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PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Good afternoon -- good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Michael Iacopino. I am the Counsel to the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee in Docket Number 2015-02, the Application of Antrim Wind Energy, LLC. We are here tonight for a public information session in that docket. To my left, in front of me, is the Committee Administrator, Pamela Monroe. Ms. Monroe is the person with whom documents get filed. And, if you have any questions about the process, she is the person to call. And, if you have questions that you think can be answered on the website, that is the website address, right there, for the Site Evaluation Committee.

A public information session is an opportunity for -- the statutory opportunity for both the applicant and the Committee to make presentations to the public. The Applicant will make a presentation after I'm done doing the Committee's presentation. Our purpose is to provide you with information on how the Site Evaluation Committee works. We'll answer questions about that at the appropriate time. After my presentation, the applicant will put on a presentation explaining the Application and the project that they are proposing.
Once both of those presentations have been made, we will take questions from anybody who has any. Those questions should be written down. I believe there are sheets at the door. If you bring them up, either to Ms. Monroe or to my associate, Iryna Dore, who is over in the far corner over there [indicating]. What we'll do is we'll take those questions, and we'll try to categorize them, and then ask them of the appropriate person, once we have them all up here. Those questions can be for the Applicant, if you have a question about the nature of the project. They can be more for me or for Ms. Monroe, if you have a question about the Site Evaluation Committee or its process.

Questions like, however, "how will the Site Evaluation Committee rule on this Application or on any motion?", or things like that, we can't answer. Nothing that I say here tonight is binding on the Site Evaluation Committee. They can -- they're the ones who make the decisions in the case. I'm just their lawyer, and the person who will explain the process for tonight.

First thing I'm going to talk about is the purpose of RSA 162-H. RSA 162-H is the statute that creates the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. The purpose of the statute is basically a balancing act. The
Committee is charged with the job of balancing the benefits and impacts of the site selection for any type of energy facility, whether it be a wind plant -- a windmill facility, like Antrim Wind is proposing, whether it be a wood-burning facility, a natural gas facility, a nuclear facility, the job of the Committee is to balance both the benefits and the impacts.

And, those benefits and impacts are in the following subject areas: On the general welfare of the population, the effects on private property, the location and growth of industry, the economic growth of the state, the environment, historic sites, aesthetics, air and water quality, and public health and safety, as well as -- and natural resources.

Another purpose of the statute is to avoid undue delay in the construction of new facilities, and to provide a full and timely consideration of all environmental consequences.

And, probably relevant to what we're doing tonight, is to provide full and complete public disclosure. So, that the public can learn and understand what any particular project is about, and what effects it may have.

And, finally, the Site Evaluation
Committee is charged with ensuring that the selection of sites and the construction of energy facilities is treated as a significant aspect of land use planning, in which all of these benefits and impacts are resolved in an integrated fashion. What that means is through a single process. In essence, the Site Evaluation Committee is the statewide planning board for energy projects. It is designed, the way it operates, it's designed to integrate all of the permitting that would otherwise go on.

If we were to -- if somebody were to come to you and say "we're going to build a Walmart in your town", they would still have to go get permits from a number of different state agencies, and also go to the town planning and zoning board, most likely, to get things.

And, when you're an energy facility, the Legislature has determined it most appropriate and most prudent to do this through a single integrated process, because energy facilities affect the local area, of course, but they also affect the entire state. And, in that single permitting process, the Legislature has indicated that all environmental, economic, and technical issues should be decided.

The Site Evaluation Committee preempts
the authority of your local zoning and planning boards. Doesn't mean that we don't listen to what your zoning ordinances are, doesn't mean that we don't consider them. However, any decisions that your local zoning board or planning board might make about the project are preempted, because that authority is granted to the Site Evaluation Committee through RSA 162-H. Some people refer to the process that we use as the "supermarket theory" or the "one-stop shopping theory" of permitting.

On the Site Evaluation Committee, we have the three Public Utilities Commissioners, the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Services, the Commissioner of the Department of Transportation, Commissioner at Department of Resources and Economic Development, either the Commissioner of the Cultural Resources Department or the Director of the Division of Historical Resources. For the most part, that's the Director from Historical Resources, is usually the person who sits. There are two public members. One of them, by statute, must be an attorney. They both must have -- they both must have some expertise with energy facilities. We also have one alternate public member, and that -- those criteria apply to the alternate as well.

The Committee today consists of Martin
Honigberg, he is the Chair of the PUC, and he's also the
Chair of the Site Evaluation Committee. Thomas Burack,
who is our Commissioner of the Department of Energy -- I'm
sorry, the Department of Environmental Services. He's the
Vice Chairman. Also sitting on the Committee today, the
individuals, are Robert Scott, PUC Commissioner; PUC
Commissioner Kate Bailey; DRED Commissioner Jeffrey Rose;
Van McCloud is our Commissioner of Cultural Resources, but
normally Elizabeth Muzzey is the member of the Committee.
There is a public member, Patricia Weathersby. We had
another public member, Roger Hawk, who resigned last week.
And, our alternate member is Rachel Whitaker. Patricia
and Rachel are both public members. They were both
appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Executive
Council.

The members of the Committee, at least
those who are state employees, are permitted to designate
somebody to sit in their seat for the proceedings. The
limitation on that designation is that the person must be
a staff attorney or a senior administrator in the agency.
And, in this case, there have been some appointments made
by the members of the Committee. Robert Scott is -- this
list is the list of the Subcommittee members who will hear
the Antrim Wind case. Robert Scott is a PUC Commissioner,
he is sitting, and Chairman Honigberg has designated him as a "Chairman" or "Presiding Officer" for the Antrim Wind docket. Michael Ladam is the PUC Director of Regulatory Innovation and Strategy. He was designated by Kathryn -- Commissioner Kathryn Bailey. Jeff Rose, Commissioner Jeff Rose of DRED will sit on this Subcommittee. Commissioner Burack has appointed Eugene Forbes, from the Water Division, he's the Director of the Water Division, to sit in his place. And, Elizabeth Muzzey has designated Dr. Boisvert, Dr. Richard Boisvert, who is the State Archeologist, to sit in her place. And, Patricia Weathersby will serve as a public member on this Committee. We're short one member right now. I assume that, although I have not seen an order, but I assume that Ms. Whitaker will be appointed as the second public member, since that's what the alternate member is supposed to do, sit when there's a vacancy or somebody else cannot be there. So, that's the Subcommittee that's been designated for this particular docket.

This integrated process that is RSA 162-H doesn't just involve the Committee. There are other people who are, shall we say, "regulars". And, that's Counsel to the Public. Counsel to the Public is appointed by the Attorney General. The purpose of Counsel for the
Public in every case where an application has been filed is to represent the public, that means the general public, in seeking to protect the quality of the environment and in seeking to assure an adequate -- an adequate supply of energy. The Counsel to the Public is normally an Assistant Attorney General. And, that Assistant Attorney General has all the rights, responsibility, and privileges of a party to the docket. In other words, they're treated just as if they were somebody who was filing an application for a power plant of some sort.

In this case, our Counsel to the Public is Assistant Attorney General Mary Maloney. She is seated in the back row.

And, if you could stand up, Mary, and just tell people a little bit for how they can reach you and how they can get in touch with you.

MS. MALONEY: Well, I would be happy to speak to any of you at any particular time. You can reach me through my office at the Attorney General's Office, in Concord. And, my telephone number is 271-1212. Or, you can write, 33 Capitol Street, in Concord, New Hampshire 03301.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, if you go on the Site Evaluation Committee website, and you look
in that portion of this docket, you'll be able to find
Ms. Maloney's appearance, and that also has her contact
information in it as well.

In determining whether or not to grant
what's called a "Certificate of Site and Facility", to any
particular energy project in the state, the Committee is
subjected to certain timeframes by statute. And, I'm
going to review those timeframes with you now.

There's a lot of them. And, what we've
done on the overhead here is I actually tell you what the
timeframe is, and then what it is at least today, in this
particular case. If any of one of these timeframes
changes, it is possible that the dates could change, or,
if the Site Evaluation Committee determines that it is in
the public interest to delay consideration of the
Application for some reason, these dates could obviously
change.

But, in every application, the
applicant, and this is new, I know -- I see some familiar
faces out there, I know there's been a prior application
in this town. So, some of you may be somewhat familiar
with this process, but our statute has changed since that
last case.

And, so, now applicants have to do a
Pre-Application Public Information Session at least 30 days before they file their application. I understand that that was done in this case by Antrim Wind. Once they filed their Application, Martin Honigberg, our Chair, forwarded the Application to any agency that has jurisdiction, that means that would normally issue a permit or have some other regulatory authority. In addition, the Committee reviewed the Application as well. And, the Committee determined -- well, first of all, all of the agencies that we forwarded the Application to determined that the Application was complete for their purposes. And, the Committee, after holding a hearing, determined that the Application was complete. And, that means that the Application contains sufficient information for the Committee to undertake its process. That's all that means. And, that was done December 1.

That date, December 1, becomes important, because that's the date from which all the other deadlines flow. The Chairman, I've already told you, has designated a subcommittee. There has to be one public information session in each county. That's what we're doing tonight. That has to occur within 45 days, after December 1st, in this case.

