

Dear Chairperson Martin and Members of The Site Evaluation Committee,

I am one of many people who are puzzled, actually concerned is a better description, by the apparent errors, omissions and mistakes this regulatory body has evidently repeatedly and consistently made. Since all of these errors, omissions and mistakes have apparently been to the detriment of the public and to the benefit of the developer, a pattern has been established.

The obvious question becomes whether the lack of public notification and communication to the public, along with what appears to be a complete lack of interest in upholding the post certificate compliance you said you'd monitor and enforce, is the result of an organization that is simply not functioning as it should or the result of willful and deliberate decisions?

Since the SEC seems perfectly willing to accept the findings of the developers lawyers and hired "experts" at face value without even engaging or listening to the public, seemingly by repeatedly deliberately excluding the public, one could make an assumption about whether the SEC has made a willful decision. That, of course, sounds a bit hard to believe.....but your track record with the public is equally hard to fathom.

When the current Antrim Wind project was approved, after some very minor alterations versus the project you had already rightfully rejected, conditions were placed on sound, lighting, shadow flicker etc. Residents of Antrim, the public, have stated that these post construction compliance conditions are being violated. This adjudicative body's reliance on paid "experts", paid for by the developer, to measure compliance, or to approve the certificate in the first place, is a broken system.

Multi billion dollar corporations can apparently find an "expert" to deliver the "results" they want both pre and post construction. Cost is not a problem. On the other hand the public and some municipalities are left scrambling for funds. This dichotomy between developer resources and the public's ability to respond is apparent in Antrim both in the approval of the certificate and in the compliance monitoring, or lack thereof.

That is likely an issue that needs a legislative fix. What the SEC needs to fix, and please fix now, is including the public in how and when you communicate and notify as well as upholding and enforcing the public protections you built into the compliance conditions when the certificate was granted.

Thanks for your consideration.

Larry Goodman

Sent from my iPad

