

Janet Renaud

Thu 1/31/2013

Dear Ms Murray:

I am not an abutter, nor do I even live in either Temple or New Ipswich; however, I am an avid hiker and an ardent lover of New Hampshire's remaining wild places, and therefore cannot call myself a disinterested party. I attended Temple's Wind Forum in November of 2011. I was impressed by all the research the Temple folks had done.

I would call my input more like, say, speaking of collateral damage from a regional impact standpoint.

I have been very interested in this subject since I first saw the facility in Lempster. I have followed the situation in Antrim very closely. I am very much in favor of renewables, but I am a land conservationist at heart and I believe we, as a country and a state, are rushing into this before we know all the downstream impacts.

This company is using a trick they have learned – as soon as they hear objections from local people, the developer pushes the project over the threshold, or otherwise petitions that the SEC take over. This removes local control, and since the state's energy policy hasn't been updated in nine years, the state is still legislatively pro-wind. A moratorium is being considered by the new legislature, and I strongly believe that this should be factored into the SEC's decision-making. There is a lot of new science about wind, and science should be leading the way, not carpet-bagging companies with their pockets full of subsidies. I URGE you to deny this petition.

Speaking of propaganda, I would urge you to see a documentary called *Windfall*. It is anti-wind slanted, to be sure, but it shows how events unfolded in a small town in upstate New York. It is quite alarming.

I moved to New Hampshire to get away from so-called "civilization." I am an avid hiker. I hike regularly in Pillsbury, and the last time I went there, I was stunned that I actually could see the Lempster turbines from a remote section of the park. I would be sickened if I had to look at them while hiking on the Wapack Trail (Temple-New Ipswich). A man in Hancock has spent his entire life protecting land there, and now, because Antrim people have misunderstood the meaning of local control, and want to "promote development," that lifetime's work is meaningless: that beautiful, unbroken wilderness might now be loomed over by monstrous, industrial symbols of "civilization." Cell towers proliferating everywhere are bad enough – now this? How do these things fit into the "rural character" listed in so many southern New Hampshire master plans (including ours)? A "wind farm" is not a farm, it's a large, intrusive industrial complex.

Some people say they are a way to get away from oil, gas and coal, but there's no evidence at all that any of these things have shut down because we now have wind turbines. I don't believe someone who really loves what we have in northern New England – pockets of real, unsullied wilderness – want to walk through an industrial park when taking a hike in the woods. It *may* be a good idea elsewhere – say, Nebraska – but I truly believe they are wrong for New Hampshire.

Thanks for listening.

Sincerely,

Janet Renaud
89 Gould Hill
Greenfield, NH 03047