After today, within 90 days of December
1st, there has to be a Joint Public Hearing in the county. And, that Joint Public Hearing is different than tonight's. Some of the things will be the same, you'll get to ask questions, and the Applicant will make a presentation. But, at that Joint Public Hearing, the Subcommittee will actually be here. It won't just be me, it won't be just Ms. Monroe, although we'll probably both be here with the Subcommittee, but the Subcommittee will be here to hear from you and to hear from the Applicant.

MS. MONROE: Mike, that's actually scheduled for the 22nd, at six o'clock, here.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And that, I'm informed, is scheduled for February 22nd, at six o'clock. This is the day that we have to do it by. Our crack Administrator has got us in under the wire.

Within 150 days of December 1st, all those state agencies that might have jurisdiction or have some kind of regulatory authority over the project are required to send us draft reports and draft conditions. And, those are things that say "well, we've reviewed this, and we would -- we are likely to request -- or, if we were to grant this Application, we're likely to require the following conditions." But they're just drafts, they can change. Okay? And, that's 150 days after the acceptance
of the Application, and in this case it would be April 29th, if my math is correct.

And, then, each agency has to give us final decisions on their portion of the application within 240 days after acceptance of the application. And, in this docket, that's July 28th.

Now, this is the timeframe where there's a lot of work by the independent state agencies, where they're doing all their work. Day 240 to Day 365 is when the Committee really starts to have a lot of work. And, what's happens there is we have to hold an adjudicative proceeding, very much like a courtroom trial that you see on TV. And, we have to do that between Day 240 and Day 365, because, within one year from the date of the acceptance of the application, we have to make a decision. And, when I say "we", I mean "the Committee". And, the Committee has to make a final decision, up or down, on the Application, whether to grant or to deny the Certificate.

So, those are the timeframes that we'd follow. Now, these timeframes aren't really controllable by the Committee. They're designated by statute, and the Committee is supposed to follow them. The only exception is if the Committee finds, for some reason, something happens that it is in the public interest to delay the
consideration, then they would have to make a public
interest determination and would issue a written order
explaining why.

Okay. How do these state agencies
actually work in this process? There are a couple of
different ways. Let me pull all this up here, because --
first of all, there are -- different state agencies have
different authority and different "jurisdiction", that's
what us lawyers like to call it. All state agencies that
have any kind of permitting or other ability to regulate,
and I'll give you an example, if you're going to impact
wetlands, you have to get a Wetlands Permit from the
Department of Environmental Services. So, the Site
Evaluation Committee, obviously, is going to consider the
Department of Environmental Services as being an agency
that has permitting authority. Because, if it was a
Walmart, they would have to issue a permit. Okay?

There are also agencies with "other
regulatory authority". A good example of that is the
Division of Historic Resources. They don't actually issue
a permit, however, they do have regulatory authority over
the historic resource aspects of the project.

But those agencies with permitting or
other regulatory authority get to receive proposals and
permit requests, review them, determine completeness, those things that we talked about in the last slide. They also get to recommend conditions to the Committee. They get to identify issues of concern on the proposal or the permit, and notify the Committee -- or notify the Committee that they don't have any concerns. When they do identify concerns, they can designate one or more witnesses to appear before the Committee at a hearing, and to provide input and answer questions of parties and Committee members.

And, finally, if there are conditions that are recommended by the individual agency, and the Committee determines that it is prudent to impose certificate conditions that are different than those recommended by the agencies, the agencies shall -- the Committee has to notify the agencies, and the agencies have the ability to respond to the Committee's request. And, there's a timeframe for that, not later than ten calendar days from receiving a notice from the Committee.

So, that's sort of the new -- this is new in the new statute, this is a new interaction between the state agencies and the Committee. What it actually does is sort of formalize that process a little bit more than it used to be. It used to be, there was just the two
days; give us your draft conditions, give us your final conditions. This gives the state agencies that are concerned a little bit more authority in the hearings, a little bit more ability to be heard and to express their -- any concerns that they might have. It also gives them the ability to express that they have no concerns with the project.

Just so everybody is aware, there are a lot of things that go on before an application actually gets filed with the Site Evaluation Committee. And, this slide just gives you an example of some of those. These things don't go up in a vacuum. Plans aren't presented to the Committee in a vacuum.

There is an Independent System Operator, has nothing to do with the Site Evaluation Committee, but an applicant has to get in the queue, it has to be able to put electricity into our power grid. The Independent System Operator operates the entire power grid for New England. And, so, any proposed project is going to have to meet their concerns and do the studies that they require. There are environmental and resource studies that have to be done. If somebody comes to the Site Evaluation Committee and says "I want to build a wind farm, but I've done no studies of birds and bat" -- "birds
and bats{
}, highly unlikely that anything is going to be
done within the one year that the Site Evaluation
Committee has to do its job.

There are often many pre-permitting
meetings with various federal and state agencies, to find
out what their requirements might be, to coordinate, and
to find out how to file various things with them, and to
get their guidelines and regulations.

There's regional planning commissions,
the municipalities. I would be quite shocked to hear that
any applicant has come to the New Hampshire Site
Evaluation Committee without first going to the local town
and at least talking with their planning officials.

If it's purely a generator, there's got
to be some agreement with some kind of transmission
company, perhaps a contract to sell the power to somebody.

There's financing issues. There's
eligibility for various tax credits, depending upon what
type of facility it is.

And, then, the last thing they do before
they file, normally, that an applicant does before they
file with the Committee is to have that pre-filing Public
Information Session.

We always encourage applicants to do as
much work before they file the application as they can, because that makes our process more efficient. An application has to contain certain information. First off, it has to contain enough information to satisfy all of the individual state agencies' normal applications.

And, then, there's a whole bunch of other stuff. And, I'm not going to go through all these things. But, in general, the application that we see are usually very large, and they have to include a number of things. Such as detail of the financial, technical, and managerial experience of the applicant. Excuse me. They have to have -- they have to -- the application has to contain in reasonable detail the elements of any financial assurances for decommissioning the facilities. These things don't last forever. At one point or another, they do get dismantled. They have to provide a description of the impact of each major part of the project. It might be easy for a wood burner that sits in one place. But something that's linear, a transmission line or, in many cases, a wind farm, there are many different parts that's spread out over the landscape.

And, so, the application requirements are very extensive, and they have gotten more extensive with our new administrative rules that were adopted as of...
December 16th. They can be found on our website at that address [indicating]. There are now rules that are specific to wind energy systems that would apply in this particular case. Any application that was pending when the rules changed is still subject to the new rules. However, the applicant must be given the ability to comply with the new rules and to provide any additional information that may be required. I understand that we have sent a public communication to Antrim Wind advising them of that, and I'm sure we'll get a response from them.

MS. MONROE: [inaudible] February 19th.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Now, you're all here because you're members of the public, and I know that probably a lot of you, maybe even all of you, want to participate in this process. There are a number of different ways that the public can participate in the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee process.

The first, and easiest, I suppose, if I were a member of the public, is just to call up Mary Maloney and express your views to her and, you know, tell her what you think.

The next way is, of course, and this one has already passed in this case, is you could attend the Pre-Filing Public Information Session, which was held
somewhere here in Hillsborough County, I'm not sure where
it was, but -- you can attend tonight and ask questions
and -- or make a public statement. And, you can also
attend the Public Hearing, where the Committee will be
here, and, like I said, that's February 22nd in this
particular case.

In addition, the public can participate
in additional informational meetings. Upon the request of
any municipality where a facility is proposed to be
located, if that municipality requests the Committee to
hold additional informational meetings, the Committee must
consider doing so. And, quite frankly, they usually do.

You can also submit written public
comment at any time right up until the date that a
decision is issued. The Committee is required by statute
to consider and weigh information and any reports
submitted from the public. And, I can assure you that
this Committee does, in fact, do that.

You can also participate as an
intervenor in what we call the "adjudicative proceeding".
In order to participate as an intervenor, you must
demonstrate by motion, in other words, put it in writing
and send it to the Committee, it can be in the form of a
letter, or, if you're a little more adept at the legal
stuff, you can make it a motion. But you send a request to the Committee to intervene. But, in doing that, you have to satisfy the Committee that your rights, duties, privileges, immunities, or other substantial interests may be affected by the proceeding, and that your participation in the proceeding would be in the interest of justice and that you would not interfere with the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceedings.

In this case, the Committee has set a deadline of January 15th for the filing of motions to intervene. So, if you're considering filing a motion to intervene, please do it by January 15. There will be a deadline for objections approximately ten days after that. And, I assume that the Chairman of the Committee will rule on all of those motions that are filed shortly after receiving objections.

When we get to the point that we have the adjudicative proceeding, there are certain standards that the Committee must follow. They must give due consideration to relevant information regarding the potential siting, or route of a transmission line, but siting of a proposed facility. They must give due consideration to the significant impacts and benefits. And, they must consider whether the -- whether the
issuance of the certificate will serve the objectives of
the statute. In other words, does it advance those
purposes of the statute that are reviewed in our very
first slide?

And, then, there are certain findings
that the Committee must make if it's going to grant the
certificate. If it can't make these findings, then it
should deny the certificate. And, those findings are that
the applicant has adequate financial, technical, and
managerial capability to assure that the construction and
operation of the facility will be in continuing compliance
with any terms and conditions which are contained in the
certificate. The Site Evaluation Committee has the
authority to put conditions in these certificates.

