

Mon 5/6/2013 10:35 AM

From: Larry Goodman [mailto:larrygoodman4@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 06, 2013 7:32 AM
Subject: Fwd: Please Support SB 99

Dear Chairman Borden & STE Committee Members,

This is to ask for your support of SB-99 and that you vote "OTP."

Thank you for recently examining the issues surrounding wind energy projects. It was good to see that ISO-NE was represented at the last round of hearings.

ISO NE seemed to use the NEWIS study as the basis for much of their testimony and written exhibits. Are you aware of who wrote the NEWIS study?

-GE Energy Applications and System Engineering

-EnerNex- Wind Energy Consulting

-AWS True Power- Solar & Wind Energy Consulting

In other words this now dated study, as you may already know, was written by companies with huge financial stakes in the industrial wind energy business.

In spite of this less than objective set of authors, and in spite of the NEWIS report starting out with two of the most encompassing legal disclaimers imaginable, the ISO NE exhibits from NEWIS captured some significant considerations.

Unfortunately, this report looked only at wind in the absolute with no comparisons to higher capacity/lower cost renewables so it is hardly a document that allows for comparative cost/benefit analysis or comprehensive decision making.

What it does provide, in spite of its author's financial incentives to deliver a pro industrial wind document, is a cautionary set of reasons to be very careful in how wind is used/not used throughout New England. Allow me to recap a few noteworthy facts from the documents you reviewed but also from:

ISO NE's 2013 Regional Electricity Outlook

"Accommodating a high percentage of variable resources {wind} will require careful assessment of the timing of resource and transmission development."

For the grid to accommodate 2000 to 12000 Wind MW, it will cost between \$1.6 Billion and \$25 Billion in transmission upgrades. Please note that the grid already has 711MW of wind.....but, as you know, much of it is curtailed which was captured on the final page of the document ISO NE presented to you.

To accommodate wind....."considerable investment in smart grid technology will be needed." Why are we bending over backwards for wind when there are far better renewable options as PSNH has recently stated?

"Wind is at its lowest level when demand is peaking."

New York State has approx 20 industrial wind plants. They delivered a 22.2% capacity in 2012. And western NYS is a stronger wind region than NE. That must be why ISO NE suggests off shore is better than on shore.

So, if I understand this right:

- 1) We are accommodating the lowest capacity renewable with new wind installations
- 2) Transmission upgrades could be as high as \$25 Billion for a source that will not provide power when demand is most acute.
- 3) In addition to transmission upgrades, wind will require control room and storage upgrades.
- 4) "When available, wind could reduce fossil fuel generation."
How many caveats can be in one short sentence?
We know wind is only available 20-25% of the time {NYS} and the phrase "could reduce" is much different than "will reduce."
Recent press has confirmed that wind DOES NOT meaningfully displace fossil fuel generation. Even progressive papers like the LA Times have been very clear on this.

There are better renewables. Please don't look at wind in isolation. Please look at the full spectrum of renewable options which include higher capacity/lower cost renewables.

Even off shore, where ISO NE recommends wind go, wind is still weak versus better renewables. There is more divisive behavior, more litigation, more lobbying, more politicking around wind than any other energy source. The more we know, the more we should curtail this inefficient source permanently in favor of cheaper/smarter higher capacity alternatives.

Thank you for your ongoing focus on this matter.

Larry Goodman

PS. Please inform last week's "Bell Curve" speaker that she is talking about human beings, not rodents. Her written research seems to interchange them seamlessly. Perhaps she personally needs to live near a turbine before the bell curve theory is debunked and an individuals health, well being and right to be free of audio tyranny is protected?