

Dennis Cashman, Ph.D. 114 Shore Drive South Bridgewater, NH 03222

My name is Dennis Cashman. I live in Bridgewater, New Hampshire. I want to express my support for the development of clear energy facility siting criteria as was the stated direction of SB 99's public stakeholder pre-rule making initiative, which was to balance the voice of the people with the consultants and lobbyists supporting industrial wind. In my testimony, I want to comment on organizational decision-making processes, as well as offering siting criteria for areas of Scenic Resources of State or National Significance (SRSNS). The impetus behind this is to protect our precious scenic resources, the main driver of our robust tourism industry.

I am a PhD - degreed management consultant and college professor, teaching doctoral and Masters level leadership and management programs. My interest in Scenic Resources in the State of NH began 35 years ago when my wife and I first discovered Newfound Lake. We eventually moved from Connecticut to our permanent residence on Newfound, one of the natural unspoiled areas called "The Most Beautiful Lake" by Yankee Magazine and a popular tourist destination. I am joined today by many of my neighbors who share similar stories. Unfortunately, our tourist area has also become a popular target for industrial wind developers. The surrounding mountain ridgelines that define our spectacular views also happen to be producers of thermally generated winds.

One of the management skills that I teach my students is objective critical decision-making. It is characterized by the establishment of a clear decision statement and clear, objective, priority-weighted decision criteria that are established well ahead of any generated alternative decision paths. These criteria are defined, articulated, and weighted by a democratic process to build buy-in and objectivity. Factual, unbiased research-based data is far more desirable for sound decision-making over ingratiation or political coalition building, an influence technique often used by wind developers. In the absence of objective data and in support of fuzzy criteria, they often use a 'data dump' technique, where there is so much information that the decision-maker assumes that it meets the criteria, because the criteria were never clearly defined in the first place. A recent example was a wind developer's 4,500 page application, complete with multiple career wind experts' benefit claims for improvements in the economy, jobs, tourism, wildlife, etc. Unfortunately for New Hampshire's profitable tourist economy, more industrial wind facilities are being proposed in our scenic areas, ready to take advantage of our fuzzy siting criteria.

In research, there is a concept known as face validity. It is the first test for something that we believe is true because it matches our experience and makes sense. In order to move to statistical validity, it generally requires a funded study. Members of the public are good sources of face validity but unfortunately we do not possess the funding to move it to the level of a formal study. In place of these informal face validity studies, the public's sensibilities are often dismissed in favor of corporate-funded studies. However, we always return to face validity. Said in another way, we ask ourselves if the study matches our experience and does it make sense? Tourists who visit our NH lakes cite our water quality and scenic value as their main draw. Clear criteria would assess the impact on Scenic Resources of Significance.

Upon review of the literature, a recent recommendation set forth by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection's review of Bowers Wind in the Down East Lakes region, provides an excellent template for New Hampshire's siting criteria. As in the Down East Lakes region, New Hampshire tourism is chiefly based upon scenic and natural resource value. The metrics suggested here are to assess a project's impact upon Scenic Resources of State or National Significance (SRSNS). What Maine DEP did was to quantify through specific and measurable criteria, visual impact because they knew that tourism was dependent on scenic and natural resource value. In NH, our focus must be to protect and mitigate the risk to our robust tourism industry. Over the past week, the Union Leader interviewed a Newfound area-based realtor. He reported that vacation rentals on the lake were over 90% booked. Since his 145 rental weeks represent about 10% percent of the total available

1500 rental weeks in the summer. That equals a conservative estimate of \$2.25 M, not including the boost to the local economy. Again, our focus should be to promote and protect tourism.

The Maine DEP put forth a very useful model for siting criteria in areas of impact upon Scenic Resources of State or National Significance (SRSNS). I suggest the NH SEC consider this as the best available model. The full description is available on pp.10-28 at

<http://www.mpbn.net/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=6EGT4NQCeL0%3d&tabid=1046>

Assessment of Impact to Scenic Resources of State or National Significance (SRSNS) by Wind Facilities

Purpose: "A proposed project should not unreasonably interfere with existing scenic, aesthetic or recreational uses of a protected natural resource."

The SEC shall determine whether the development significantly compromises views from a scenic resource of state or national significance such that the development has an unreasonable adverse effect on the scenic character or existing uses related to scenic character.

In making its determination, the SEC shall consider insignificant the effects of portions of the development's generating facilities located more than 10 miles, measured horizontally, from a scenic resource of state or national significance. Note: At the time of the Bowers Wind proposal, wind turbines stood less than 400 feet and the distance was established at eight miles. Since today's proposed towers stand 500 to 550 feet, a recommended distance of **10 miles** is used.

Scenic Resources of State or National Significance (SRSNS) shall be defined by the following categories and characteristics. A description of what constitutes each type of a SRSNS and the applicant's summary of potential impacts to each of the SRSNS ***within 10 miles*** of the proposed generating facilities:

- 1) National Natural Landmarks** - Federally designated wilderness areas or other comparable outstanding natural and cultural resources.
- 2) Historic Places** - Properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and its amendments.
- 3) National or State Parks.**
- 4) Lakes of Scenic and Tourist Value** - Identified as having outstanding or significant scenic quality by the NH Department of Tourism or another State-recognized authority for scenic/ natural resource-based tourism.
- 5) Scenic Rivers or Streams** - Identified as having unique or outstanding scenic attributes by the aforementioned organizations.
- 6) Scenic Viewpoints** - Located on state public reserved land or on a trail that is used exclusively for pedestrian use, e.g. The Appalachian Trail, that the Department of Agriculture has identified.
- 7) Scenic Turnouts** - Constructed by the DOT on a public road designated as a scenic highway.

The SEC shall review the Applicant's assignment of scenic impact ratings: Low, Medium or High to each of the project's identified SRSNS locations and basing such rating on each scenic impact criteria:

- Extent of impact** (Number of visible turbines)
- Nature of impact** (Visible angle, percent of visible locations within each SRSNS)
- Duration** (Seasonal, occasional or year round use)
- Effect upon Enjoyment and Continued Use** (Dominance of landscape view expectation)
- Scope and Scale** (Cumulative effect, proximity to other wind facilities)

Note: Overall number of SRSNS sites affected by an overall scenic impact of Medium or High may be deemed as having an unreasonable adverse effect on the scenic character of SRSNS. Further, if a single SRSNS receives an overall scenic impact rating of High, it appears to be sufficient grounds for concluding that the project would have an unreasonable adverse effect on scenic character.

Please make the right decision for the citizens of NH and support the addition of specific, clear, and measurable SEC siting criteria that are being offered by your constituents today.