The second finding that the Committee
must be able to make in order to grant an application, and
must deny an application if it cannot make it, is that the
proposed facility will not unduly interfere with the
orderly development of the region with due consideration
having been given to the views of the municipal and
regional planning commissions and governing municipal
bodies. Basically, that means that the Committee has to
give due consideration to what your towns say, what your
planning commissions say, your planning boards, your
ordinances, and things like that, in determining whether
or not the project will interfere with the orderly
development of the region.

In order to grant the certificate, the
Site Evaluation Committee must also make the following
findings: That the facility will not have an unreasonable
adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air or water
quality, the natural environment, or public health and
safety.

And, finally, the last finding that the
Committee must make, and it's a new one, which has not
usually been -- we haven't had a certificate -- an
application that we've gotten to the end of yet with this
one, but the issuance of a certificate must serve the
public interest.

So, those are the findings that the Site
Evaluation Committee must make before it can grant the
certificate. And, like I said, if it can't make any one
of those findings, the requirement is that they deny the
certificate.

And, again, there's the Site Evaluation
Committee's website where you can find more information.
You're going to have an opportunity to ask questions of me
and Ms. Monroe in a few minutes. But what our next order
of business will be to allow the Applicant to make a presentation to you specifically about the Project.

    After that occurs, we'll take questions.

So, please, if you have questions, for either the Applicant or me or Ms. Monroe, please write those questions down, and either give them to Ms. Monroe or Ms. Dore. We'll get those questions answered as best as we can. And, then, we'll open the floor to public statements and public comments, if anybody wishes to make a public statement or a public comment.

    Sorry if I've taken too long, but -- and sorry I was late.

    So, at this point, I don't know who's up for the Applicant? Jack.

MR. KENWORTHY: Thank you, Mike. Good evening, everybody. My name is Jack Kenworthy. I am the CEO of Eolian Renewable Energy. I'm also an executive officer of Antrim Wind Energy. I'm here tonight to present information to you all about the Antrim Wind Project and to answer questions.

    To start, just a little bit of background about who the Applicant is. Antrim Wind Energy is a special purpose entity that was formed in 2009 specifically to develop, own, and operate the Antrim Wind
Project. It was formed by -- it is owned and managed by Walden Green Energy and Eolian Renewable Energy. Walden is a global renewable energy firm based in New York, whose principals have over 50 years of experience in energy-related businesses and transactions through careers at large commercial banks. Walden is, in turn, majority owned by RWE Supply & Trading, a subsidiary of RWE AG, which is a German company that's one of Europe's top five electric and gas utilities, and has operations around the world, include over 2,900 megawatts of renewable energy assets.

Eolian is based in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. It's operated by its founding principals, who have over 35 years of experience in energy and real estate development.

I have another slide that's projected up here that's just going to stay up throughout the presentation for ease of reference. This is a map of the site. It's the same map that is on the poster board on the right-hand side of the room here. And, a number of the features I'm going to describe in this preparation are reflected on this site plan.

The Project, for the most part, essentially consists of -- it's a 28.8-megawatt wind
energy facility in the northwest portion of Antrim. Our proposal calls for the construction of nine 3.2 megawatt wind turbines. There will be a collector and an interconnection substation, an operations and maintenance building, and one permanent meteorological tower.

This facility will be located entirely on private property, and will be accessed by a new gravel surface road that will be constructed off of New Hampshire Route 9. The Project has leased property from six different landowners in the Town of Antrim. We leased a total of about 1,870 acres in the northwest portion of the town.

Adjacent to this area, kind of the adjacent development consists primarily of rural residential dwelling, seasonal camps, and undeveloped forestland in various stages of maturity. The closest residence to any turbine in this Project is one-half a mile. None are closer than a mile, and most are -- all are greater than half a mile away.

And, this map, everybody is here, so, I assume you know where you are, but these maps kind of put into context, obviously, where Antrim in the State of New Hampshire, and it's a little tough to see over there, but, within Antrim, where the turbine arrays are located on the
I mentioned it's a 28.8 megawatt facility, consisting of the turbines, the met tower, the collector/interconnection subs, and the O&M building. We'll also need to be build a little over three and a half miles of new gravel surface road to access the site. There will be a 34 and a half kV collection system, which ties all the turbines together, and brings that energy that's being generated back down to the substation to get that energy up onto the grid.

Importantly here, there's no new transmission lines that need to be constructed for this Project. The site is adjacent to an Eversource transmission corridor that has both a 34 and a half and a 115 kV line in it. And, so, we will be interconnecting to that 115 kV line through the construction of a new substation. And, that eliminates the need for any new transmission for this project, it gets that power up on the grid right on-site.

The Project will be required to clear a little over 55 acres of land in total for the construction of the Project. And, the Project also includes 908 acres of permanent conservation land, which I'll talk a little bit more about later.
And, this, again, is the same map that's being projected on the other screen. But it lets you see, on the left-hand side of the map here is Route 9, and coming off of Route 9 you have our collector substation and O&M building, and then the road works its way up to the hill to reach the turbines.

The turbines in this Project are Siemens, are manufactured by Siemens Energy. The model is an SWT-3.2-113. These are 3.2-megawatt wind turbines. Each turbine has a rotor diameter of 113 meters in diameter. There are two different hub heights associated with the turbines in this Project. Turbines 1 through 8 will have hub heights of 92 and a half meters, and Turbine 9 will have a hub height of 79 and a half meters. And, the corresponding tip heights for those different hub heights are 446 feet and 480 feet, respectively.

These turbines are direct-drive units. So, there's no gearbox in the machines, which adds to turbine efficiency, it adds to reliability, it decreases operations costs, and also decreases the number of components in the wind turbines.

The design life of these turbines is 20 years. That's the certified design life of the turbines. Although, their expected operational life is longer than
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that. So, we expect that the Project will, in the first
instance, operate for 20 to 25 years. I'll talk a little
bit more about that in a moment.

You heard Attorney Iacopino mention
studies that occur prior to bringing an application before
the Committee. Antrim Wind has performed extensive
studies on the site, has assessed potential impacts
associated with the Project. Our protocols, as it related
to natural resources, were developed in conjunction with
New Hampshire Fish & Game Department, U.S. Fish & Wildlife
Service, the New Hampshire Natural Heritage Bureau, the
New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources, the U.S.
Army Corps, and the New Hampshire Department of
Environmental Services.

I won't read down through the whole list
here, but you can see that a great many studies were
conducted with respect to environmental resources, birds,
bats, wildlife, wetlands, vernal pools, things of that
nature, in addition to public safety, and other concerns
related to shadow flicker, aesthetics, sound, economic
impacts, and property values.

The wetlands on the site were delineated
by a New Hampshire Certified Wetland Biologist. The full
reports of the wetland and vernal pool studies are
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submitted as part of our Application and are available on
the SEC website. The wetlands impacts for this Project
are very small. The total Project wetlands impacts will
be about two-tenths of an acre in total. And, the -- in
2012, the New Hampshire Department of Environmental
Services recommended both Wetlands and Alteration of
Terrain permits for approval, with conditions. And,
Antrim Wind has incorporated those recommended conditions
into its 2015 Application for the reconfigured Project.

Natural communities were also studied in
advance of the Project being submitted. I mentioned
before, in general, this area is undeveloped and forested.
And, it's been subjected to timber harvesting over the
past several decades. In the course of our studies, no
significant natural communities were identified as a
result of those surveys. We were on site twice with New
Hampshire Natural Heritage Bureau performing site visits,
and they determined that it is unlikely that the Project
will impact rare plants -- rare plant species or exemplary
natural communities.

With respect to visual assessment,
Antrim Wind worked with LandWorks to perform a visual
assessment for the Project. The study area for his visual
assessment extends out to a 10-mile radius from each
turbine, which constitutes about 353 square miles, and parts of all or part of 20 different towns. Viewshed maps were created to determine the amount of visibility, and which sensitive locations within that area might have visibility. In total, only about two and a half percent of that 353 square miles has visibility of the Project. LandWorks used a comprehensive methodology in the VA that identified scenic resources within the 10-mile study area, it identified the sensitivity of those resources, it addresses the visual change the Project may have to that sensitive resource, the effect the visibility may have on a reasonable person, and, finally, reaches an overall conclusion on whether the Project has an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics given the visual change. And, LandWorks' conclusion is that there will be no unreasonable adverse effect from the Project on aesthetics.

We have engaged Epsilon, an engineering firm, to perform a shadow flicker study. The study that we submitted as part of our original Application in October demonstrates that, without any operational controls, the Project would easily be able to meet the industry standard of 30 hours per year of shadow flicker at any sensitive receptor. The maximum was 10 hours and
10 minutes. Antrim Wind will be filing updated information, as Attorney Iacopino suggested, in response to the SEC's adoption of new shadow flicker guidelines.

   FAA lighting: Tall structures, over 200 feet, are required to be generally marked and lit by the Federal Aviation Administration. Antrim Wind will comply with all of the requirements for marking and lighting that the FAA gives us. Based on the current FAA guidance, we've received determinations of no hazard for the nine turbines that we're proposing to site here. And, the FAA has indicated they require lights on six of those turbines. These are medium-intensity, synchronized red flashing lights that will need to be on at night. No daytime lighting is required. And, these are located on the top of the turbine nacelles.

   Antrim Wind is also committed to utilizing a radar-activated lighting control system, as part of a settlement agreement with the Appalachian Mountain Club several years ago, and once that technology is approved by the FAA.

