

March 1, 2015

Bruce Cummings  
156 Rocky Shore Rd.  
Bridgewater, NH 03222

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL ([bhcummings1@gmail.com](mailto:bhcummings1@gmail.com))

New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee c/o David K. Wiesner, Staff Attorney  
N.H. Public Utilities Commission  
21 South Fruit St., Suite 10  
Concord, NH 03301

Re. New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee Rulemaking, Docket No. 2014-04

Dear Mr. Wiesner,

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this public hearing regarding the establishment of rules for the siting of energy facilities.

I write today concerning the subject of property value impact.

It does not take a genius to understand the addition of multi-dozens of 500' structures will transform the view scape of the spectacularly beautiful state of New Hampshire. Imagine the sunset through turbine blades overtly flickering for all to see. Even the night sky currently filled with a kaleidoscope of stars will convert from starlight to a cityscape of blinking red lights.

The effect on New Hampshire's communities is already felt in the regions where the wind turbine industry has already arrived, just as it has in virtually every wind turbine project in this country. Neighbor vs. neighbor. Town vs. town. Internet blah blah. Signs everywhere. Concern. Construction and expansion paralysis. Editorials. Politicians trying to figure the angles. Distortion.

Local real estate agents near these wind turbine projects are required to announce to any prospective buyer that towers may alter the landscape in the future. By this move alone, property values are deemed to be affected in a negative way. The rule of thumb for property has always been location, location, location. In real estate perception = value. Therefore, the entire subject of wind turbine projects and the effect on property values is critical for both the affected public and the SEC Rule making.

I have three requirement areas listed below.

1. Rules Site 300.05 (b) (7) Photo simulations – The Highland Council (UK) developed *Visualization Standards for Wind Energy Developments*. Visualizations must meet this standard:
  - Photographs used in the simulation shall be taken at an equivalent focal length of 50 mm (i.e., “normal view”)
  - Simulations should represent the equivalent of what would be taken with a 75mm focal length lens on a full-frame 35 mm camera and printed at 15.3”x10.2” (390x260) for handholding.

If one looks at the photo simulations of Wild Meadows, or any other wind project application, one can see the simulations are provided in such a way as to make the turbines appear very small due to the scope of the background. In fact, Wild Meadows omitted the turbine blades!

2. Including the visual impact to private property is critical. The AMC commented in their letter to the NHPUC:

*“the revised purpose section of NH RSA 162-H includes “private property” as being potentially affected by energy facility development. However, the proposed requirements for the visual impact assessment give no consideration to assessing aesthetic impacts on private property (primary residential areas), though information on potential impacts to private property is required for noise and shadow flicker. While this is not an issue we have raised in the past, it was a major topic of discussion for the aesthetics workgroup during OEP’s pre-rulemaking public stakeholder process. This omission is likely to be or high concern for many citizens who actively participated in this process.”*

3. So called *Good Neighbor Agreements* have become an increasingly common practice between wind energy producers and “difficult” neighbors. These silencing tactics are used to “buy off” neighboring stakeholders in order to further the ambitions of the wind energy producers. These waivers of individual rights and practices should be banned completely NH Code of Administrative Rules.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on the Rulemaking Process.

Sincerely,

Bruce H. Cummings  
603.707.0320