
| 79:14 | 11:1;94:2 | 9,755 (1) |  |  |
| 1985 (2) | 32 (2) | 94:18 |  |  |
| 46:19;49:17 | 6:1;9:1 | 9:00 (2) |  |  |
| 1989 (1) | 33 (1) | 98:22;99:12 |  |  |
| 33:4 | 9:1 | 9th (1) |  |  |
| 1A (3) | 39 (1) | 23:22 |  |  |
| 73:13,15;75:9 | 48:1 |  |  |  |
| $73: 13,15 ; 75: 9$ | 4 |  |  |  |
| 2 | 4 (1) |  |  |  |
|  | 17:19 |  |  |  |
| 2 (3) | 4:00 (1) |  |  |  |
| 10:23;17:13;75:11 | 72:9 |  |  |  |
| 2.3 (1) | 4:30 (1) |  |  |  |
| 29:8 | 72:9 |  |  |  |
| 2:45 (1) | 452 (1) |  |  |  |
| 72:14 | 94:23 |  |  |  |
| 20 (1) | 48 (4) |  |  |  |
| 92:22 | 6:10;7:17;21:1,4 |  |  |  |
| 20.8 (1) | 49 (2) |  |  |  |
| 92:13 | 6:10;7:17 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008(1) \\ 37: 4 \end{gathered}$ | 5 |  |  |  |
| 2008-04 (1) | 5 (3) |  |  |  |
| 2010 (1) | 53:17;56:4;62:9 |  |  |  |
| 14:12 | 500 (1) |  |  |  |
| 2011 (1) | 68:23 |  |  |  |
| 17:2 | 5-mile (2) |  |  |  |
| 2012 (4) | 42:3;43:10 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11: 1 ; 20: 6 ; 23: 22 ; \\ & 94: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 6 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 20-percent (1) } \\ \text { 21:14 } \end{gathered}$ | 60,000 (1) |  |  |  |