   And, I know that's been a subject of some question as to when that will, in fact, happen. In late 2015, the FAA did, in fact, issue a new advisory circular that addresses the requirements for what they're
calling "aircraft-detecting lighting systems", or ADLSs. So, that has been issued. Antrim Wind will continue to work with the FAA to clarify the requirements for the Antrim Project site specifically, and to advance the approval of an ADLS for this site.

And, essentially, what this means is, with this technology installed, unless there is a low-flying aircraft in close proximity to the turbines at night, those lights will be off.

Sound studies: We also worked with Epsilon to perform a sound study for the Project. It included measuring baseline sound levels to characterize the existing sound in the area of the Project area. We then used -- we modeled the turbine-only sound levels to predict throughout the entire area, both on and off the wind farm site, what future sound levels will be. The modeling was again based on this specific turbine, the Siemens SWT-3.2. And, the Project -- and the study demonstrates that the Project will not exceed 40 dBA at the outside facade of any residence, which meets the new SEC standard of sound, which is among the strictest state standards in the nation for sound levels.

We are going to be performing additional background sound studies to, again, in accordance with the
new SEC requirement for sound that were adopted in December.

Cultural resources: We've evaluated both what we refer to as "above-ground" and "below-ground cultural resources", basically, archeological resources being below ground. Again, developed or involving consultant consultation with the Division of Historical Resources. We performed both Phase 1A and B studies that were submitted back in 2011. And, the DHR has given us a response that no further study is required for archeological resources, because there will be no impact to archeological resources.

For historic architecture, the review is subject to Section 106, where the U.S. Army Corps is the lead federal agency. Antrim Wind followed both New Hampshire DHR guidelines for wind energy projects in performing our studies, as well as the guidance from the Army Corps. Army Corps has filed a letter with the Site Evaluation Committee, in December, I believe, I don't think it was in January, indicating that, from their view, no further consultation was required. Antrim Wind will continue to work with Army Corps and DHR until the 106 process is completed.

Orderly development of the region: Wind
projects require a set of very specific conditions to be successful. There needs to be adequate wind speeds at a site, you need to have proximity to transportation infrastructure and transmission infrastructure. As I mentioned here, our site is directly off of Route 9. So, transporting a turbine -- turbine components will not require the use of local roads, which is a benefit. And, our amount of kind of the new road miles per megawatt installed is very low, which means we get a lot of benefits, in terms of clean energy, for relatively little impact from road building. We also have the transmission line right on-site. So, no new transmission is required for the site. It also requires setbacks, you know, adequate setbacks to ensure public safety, and appropriate environmental siting. This site has all these characteristics.

And, it's consistent with the orderly development of the region, as it maximizes the use of existing infrastructure, and coincides well with the local and regional land use patterns and goals.

This Project is expected to generate enough clean energy sufficient to power the equivalent of about 12,300 average New Hampshire homes, while also providing jobs, tax benefits, and conservation benefits to
the town and the region. The conservation easements that are associated with the Project provides significant and permanent open-space benefits. The open-space preservation and renewable energy attributes of the Project are very clearly and strongly supported by the Antrim Master Plan. And, historic logging and hunting and other recreational activities will not be substantially encumbered by the Project. They will be able to continue.

UNH and Seacoast Economics produced a report for us, looking at the economic impact associated with the development and operation of this Project. That report found that the Project would generate $53.4 million in local economic benefit, which is -- which includes about $11.6 million during construction, and thereafter about $2.2 million every year, for the first 20 years of the Project. So, that 53.4 million is the first 20 years. It would create or support 84 full-time equivalent jobs during construction, and 12 full-time equivalent jobs during operations. And, when we talk about the "local area" in this study, we're talking about Hillsborough County and the surrounding four counties in New Hampshire.

Public safety is, obviously, paramount in the development and design and operation of any facility. And, certainly, it's true of a wind facility.
So, this facility being located on private lands, with substantial setbacks to neighboring property owners and residences of over half a mile to the nearest turbine, will protect the public from any potential safety hazards associated with the Project, both during normal operations and in event of any type of emergency.

In addition to that, we've addressed public safety concerns, both in our Application, but also in an agreement with the Town of Antrim that was signed in 2012, that includes additional public safety measures, like restricting access to the site, gating and locking access roads, but making sure emergency access has -- emergency response has access to those gates; ensuring that the wind towers are not climbable, and the doors are locked; ensuring that all high-voltage equipment is enclosed and that the substation will be fenced in; maintaining a setback of at least 1.1 times the turbine height to any neighboring property line; also having signage on all Project roads, in addition to informal trails, that warn of potential hazards, and, on roads, those will be no less than 750 feet, and, on trails, 500 feet from any turbine.

It will include marking all electrical equipment, and making sure that the markings are highly
visible; ensuring all equipment has the necessary design safety certifications; and ensuring that all blasting adheres to the Department of Environmental Services and Department of Safety standards, and notifying the Town in advance of any blasting activities.

Finally, in addition to the robust onboard fire prevention and response technologies that are built into the Siemens turbines, Antrim Wind has agreed to employ a system called "Firetrace", which is an active fire suppression system inside the nacelle. So that, in the very unlikely event that a fire were to erupt in a nacelle, there's an active fire suppression system there to extinguish it.

The Project will adhere to all applicable fire and safety codes, and will have a complete emergency response plan that's developed in consultation with the Antrim Fire Department and the State Fire Marshal's Office before construction has commenced.

The construction process: We are currently expecting that the commercial operations could commence as early as December '17. In order to get there, we would begin tree-clearing. Our tree-clearing is going to be restricted between October 1 and March 31, in order to avoid impacts to nesting birds. Road construction
follows the tree-clearing, as soon as the clearing and
grubbing has been performed. And, then, turbine pad and
foundation construction, electrical line construction,
followed by turbine erection, and, finally, commissioning.

The Project roadways, which are 16 feet
for the access roads and 34 feet for the crane paths, will
all be reduced to 16 feet after construction is completed,
by revegetating the shoulders. And, prior to commencement
of construction, AWE -- Antrim Wind will provide the town
with a briefing.

Antrim Wind has selected Reed & Reed as
its general contractor for the construction of this
Project. Reed & Reed is the leading wind energy
contractor in New England. They have installed over 411
turbines, nearly a thousand megawatts of wind projects in
New England since 2007, and bring a great deal of
expertise to the Project. And, additionally, many New
Hampshire subcontractors and suppliers will be used to
support the construction of the Project.

Attorney Iacopino mentioned
decommissioning. Antrim Wind has developed a
decommissioning plan. Again, the initial operating life
of the facility is expected to be between 20 and 25 years.
The Project may be repowered after that initial operating
period. So, once the initial turbines that are installed reach the end of their design life, we may remove those turbines and install new turbines, and reutilize the existing site infrastructure and operate them for another period of time.

But, once the turbines are ultimately no longer operational, they will be decommissioned. The decommissioning calls for the removal of all of the facilities on the site, including underground facilities, to a depth of a minimum of 24 inches below grade. We've also specified in this decommissioning plan that, beyond the property boundary, between -- beyond the Ott property boundary, which is just as the access road reaches the ridgeline, that road will be broken up and reseeded after decommissioning has been completed.

Antrim Wind has agreed to provide the decommissioning funding assurance prior to commencement of construction for the full value of the decommissioning cost estimate. So, we have had a contractor perform a decommissioning cost estimate for us. And, that amount will be -- will be provided prior to commencement of construction. It will be provided -- the funding assurance will be provided in a form that is either a decommissioning bond or a letter of credit or another
financial mechanism that guarantees AWE's ability to comply with its decommissioning obligations.

Some of the benefits of the Project, to start with emission benefits: Many studies in New England and in New Hampshire have consistently demonstrated that installing additional wind generation into New England results in significant emissions benefits, including carbon dioxide. It also results in substantial savings of fresh water, because wind turbines do not need to create steam to spin a turbine to create power.

A 2013 report by Environment New Hampshire finds that existing wind energy installed in the state so far is resulting in over 157,000 tons of CO2 not being emitted every year, which is the equivalent of about 32,000 cars being taken off the road. While it's also saving over 70 million gallons of fresh water each year.

So, the Antrim Wind Project, if I have my numbers right, the existing installations in New Hampshire, about 170 megawatts, Antrim coming in at just under 30, will make a significant contribution to increase these benefits that New Hampshire is already realizing.

Antrim Wind has always made it a priority to include conservation as a key benefit of this Project. And, over the past several years, we've met many
times with conservation groups, both local and statewide, on a numerous range of topics, both to share information and to listen to their thoughts and suggestions. Again, I'm not going to read off all the names here, but we have -- we have made a significant effort to engage with and listen to and respond to the conversations that we've had with the conservation community.

Specifically, we have worked with local landowners and the Harris Center for Conservation Education and the Town of Antrim to reach agreements that will permanently conserve 908 acres of land in and around the project area once this Project is built. That includes 100 percent of the Project ridgeline. And, the conservation plan will significantly enlarge the amount of conserved land contiguous with the DePierrefeu-Willard Pond Sanctuary. It will add 908 acres, contiguous acres, to the existing 1,671-acre sanctuary.

