

-----Original Message-----

From: Larry Goodman [<mailto:larrygoodman4@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 27, 2013 2:30 PM

To: Drew, Tim; Murray, Jane A

Subject: Fwd: ISO New England

Hi Tim,

I submit this for the file for the "Wild Meadows" Turbine proposal.

If you think it would be useful to members of the SEC now, please feel free to circulate it in conjunction with the two pieces of correspondence I just sent you.

Thanks again, Tim, for all your time and help.

Larry

www.nhwindwatch.org

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Larry Goodman <larrygoodman4@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, May 14, 2013 at 4:39 PM

Subject: Re: ISO New England

To: "Wilkinson, Eric" <EWilkinson@iso-ne.com>

Cc: "Harris, Cynthia" <charris@iso-ne.com>

Thank you for your timely reply, Mr. Wilkinson.

As you say these questions/topics require "significant analysis and resources to address fully."

Since ISO-NE is evidently not in a position to answer them now, why allow any additional wind energy onto the grid until you are clearly able to define the absolute and comparative costs and benefits?

It's pretty clear that converting coal to gas or nuclear reduces CO2.

It's pretty clear that wind can never replace any fossil fuel or nuclear as a base load provider.

It's pretty clear that wind is a very low capacity renewable.

It's also apparent that wind is now very controversial throughout your coverage area and that much of it is already being curtailed by ISO-NE.

There are cheaper and higher capacity renewables as we all know.

Given all these known facts and given ISO-NE's current limitations in addressing the questions I asked thoroughly.....why are we adding any more wind to a grid that doesn't use much of the wind it has now,

has transmission issues with wind and thinks that wind "could displace" fossil fuel but there are zero metrics to verify it or compare wind to other higher capacity renewables?

I don't want to appear argumentative, Mr. Wilkinson.....but I trust you'll admit wind is being added to the grid in an ad hoc manner with no clear numbers defining the cost or environmental benefits and/or drawbacks.

If the NEWIS report, apparently authored by three companies with financial ties to industrial wind, can't and doesn't provide comparative and absolute metrics on cost, CO2 reduction or "displacement"then why add more of it to the grid?

Lastly, please tell me :

- 1} How and when is the PAC heard by management?
- 2} What does the word "stakeholder" mean in the context you use it?
- 3} Please give me an example of an issue or initiative that was resolved by or started via the PAC and then acted on or enacted by management?

Industrial wind should be completely curtailed until basic questions are answered. I may be a novice and a layman; but I know that adding wind to the grid right now appears to be being done in a vacuum; and that the "thorough analysis" you mention needs to be in place before any more of NE is ripped up for turbines.

So, please take a leadership role on this at ISO-NE. Please speak with precision and clarity. You know the truth about wind same as I do.....stop this now please before NE becomes the next California with an unstable and poorly planned grid.

Thank you. I appreciate your help and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Larry Goodman
www.nhwindwatch.org

On Tue, May 14, 2013 at 11:52 AM, Wilkinson, Eric <EWilkinson@iso-ne.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Goodman,

I've been asked to respond to your questions regarding wind and the operation of the electric grid. You have posed some interesting questions that would require significant analysis and resources to address thoroughly. One place where discussions about these types of issues is appropriate is the Participant Advisory Committee (PAC). This is a stakeholder committee chaired by the ISO. More information about the PAC is available here: http://www.iso-ne.com/committees/comm_wkgrps/prtcpnts_comm/pac/index.html

Regards,

Eric Wilkinson

External Affairs
ISO New England
One Sullivan Road
Holyoke, MA 01040
Office [413.540.4686](tel:413.540.4686)
Mobile [413.387.7197](tel:413.387.7197)

Fax [413.535.4379](tel:413.535.4379)
EWilkinson@iso-ne.com

 *Please consider the impact to the environment and your responsibility before printing this e-mail.*

--
Larry

--
Larry

Hi Tim,

I hope you had a good holiday weekend. {you too, Jane}

Thanks again for your email of May 13th indicating my www.nhwindwatch.org request had been filed for all members of the SEC to review.

As members of the SEC consider that request, I wanted to submit this note to ISO-NE for the file and for the consideration of members of the SEC as they evaluate the request you indicated they are currently reviewing.

I believe ISO NE's response to the note below is further confirmation that there are no clear metrics that have been defined for industrial wind.
As you can see from the note below, I asked ISO NE for metrics that could demonstrate industrial wind's economic and environmental impact on the grid.

I received a response from ISO NE which I will forward to you momentarily. Essentially it said;

ISO NE can't answer the questions below "**without significant analysis and resources to address thoroughly.**"

As I understand it, ISO NE already curtails a significant portion of wind energy during the intermittent times it is available.

ISO NE evidently can't really define some basic questions for industrial wind "without significant analysis and resources to address thoroughly."

I hope/trust this serves as additional support for the importance of clear financial and environmental metrics around industrial wind and for the SEC to approve our prior request that is now being reviewed. We do not believe there are clear financial or environmental metrics for industrial wind in NE and the ISO NE response is fully collaborative.

I will forward you the correspondence from ISO-NE in a moment. Thanks again, Tim, for your ongoing assistance with this "Wild Meadows" project.

Sincerely,

Larry Goodman
www.nhwindwatch.org

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Larry Goodman** <larrygoodman4@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, May 13, 2013 at 10:13 AM

Subject: Correspondence

To: charris@iso-ne.com

Hi Cindy,

Thank you for your time on the phone.

I appreciate your providing my correspondence to Mr. Vitale and Mr. van Welie.

As I mentioned, my name is Larry Goodman and I am a member of:

www.nhwindwatch.org

As you know, virtually all of the states covered by ISO-NE are embroiled in legislative, regulatory and legal debates/disputes involving industrial wind.

Aside from the 2010 NEWIS document, evidently prepared by three companies with clear financial ties to industrial wind, there appears to be a dearth of both absolute and comparative metrics around industrial wind.

When your literature says wind "could displace" fossil fuel, how is that quantified in general and for specific projects? How is it quantified versus other renewables?

When your literature states: "Transmission upgrades for wind could range between \$1.6 and \$25 Billion".....depending on what variables?

As you know, five leading national newspapers have questioned wind as a CO2 reducer in the absolute and versus other renewables; and Bloomberg just published a chart showing wind as the highest price renewable with the lowest capacity.

Where am I going with all this? Three requests please for ISO-NE.

- 1) Quantify all key metrics around wind, both absolute and comparative versus other higher capacity renewables. This is, I believe, what Maine's Energy Director {Patrick Woodcock} pointed out is missing in remarks he made last week.
- 2) Quantify what "could displace" fossil fuel means? As you know PSNH's Michael Skelton has called wind "intermittent and unreliable" and stated "there are far better renewables."

Even the progressive LA Times has stated that wind doesn't displace fossil fuel. The WSJ has been very clear on this. Please put some absolute and comparative metrics around wind versus other renewables on cost and CO2 reduction based on on shore capacity factors.

- 3) Please engage truly independent resources to provide a document to replace the NEWIS document which appears to have been prepared by the fox in the hen house unless I somehow misread the author's affiliations.

Overall, we are asking for your leadership, clarity and metrics, and a clear and comprehensive cost/benefit analysis. Let's not rip up New England for a well marketed source of energy that is not, I believe, what it purports to be.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Larry Goodman

www.nhwindwatch.org