

6 February 2013

Ms. Jane Murray, Secretary

New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee

N.H. Department of Environmental Services

29 Hazen Drive

Concord, NH 03302-0095

Re: Docket No. 2012-01-Application of Antrim Wind Energy, LLC

Dear Ms. Murray:

The enclosed is for filing with the NHSEC.

I sat through hearings this afternoon on what was, in essence, a *meteorological* facility, a facility for "farming" the wind. Yet, there was hardly a bow to its essential meteorology. And there were no references whatsoever to the particular meteorological situation(s) which will generate the "worst-case" noise. The appellant's neglect of this weather-generated noise is unforgivable, but understandable. The committee's neglect will not be so easily understood, especially given the hundreds of references in the transcripts, and through the hearings, to "worst-case" noise.

There is no dispute that the amount of noise generated by these giant turbines is a function of the wind speed and wind shear. Nor any dispute that the extent to which this noise is broadcast to its neighbors is also a function of meteorological parameters, in this case the speed and direction of the wind, and its shear, and the (temperature) stability of the atmosphere. Yet, there was not a shred of meteorological evidence presented to, referred to, or otherwise discussed by, the committee during this afternoon's discussion of noise, and prior to its straw vote on the noise issue.

It is my hope that the resultant straw vote will be ignored when the committee considers the overwhelming evidence for the failure of the appellant to adequately measure, analyze or discuss the effects of the special meteorology of Tuttle Hill on the "worst-case" noise generation, prior to any final decision.

I will be very disappointed if it turns out that the rules of the hearing were such that Ms. Bailey, and other committee members, are not allowed to consider any evidence regarding the "worst case" noise levels, unless it was introduced in the course of the hearings. I had understood that non-intervenors could introduce evidence pertinent to any such fundamental issue. My brief, included with the 14 January 2013 brief of Geoffrey Jones of the Stoddard Conservation Commission, was just such evidence. Both Ms. Linowes and Mr. Block referred to this "missing" information in their testimony, noting that the weather information supplied by the applicant was inadequate to address the "worst-case" noise, and was made irrelevant because of serious technical errors.

Sincerely,

Dr. Fred Ward

Stoddard