Antrim Wind has also entered into a land conservation funding agreement with the New England Forestry Foundation, whereby Antrim Wind will fund $100,000 to the New England Forestry Foundation, which they will use to acquire additional conservation lands that are to be used to enhance and protect the region's aesthetic character, wildlife habitat, and public
recreational opportunities. And, again, full details of those agreements have been provided with our Application.

This is a map that depicts, in green, the contiguous conservation lands that will be put in place as a result of the Antrim Wind Project. You can see there's 100 percent of the ridgeline picked up there. The total amount of acreage inside that green area is approximately 908 acres. And, you can see how it abuts to the additional conservation lands to the south.

Antrim Wind has also developed a comprehensive bird and bat conservation strategy that was developed in consultation with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the New Hampshire Fish & Game Department. This plan takes innovative and proactive steps to mitigate potential impact to bird and bats, through performing comprehensive pre-construction surveys, performing post-construction monitoring for multiple years, and developing incident response protocols and a structured consultation process with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and New Hampshire Fish & Game, to address future impacts through adaptive management. It's a living document that allows us to respond in consultation with these agencies to things that may happen in the future that we can't anticipate now.
We've also agreed to test curtailment of turbines under certain conditions that have been shown to reduce risk to bird and bat species, and the development of this program has met with all of the recommended guidelines by U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service for land-based wind.

There are a number of community benefits that the Project will bring to Antrim and to the surrounding community. In Antrim, the Project will become the largest taxpayer in town, bringing steady revenue to the town over the Project's life, without adding significant costs to the Town as other forms of development might.

The PILOT agreement with the Town, between Antrim Wind and the Town of Antrim, which is a 20-year PILOT agreement, is the highest per megawatt payment of any wind PILOT in the State of New Hampshire. In addition, there are substantial direct and indirect economic benefits to the town and region brought by the investment, including the employment benefits of the local contractors in construction and other trades, as well as the food, fuel, housing materials, and other indirect benefits that accrue during construction and during the operation of the Project.
I mentioned the permanent conservation benefits of the 908 acres, plus the off-site planned conservation fund. Antrim Wind has also entered into an agreement with the Town of Antrim to fund $40,000 to enhance the recreational facilities around the Gregg Lake Beach area, and to fund $5,000 a year to the Antrim Scholarship Fund every year for the life of the Project. And, that is an unrestricted gift that the Antrim Scholarship Committee can use as they see fit, and, as I mentioned, will go on every year for the life of the Project. That's about 25 percent or so of that Committee's operating budget currently.

Antrim Wind has got a long history of working closely with the Town over the past six years, in a variety of ways, and that has led to a series of agreements that have been put in place. I mentioned, in March 2012, Antrim Wind and the Town of Antrim entered into an agreement that addresses issues around construction and operating period requirements, it addresses issues such as noise, public safety, construction timing, decommissioning, how to detail with addressing complaints, emergency response, and other key issues.

We've also entered into a PILOT
agreement that I mentioned a moment ago, which, again, is the highest per megawatt payment. What that is is $11,250 per megawatt, which, for this Project, is $324,000 in year one, and that will escalate by 2 percent every year for the 20 years that the Project -- that the PILOT is in effect.

The PILOT agreement also has pre-construction payments that will start to be made to the Town once construction has commenced. That was recently updated in November of 2014 to extend the commercial operation date deadline to the end of 2018.

Again, I mentioned the Gregg Lake letter agreement and the Scholarship Fund commitment letter that was executed with the Trustees of Trust Funds.

I want to take just a minute and talk about some of the changes between the 2012 proposal that was made by Antrim Wind and the 2015 proposal. We have made significant changes to the Project to address concerns that were raised during the 2012 docket. Turbine 10 has been eliminated entirely. Turbine 9 has been significantly shortened. All of the turbines have been changed from Acciona turbines to Siemens turbines, which are smaller, quieter turbines. We have added 100 acres of conservation land to the ridgeline to bring that number up.
to 908 acres, and to include 100 percent of the ridgeline. We've added $100,000 in off-site conservation funding to NEFF. We've added a five year -- or, the $5,000 per year commitment to the Antrim Scholarship Fund. We have included a landscaping plan around the clearing for the substation and operations building.

We've incorporated all the comments from the Department of Environmental Services and New Hampshire Fish & Game from that docket into the primary application that we've submitted to the Committee. We have developed a more robust decommissioning plan and decommissioning funding plan. And, as I mentioned before, we've made the commitment to install active fire suppression in the nacelles of all the turbines.

We have been very proud to have support for this Project for quite a long time. The consistent focus that we've maintained on stakeholder engagement from the very beginning, I think, together with careful siting, design, and the establishment of significant community benefits that have taken into account what we've heard from folks in and around the community have garnered broad support from within the Town of Antrim and across New Hampshire.

We're very proud to have the support of...
the Antrim Board of Selectmen, organized labor groups, local contractors, and many in the environmental community.

Just yesterday, in a letter to the SEC, the Sierra Club, in a letter to the Committee, wrote that "As Chapter Director of the New Hampshire Sierra Club, I write to the Site Evaluation Committee in support of the Antrim Wind Project." "The scale of this project is exactly what environmentalists endorse for small, local and manageable power sources that create less climate and visual impact, lowers costs, creates local jobs and improves public health."

So, I think this is a result of a lot of work to make sure that we are listening to concerns, that we're addressing them, and we're having a lot of dialogue to make sure that we're bringing the best project forward. So, we're very proud to have that support.

In summary, this Project is the result of a very careful site selection process, focused on high performance and low impacts. The studies that we've performed indicate that the Project can be built without undue adverse effect on the community or environment, while bringing significant economic and energy benefits to the area and the State of New Hampshire.
The initial direct impacts caused by this Project will be 55.3 acres of clearing, which will ultimately be reduced down to 11 and a quarter acres of facilities. That will produce enough energy for 12,300 average homes, bring in substantial new revenue, resulting in significant ongoing emissions benefits.

This Project has been significantly revised since the 2012 docket to address concerns, in particular, about aesthetic impacts. And, the Project is consistent with the goals of the State of New Hampshire to increase clean energy, and meet the criteria under RSA 162-H to receive a Certificate of Site and Facility.

Thank you very much. That is the end of my presentation.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The next item on the agenda is questions from the public. Not "from the Subcommittee", that's an error on the agenda, but questions from the public.

Does anybody else have written questions? I have two sets of them. If you could bring them up here, or to Iryna, in the back corner.

And, we'll take a short break to let Mr. Patnaude move his machinery around.

(Short pause.)
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Any other questions before we begin? Anybody have them? None?
Okay.

Okay, I'm going to start. This first question involves power purchase agreements. It's directed to the Applicant. It's really three questions, but I'm sure you can answer them all.

Do you have a power purchase agreement in place? If so, with whom? And, what are the details?

MR. KENWORTHY: No, we do not.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The questions here all -- well, actually, --

DR. WARD: Only with ones with the asterisks.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I understand that. I wanted to sort of compare it, if there's any with the other ones.

Okay. What went into your site selection, both on Tuttle Hill, where to put the met site on Tuttle Hill?

MR. KENWORTHY: Is the question concerning --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: What went into your site selection for the met tower on Tuttle Hill?
I take it is the question.

MR. KENWORTHY: Sure. The location of the meteorological tower was developed with input from our meteorological consultants. It's a combination of factors that go into where it is ultimately located. There was only one met tower that was sited for this Project. We put it in a location that has good exposure. In other words, it's not obstructed by any significant portion of the landform. It has good access to wind in 360 degree directions. And, it was a site that we could access without creating significant new impacts. There was an existing trail to get up to that site and a very limited amount of new clearing.

So, the initial siting and the instrumentation of that tower were developed with input from the meteorological consultants, and some of those factors were at play. We subsequently utilized a LiDAR, which is a remote sensing unit, which uses light to measure wind speeds at numerous locations across the site, so that we have representative samples of the winds from more than just one met tower location. And, so, that unit was moved between the met tower site and the location of Turbine 6, and the former location of Turbine 10. And, so, we have measurements from all those locations.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.

Another question about your meteorology and your met
tower. You state that there is adequate wind speed, but
do not make the met tower data available to the SEC, which
could help determine likely output of turbines. In the
interest of open hearings and full information, would you
make the met tower data available to the Site Evaluation
Committee?

MR. KENWORTHY: We have made the
expected energy yields available in our Application. We
have indicated what we expect our net capacity factor to
be with these turbines. The specific data that is
meteorological data is proprietary data. It is a pretty
closely-guarded information in our industry. So, we're
happy to clarify questions as they arise, as to the
legitimacy of the assertions that we've made about the
energy that we will generate, but I think that will fall
short of providing all of the meteorological data that
we've collected on the site.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. What
meteorological issues did you consider? What answers did
you get? And, did you address these to the Site
Evaluation Committee? If so, where in the record can one
find those answers?
MR. KENWORTHY: I'm not entirely sure if I understand the question, but I'll attempt an answer. Generally, in a meteorological campaign, we are looking, obviously, at wind speeds. We need to understand what the velocity is, right? Wind speed is what drives the power that ultimately extracts energy from the turbines. We also look at issues such as turbulence, we look at inflow angle, we look at temperature and humidity and pressure, not only to understand what effect those elements will have on a mechanical loads analysis for the turbines, ultimately, Siemens, as the turbine manufacturer here, who has to approve the siting of their turbines in this location, takes all of our meteorological data and they certify that it is suitable to install these turbines at this location. So, they're concerned about loads on the turbines that may be increased due to things such as turbulence.

Icing is another factor that we look at. We want to know about, you know, how much of an effect icing may have on our annual energy estimates.

And, so, we really look at as much data as we can, with respect to wind speed, shear, turbulence, inflow angle, direction is very important. We develop a windrow, so that we understand from which direction these
winds will most often blow. And, all of that is evaluated by our meteorologist to come up with an energy estimate, is also evaluated by Siemens, to certify that their turbines are suitable for this installation.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Is there a place in the Application where one can find that information?

MR. KENWORTHY: In terms of -- I'm not sure that specific answer is in the Application. I think we do describe the types of elements that are required for successfully siting a wind project, including meteorological considerations. But, again, the data that are -- whether it's turbulence or barometric data or wind speed or direction data, I don't believe have been provided.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Site Evaluation Committee requires the use of ISO 9613-2 for calculating the broadcast of noise from your turbines. Do you agree -- do you agree that this model is appropriate for the job?

MR. KENWORTHY: I don't know the answer to that. I'm not familiar with the standard. I could certainly check it. And, we could ask our acoustic consultant, who has performed the studies for us. But I
don't know the answer to that question.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Does your shadow flicker model account for the added solar intensity and much reduced background clouds due to the elevation of your facility with respect to the surrounding residents? If so, how?

MR. KENWORTHY: The shadow flicker modeling is a computer model, which takes into account, obviously, the location and size of the turbines. It takes into account the location and distance of all receptors. It assumes that each of those receptors have a 360 degree band of windows around the structure. It, you know, we do look at multiple calculations, and particularly now, in accordance with the new SEC rules, both to calculate the astronomical maximum, for, in other words, if the sun shown 100 percent of the time, if the wind blew 100 percent of the time, if it always blew from a direction such that the turbines were perpendicular to every receptor, we calculate that astronomical maximum. And, then, using historical weather data for this area, in terms of the number of cloud days there are, we make adjustments to get down to an expected number of hours of shadow flicker. So, it certainly does account for -- pardon me -- information that is specific for this area.
I don't know if it's true that there's more sun on the ridge than there is down below. I couldn't -- I couldn't necessarily say one way or the other. I think it may be the opposite. But, I think, to the extent that there is data available for us to rely upon in making the adjustment, that's the data that we have used.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Dr. Ward, did you want me to go onto the next one in this paragraph or --

DR. WARD: No, not unless it's marked.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Are there any other questions?

DR. WARD: I have a back side of the thing.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh. I'm sorry.

DR. WARD: Okay. Sorry.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. What is it about Tuttle Hill that led you to choosing that location?

MR. KENWORTHY: Sorry, the met location or that location?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Tuttle
Hill. What was it about Tuttle Hill that led to your choosing it?

MR. KENWORTHY: The initial selection of the site was the result of a modeling using GIS that can screen for, I don't remember exactly how many, but certainly well over a dozen different factors. It was looking for projected wind speeds. Wind speeds are pretty strongly correlated with elevation in this part of the world. So, you tend to find higher winds up on ridgelines. It was looking for sufficient distances and setbacks from nearby residences. It was looking for proximity to roads, proximity to transmission resources. It was looking for a lack of known and mapped significant environmental resources. And, so, we pulled a lot of data down from the New Hampshire GRANIT to use in our constraint modeling. And, essentially, those factors lead you to a site where you believe you have sufficiently strong winds, you believe you have a place that you can interconnect the project to the grid, you believe you have roads that you can use to access the site, and that you will be sufficiently set back from neighbors to ensure public safety, and you don't have significant environmental issues that will be caused by constructing the project. All of that is modeled in a GIS system, and
that eventually led us to the site.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Was there anything special about its meteorology that went into that choice?

MR. KENWORTHY: You can't tell much about meteorology until you start to measure it. What we have, before we go to a site and install a tower and start to measure it, is a model. And, so, we can purchase data from various sources that estimate, with some degree of resolution, what we expect wind speeds to be at 70, 80, 90 meters in hub height. Those aren't always true. There are sometimes sites that you think are going to be windy that end up not being windy, or it's windy, but it's too turbulent. There are sites that you think won't be windy, and they end up being windier than you think.

So, you can't tell much about the meteorology from the modeling. But, once we went there, and we installed the meteorological towers, and then followed up with LiDAR, we found that the site was highly suitable for a wind project.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: How much does the reason for your proposal depend upon its contributions to reducing global warming?

MR. KENWORTHY: I'm not sure I
understand the question.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I think he means is the -- your project is being proposed has something that's going to reduce global warming, how much of that is your reason for going forward? I assume is the question.

MR. KENWORTHY: Well, I'll answer it this way. This Project, we believe, is consistent with many local and state policy objectives. As I mentioned earlier, the Master Plan in Antrim speaks very favorably and supportively of renewable energy. It also speaks very favorably and supportively of open space conservation. And, this Project accomplishes both of those goals. This Project also advances New Hampshire's goals for additional clean energy development and installation. This Project will bring economic development, it will bring jobs, it will bring clean energy, it will bring stably priced energy over the long term for ratepayers in the region.

And, so, in addition to that, clearly there are benefits, in terms of avoided emissions, both carbon dioxide, sulphur oxides, nitrogen oxides, particulates, that will be realized because of this Project, and those are benefits.

I don't know how to weigh all of them
together. But, I guess, from our perspective, in the
business of developing energy facilities, it's great when
you have a project like this one that has all of them
together.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: What
percentage of the legislative mandate for renewable energy
will your facility contribute?

MR. KENWORTHY: I don't know the answer
to that offhand.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Under what
meteorological conditions did you measure noise in the
surrounding areas? Were these measurements mainly at
night? Or under conditions of meteorological ducting?

MR. KENWORTHY: The study that we -- the
study report that we filed with our Application describes
in detail the methodology that was used to measure
background sound levels. These were long-term --
primarily long-term unattended measurements. So, it was a
measurement period of approximately two weeks, with five
different measurement stations. So, many different types
of meteorological conditions were encountered during that
two-week period. And, those were correlated with the
meteorological information that was collected at our met
tower, which was installed at the same time.
So, I could say that. I could say that there were many different types of meteorological conditions that were -- that would have occurred during the two-week period in which these measurements occurred, which was 24 hours a day. So, nighttime/daytime.

I also mentioned earlier that additional background sound levels are being collected. If I'm not mistaken, they're going to be commenced in the next couple of days. And, that information will be provided to the Committee as well, to meet the new requirements in the rules.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. What is the estimated life of the Project? What happens after the 20 to 26 years? Your original Application mentioned "50 years". Do the leases with the property owner have to terminate in 50 years?

MR. KENWORTHY: Yes. So, I mentioned earlier, our leases are 50-year leases. And, by the time we may reach commercial operations, roughly eight of those years will have elapsed. The first term of the lease is -- it varies a little lease to lease, but, essentially, we have the option to extend those leases out to 50 years from the date they were first executed. What's, in ordinary circumstances, presumably -- those are the only
rights that we have today. In ordinary circumstances, presumably, a project owner and a landowner could agree to extend those agreements further. However, in this case, because of the conservation agreements that we have entered into, with landowners and the Harris Center and the Town of Antrim, we will not be able to extend the operations of the facility beyond the current term of the lease.

So, one of two things will happen. Either we will operate for 20 to 25 years initially, and then we will decommission. And, we will decommission as I described. Or, we will operate for 20 to 25 years, and we will repower until the end of the current lease period, and then we will decommission. But it will not go out beyond that, because of the restrictions in the conservation easements.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. This next question is to whomever can answer it. This person has their e-mail on the sign-in sheet, and wishes to get a copy of the power -- of the PowerPoint projects.

I can tell you that I will send a copy of the one from the Site Evaluation Committee. I'm sure Mr. Kenworthy will send a copy of his PowerPoint to this person.
But, also, you should notice that we have a court reporter here, and he is taking down everything that has been said. When that -- that will be transformed into a written transcript, which will be available on the Site Evaluation Committee's website, once it is printed and published. So, you should look for that as well.

But, if anybody else wishes a copy -- an electronic copy of my PowerPoint or Mr. Kenworthy's, please let us know before you leave and we'll send them out. Or, you can send an e-mail to Pam Monroe. I will also provide the PowerPoint, if I haven't already, to Ms. Monroe. And, I don't know if they will put it up on the website, and I don't know if our website is competent to handle PowerPoints.

For the Applicant, will the met data be available to Antrim citizens? It's probably a repeat question, but why don't you go ahead and answer it.

MR. KENWORTHY: Yes. I think, as I mentioned before, this data is proprietary, confidential business information that we're not disclosing.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Are there any other questions for either the Applicant or myself or Ms. Monroe? Thank you.
Okay. Are you still going to be required to purchase an eagle kill permit? I understand that each wind turbine will kill roughly 70 birds a year each, that's 630 birds a year.

MR. KENWORTHY: The Project does not require a take permit, for any species, including eagles. That answers that part of the question. I don't specifically know offhand what the estimated mortality is for birds from each turbine to comment on the second part of the question.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Any further questions?

[No verbal response]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Did we have anybody sign up who wants to make a public statement or comment?

(Documents handed to Presiding Officer Iacopino.)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. I'm going to go through the sheets just in the order they have been handed to me. If anybody -- are there still sheets back there? If anybody else desires to speak when we're done with these, please just let us know, either by signing a sheet or raising your hand.
Okay. So, Karen, I'm not going to get this name, Weisswange?

MS. WEISSWANGE: Pretty good.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Why don't you come right up to this microphone here. And, please tell us your name, and where you're from. And, for everybody, we ask that you be concise. And, we have several people. So, let's try to keep your comments to five minutes or less. Go.

MS. WEISSWANGE: Oh, mine will be a lot shorter. I'm Karen Weisswange, 91 Old Hancock Road, Antrim. I just wanted -- the questions I had really were answered by Mr. Kenworthy. So, and even the questions I had here. The only thing I have to ask is, I submitted the thing to do a -- to be an intervenor, and I put down "2016", instead of '15, because I thought it was the next year. Is that going to affect anything?

MS. MONROE: For the docket number, you mean?

MS. WEISSWANGE: Yes.

MS. MONROE: Okay. I don't think that's a problem.

MS. WEISSWANGE: Okay. That's all.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Next
on our list is a "maybe", Mr. Block?

MR. BLOCK: No. No comments.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.

Benjamin Pratt.

MR. PRATT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in favor of the Antrim Wind Project. The Town of Antrim, the State of New Hampshire, and the world as a whole is facing a tremendous challenge from climate change. It is absolutely essential that we dramatically reduce our dependence on fossil fuels, and wind energy is one way of doing that. Unfortunately, we are very late in taking appropriate action. And, our young people, and when I speak of "young people", I'm not talking about some future generation, I'm talking about our own young people who are alive today, they will pay a heavy price in the years to come from the climate changes that are now coming.

I understand and respect the concerns that some people have about the introduction of wind turbines. However, I feel that these concerns pale in comparison to the great damage that we are doing with our overconsumption of coal and oil.

For the sake of our grandchildren, we have no choice but to change to clean, renewable energy.
Every day that we delay will mean that the cost to deal with the many terrible problems resulting from climate change will be greater, and the permanent irreparable damages will be more severe. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

And, Mr. Pratt, you're from Antrim, right?

MR. PRATT: I'm a long-term resident of Antrim.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.

Thank you. Next speaker, Tim Perry. And, again, when you come to the podium, please tell us your name first and where you're from.

MR. PERRY: Tim Perry, Antrim, New Hampshire. Five minutes public speaking, not good.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You can use less, if you'd like.

MR. PERRY: Oh, I think I will. Thank you. As a hybrid-driving, tree-hugging, lifelong environmentalist, who is also married to a UNH climate researcher, I am obviously here to enthusiastically recommend that the Committee accept this Project, with whatever conditions are necessary, and get this on line. I have to agree, obviously, with Mr. Pratt, he's dead-on right.
I want to look at this from two quick perspectives. There's the micro perspective, which is the Town of Antrim. One of the concerns that is regularly raised is the effect this will have on property value. Sometime ago that was actually a concern. Recent research that I've seen, and I've seen this more than in one place, initially, there may be a minor property value devaluation, if anybody is living really close to these turbines is planning on moving in the next five years, they might take a five percent hit.

Beyond that, it turns out that properties that are in these kind of proximities actually have a small increase in property value in the longer term. Probably because people like me, who are out there going "Yay, clean energy."

Antrim's tourism has been, as small a industry as we have, has been brought up as possibly negatively impacted. I would point to, as I will several times, to Lempster. Lempster has actually experienced a small tourism boon. Their one little local convenience store has a interesting side business of stickers and t-shirts and sweatshirts promoting their wind towers.

I'm an avid kayaker. I've again heard about the aesthetics that are going to be negatively
affected by this facility. Gregg Lake, I live a mile from
Gregg Lake. I will come home after work, throw the kayak
on the roof of the car, run down to the lake on a regular
basin -- lake on a regular basis.

Pillsbury State Park, paddled the length
of the lake, turned around, and there's Lempster. Forgot
it was even there until I turned around and saw it.
Affected me in no negative way. Actually, it was kind of
positive, because, again, green energy.

Willard Pond, if you haven't been there,
one of the most beautiful pieces of property in New
Hampshire. You can be in 25 feet of water and count the
pebbles underneath you. A project like this will help
keep that pristine.

Thirty, forty years ago the Northeast
screamed about the pollution coming from coal plants in
the rest of the country. Nationally, we passed
legislation that solves that problem, or at least reduced
it. This will continue that path of creating green energy
that will keep that lake or pond as beautiful as it is.

I've had the opportunity to
professionally visit with a gentleman who lives closest to
the Lempster facility, but is not part of the lease
agreement up there. And, I asked him, "how is it
affecting your quality of life at your house?" He says, "You know what, on a warm summer day, if it's windy and I open the windows, I hear them." It has had no other effect on this gentleman. He has no problem with this facility. No sound pressure, no magnetic, no mysterious vibrations coming up through the ground that had caused him to be sick or dizzy, or some of the other outrageous claims you're going to hear.

If we look at this from a macro level, it's the same thing as Mr. Pratt was saying. Look at the temperatures in December. Warmest December on record since meteorological records have started. Eleven degrees above average temperature. This is planet-wide, and it is increasing every single year.

If I can be a little geeky, we are in what's called a "positive feedback loop". Every year that we have less ice and less snow in the northern and southern latitudes, we have less heat reflected back into space, which is going to cause the planet to warm, which is going to cause less, which is going to cause the planet to warm. This is not an inconvenience where our climate is going to be a little bit warmer, the maple trees may move farther north. This is a feedback loop that could theoretically end up with an uninhabitable planet.
I think this Project, in the six years it's been going on, has been the most carefully vetted and planned project that I have ever seen anywhere. I think it's an outstanding location. And, I think the company that's proposing it and will be building it has crossed every "t" and dotted every "i" possible. This is the single best example of "Think Globally, Act Locally" I've ever seen. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. And, Mr. Stephen Schacht indicated he might like to speak, a "maybe"?

MR. SCHACHT: I'm all set, sir. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Michael -- Mr. Genest, did you want to speak? Okay. This is this one. Okay. Seth Watts, I'm sorry.

MR. WATTS: Hi. My name is Seth Watts. I'm from Epsom, New Hampshire. I'm in favor of the Antrim Wind Power Project. I feel it will provide a clean and reliable renewable energy source for the state, helping our state's utility infrastructure.

I'm in the construction industry. This type of work is real important for us. I've been fortunate enough to be on a few of the wind projects in...
New England. The projects have been tremendous for me, my co-workers, and our families. It's the type of work that is a little bit longer in duration seasonally, so it helps us avoid some layoffs, you can generally work through the winter. It's the type of work that helps us build our infrastructures in our companies, both investing in people and equipment.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sir, I'm going to ask you to just slow down a little bit.

MR. WATTS: All right.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Because what you're saying is being recorded, okay?

MR. WATTS: Sorry. Okay. He's doing well.

I guess, in short, I think it would be great for our industry. It would be great in the short term, and it would great for the state and local area in the long term. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Ms. Voelcker.

MS. VOELCKER: My name is Elsa Voelcker. I'm a 32-year resident of Antrim. I live right on Old Pound Road, about a mile and a half from these proposed wind turbines. And, I don't feel this Project has changed
dramatically from the Project proposed in 2012. And, the
outcome of the SEC then was that Tuttle Hill was too small
a hill and the turbines were too large.

Fifty percent of this town is going to
be hearing this, these turbines, all winter long, when
there are no trees to interrupt your view or your sound.
And, this is -- wind power is renewable, but it's not
clean. There are people dying to get the elements needed
for the -- the elements in the turbines in China. We
don't care that there's a whole area of China that is
affected by the mining of radioactive elements, rare earth
elements.

I think solar is the way to go. Our
town is going solar, I understand. Not in a way that's
going to help the town financially very much. But it's a
beginning. I think there are lots of other ways that are
less effective than this wind project. Which proposes to
put a fence up right in the middle of a conservation
district that has been created over the last 30, 40 years,
by five different towns, for wildlife conservation.

I think it's a travesty.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.
Barbara Berwick indicated "maybe"? I guess "maybe" is a
"yes".
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MS. BERWICK: And, actually, I'm Barbara Berwick. I've from Reed Carr Road, in Antrim. And, I wasn't going to be, but there's been so many positives, I thought I should.

We abut this property. When the met tower was up, I saw the met tower every morning when I looked out the bedroom window, and we could see it from every place in our yard. So, probably, maybe this is wrong for me to assume, but I think our property will be the most impacted by the sound, by the flicker, than anybody else. We have a hill, and then we have the hill that you can see.

And, one thing I wanted to point out is that wind power is, no matter how much it produces, my son's a metallurgical engineer and he explained this to me, that they still have to have the traditional power plants. Because when the wind power isn't producing, the power plants have to be able to pick up the slack. And, they can't just suddenly produce. They have to be there. And, it's a problem in some places that actually do have a lot of windmills. So, it's not exactly as pristine and wonderful as we all were thinking.

But, for me, it's like I can't imagine living with lights flickering. We used to have one of
those little ceiling things that I couldn't stand it that make the light flicker. I can't imagine being out in my backyard and having the light flicker or change in the noise.

We live on Reed Carr, if you've ever been on Reed Carr, it's a very poorly maintained road. It's a little dirt road. It doesn't have two lanes in a lot of places. But it's a quiet, little road, and it's a quite place to live. And, now, this is going to be right in our backyard. And, I just selfishly don't want it. I realize the town will get a lot of money. But it will definitely impact our -- our life. And, I'm not sure that we'll save the environment that much.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Bruce Berwick also indicated a "maybe"?

MR. BERWICK: That's a "yes".

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.

Another "yes".

MR. BERWICK: That's my wife. I also live at 72 Reed Carr Road, which is a half a mile from the met tower that used to be up there, right up our hill. Our land goes up about a half a mile. So, our land abuts almost on the met tower that used to be there. We saw it installed, and we saw it every morning, like my wife says.
And, I'm wondering, is the met tower going to go back up on that site? Or is there going to be a turbine up on that site?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You can answer, Jack, if you know.

MR. KENWORTHY: Neither, exactly. Nothing will be exactly where that tower was. But, in that area where the met tower was, there will be -- there are turbines and a permanent met tower in that general vicinity.

MR. BERWICK: In that facility [sic]?

MR. KENWORTHY: Yes.

MR. BERWICK: Which I will have to look at, right?

MR. KENWORTHY: I don't know.

MR. BERWICK: You don't know. Okay.

So, I was just concerned, because, like my wife said, we came here 22 years ago, when it was a nice place to live, nice quiet. I'm just wondering what's going to happen, and what the future holds for us. That's why I'm concerned.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, Mr. Berwick. Okay. The next person we have signed up to speak with a "yes" is Dr. Ward.
DR. WARD: In my career, I've done a lot of crazy things, of which working with advertising people was probably the craziest.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Before you get too crazy, tell us your name and where you live.

DR. WARD: Oh. Fred Ward. And, I live in, right over the county line, in Stoddard.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

DR. WARD: Looking right at Tuttle Hill.

As I said, one of the things that was interesting working with the advertising people, and I've got involved in this, was that I was going to say to myself, I'm now -- I've got the freedom to put a great big advertising sign up that's going to get everybody to look at. So, what are the characteristics of that sign? One, I want it up on a nice big hill. I want that hill isolated, so everybody can see it. I want it as big as I can get it; and this is about a mile long. I want it as high as I can get it; and this is about a tenth of a mile high. And, what else would I like to do? Well, how about putting some lights on it. And, how about having it maybe play music or otherwise makes noise.

What this is going to do is not just look at it, it's going to say "Look at me." It's going to
constantly demand people looking at it. It would be a classic.

And, maybe Jack could make much more money if he would just say he wants to put a great big advertising sign, a mile long, a tenth of a mile high, sitting up there, where you'll see it, and you'll have to look at, because you're going to hear it and see it no matter what you do.

[Audience interjection.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, Dr. Ward.

DR. WARD: You're welcome.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next is John, I think it's "Robertson", 262 Concord Street, Antrim?

MR. ROBERTSON: I'm going to pass, I guess.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It's a pass? Okay. Ed Canedy?

MR. CONROY: Conroy.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Conroy, I'm sorry.

MR. CONROY: Thank you, Chairman. My name is Ed Conroy. Long-time resident of New Hampshire,
Barrington, and now Portsmouth.

    Personally, I'm a proponent of renewable energy sources, whether it's wind, solar, geothermal. Professionally, I'm a registered engineer in the State of New Hampshire. I've been working with 3-phase line construction. We build power lines, collector lines, and some substations. So, this job, and listening to the presentations and the comments, there's a lot of weighing, you know, with the townspeople, on which way to go with this or to express their opinions. But it does generate work. Keeps employees with the construction companies busy through difficult months of the year. And, provides, you know, tremendous economic, you know, income to families and to the town.

    So, I just want to put my support behind this Project. Thank you.

    PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. John Martin indicated that he "may wish to speak", does he?

    MR. MARTIN: I would like to. Thank you. I'm John Martin. I live in Antrim, on Stacey Hill Road, right across the river from Tuttle Hill. So, I think I'll probably have a view of at least the road going up there. I am in favor of the Project. I've moved to
Antrim recently, a couple years ago. And, prior to that, I lived in Rhode Island, and there are several windmills in surrounding towns, and I've visited them. And, the noise levels aren't that bad. And, when I drive by them and see them in operation, I find it a pleasant thing to see.

Property values for the houses in the area of those windmills, I've done some research on that, property values have actually increased. So, the people who live there have, you know, an increased quality of life, at least in some measure, or the property values would have gone down.

So, that's all I have. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Wes Enman.

MR. ENMAN: Wes Enman, 16 Pierce Lake Road, long-term resident of Antrim. First thing I want to do is express my support for the Project. Also want to appreciate -- express the appreciation for the SEC taking jurisdiction. I know it was probably a big deal for you guys to make that determination.

First thing I'd like to say is there's no such thing as free energy. There are costs associated with every kind of energy, whether it's coal plants,
nuclear, solar, or wind. I wish that there were a way that, because I agree, I think solar is great, but it literally works less than 50 percent of the time. And, as good as it is, it can't provide enough energy, sustainable energy, to run businesses, etcetera. On personal residences, I think it's awesome. But, for large scale, it really, around here at least, it can't do that.

As far as visual impact, I was in Concord yesterday, driving down the hill from Hopkinton. Every time I see the steam stack from the Bow plant, it bothers me. And, there's nothing I can do about that. And, that, actually, the smoke stack is below the treeline, but it's there, and we know that it's delivering toxic chemicals into the atmosphere.

Let's see. As far as solar and wind, this is a piece of the energy puzzle for long-term generation. Fifty years from now, let's hope that there's something way more efficient, whether it's hydrogen or otherwise, that's -- but this is right today, this is a piece to the energy puzzle.

What we have to realize with this is this is not a Seabrook, it's not Vermont Yankee, it's not Pilgrim Power. And, two of those are actually coming off line. So, we do need to generate more power. This is not
the Northeast Energy Direct pipeline, which you guys are also going to have to deal with shortly. There's no eminent domain. This is private property, with willing landowners that are willing to do this.

Beauty is in the high eye of the beholder. Some people do not want to look at these. I personally think they're stunning. And, I would love to do -- I wish I had a view of them.

And, as far as the noise impact, when I think about this, and you hear about the negative impact of it, this is not a car alarm or, you know, your alarm clock going off in the morning. This is wind blowing, it happens all the time. And, when the wind blows through the trees, that's what you're going to hear.

So, I think this is a good project. I think it's well-sited. I think Antrim Wind has really done a lot of backwork, and tried to get everybody on board with it. I know that there are some people that are going to disagree with it. But I think it's a really good project for the time. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, Mr. Enman.

Is there anybody else who wishes to make a public statement that didn't sign a sheet? That did we...
get everybody who signed the sheet?

Okay. Sir, why don't you come up,
please tell us your name. And, I would ask you that, when
you're done, if you would sign one of the sheets.

MR. DIORIO: No, I signed a sheet. I
just didn't check my name.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.

MR. DIORIO: My name is Adam Diorio.
I'm a resident here in New Hampshire. And, this Project
actually intrigued me. This is the first time I
actually --

[Court reporter interruption.]

MR. DIORIO: Oh. Okay. I didn't know
too much about this Project.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: He needs to
hear you.

MR. DIORIO: Understood. I didn't know
too much about this Project. I got a wind of it that it
was being discussed tonight, I thought I would check it
out. I, too, am -- I'm in favor of this Project. And, I
also am an avid outdoor mountaineer, love the outdoors. I
see the windmills up around the Plymouth area quite often.
And, it doesn't bother me. I'd rather actually see
windmills, versus big smokestacks, when I'm outside.
There's something about it. It's just, I don't want to see smoke or smog. I'd rather see turbines. That's just my personal opinion.

Also, I'm not sure about everyone here, but I have an electric bill. And, it comes every month. And, this last month was the highest it's ever been, for some reason. So, when I think of how clean energy can help, in some aspect, shave costs off future electric rates for myself and my family, I'm certainly in favor of it.

I'm not worried about who -- what developer or who's going to make big profits off this Project. I'm not concerned about that. Because, down the road, any business wants to make profit. I'm going on record saying that. People are in business to make money. And, that's America.

[Audience interjection.]

MR. DIORIO: Not necessarily.

[Audience interjection.]

MR. DIORIO: Okay. People have opportunities in life to make choices. And, I would like to reduce costs, myself.

So, in favor of this Project, I'd also like everyone to kind of look at how can we help the
developer reduce the costs of this Project to help reduce the rates for homeowners and customers. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. Is there anybody else who wishes to make a public statement?

[No verbal response]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Again, if you want to get information about this Project, or any other Site Evaluation Committee project, and right now we've got quite a few of them going, you can go to our website, www.nhsec.nh.gov. Did I get that right?

MS. MONROE: Uh-huh. Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: If you want to participate, the deadline -- if you want to participate as an intervenor, the deadline for filing motions to intervene is January 15th. I went over the various ways you can participate. We are going to have another public hearing with the Committee members. Is it in this building?

MS. MONROE: Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: In this building, February 22nd?

MS. MONROE: February 22nd, at 6:00 p.m.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: At 6:00
p.m. The other ways that you can participate is you can contact Counsel for the Public. You can provide written comment at any time during the proceedings. And, you can also attend the other hearings that we will have.

Not seeing anybody else who wishes to make a public statement or comment, having heard all the questions, we will now be adjourned.

(Whereupon the Public Information Session was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.)