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PROCEEDINGS
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Back on the record. Mr. Forbes, do you have any questions of the witness?

DIR. FORBES: Yes, thank you.
QUESTIONS BY DIR. FORBES:
Q. I was kind of trying to clear up something. You were asked a lot of questions about the shadow flicker sensing program that you intend to employ. I was confused a little bit about what's been created and what hasn't been created in regards to that. You indicated there was a program created. But from my way of thinking about this program, it starts with fundamental physics of how the sun tracks, and you would have to then input all of the sites of concern, the latitude, longitude, elevation and such to have that all put together. Has that work been done, or is it just that you got or Siemens has a program that would be utilized for the purpose of this project?
A. So, Siemens has informed us that they have developed what will be required to be implemented here in order to meet the shadow
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-29-16\}
flicker standards, and we are reflecting that in our supply contract with Siemens, and in some detail, so that it is clear that the system will be able to do everything that we require it to do. The components of a shadow flicker control system consists both of hardware and software components. And I will confess that $I$ don't have a hundred percent of all the details of what specifically has been used in Europe under the North Tech Supply to Siemens Turbines, which has been commonplace there and what's different about what Siemens is proposing for us to use here in the United States, as it relates to the patent issue that prevents us from just being able to use that system. But Siemens has informed us that they have an available solution for us that is an adaptation of the technologies that they've used in Europe, and it consists of the components that -- well, the hardware components is mainly the sun sensor that exists on the nacelle of every turbine and then the software program which is integrated into the SCADA, giving it the ability to turn turbines
\{SEC 2015-02\}[Day 7-Afternoon Session ONLY]\{09-29-16\}
on or off as necessary to do what you described. This is language that is very clear in the supply contract we will have with Siemens, which is that we will be able to program in locations that are identified as locations at which we may need to monitor for and potentially curtail turbines to limit shadow flicker at. So the system will know where the turbine is; it will know the height of all those turbines; it will know where the locations of the receptors are; it will know the path of the sun on each day of the year for each year the Project is in operation, and that will allow it to plot geometrically when the kind of theoretical maximum shadow flicker can occur. And then the light sensor is kind of the last factor which is capable of essentially just telling the system, can shadow flicker occur now or not, based on sunlight intensity. And we will be working on getting more specifics of what that threshold is and inform that threshold as soon as we can.

So the components that we intend to use at Antrim, based on the work we've done with
\{SEC 2015-02\}[Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY]\{09-29-16\}

Siemens, are available for us for this project. Does that answer your question?
Q. Yes, I think it does.

I guess, you know, as follow-up on the point of information request relative to the threshold where things turn on, I wonder -- I look forward to seeing that, because I wonder if you think there would be a distance factor that would be part of the equation of whether or not the intensity is strong enough to create a flicker at a location that may be one mile away or two miles away. Would that likely be part of the determination you think?
A. I don't know. I would suspect likely not, mainly because, you know, the overall amount of curtailment that we expect here is very low. And, you know, for each of the 24 locations that we're talking about, all 9 turbines potentially contribute some amount to shadow flicker, not at every location. But certainly each of the nine turbines causes some amount of shadow flicker at at least some of the 24 locations. So if we were trying to calculate for each turbine relative to each of the 24
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-29-16\}
locations what the distance factor is for those, it's more complicated than it needs to be, particularly when what we're talking about is between two hours -- or sorry -- between two minutes per year and five hours per year in total that we will need to have curtailment to meet this eight-hour-a-year standard. So my expectation is that what we will have in terms of the sunlight sensor is what the threshold is to determine that there is a shadow strong enough -- sunlight strong enough to cast shadows in a manner that could create flicker without accounting for the distance from that turbine, because really the rules here are telling us the distance that we need to evaluate at.
Q. I also wonder if there's any way to monitor at the sites, the homes, if you will. You know, I've heard a lot about the questions of weather and such, and I can easily imagine situations where there's low-lying fog and a house can't even see, yet the turbines might be up in bright sunlight. And in contrast, maybe there would be some other situation that would be
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cognizant of that. But how would one be able to really know if your shadow flicker control system is accurately, you know, representing what is happening at the impact site?
A. Well, I think it seems to me that the -- I mean, as you know, as we've discussed, we talked about producing a report. And the report will be able to identify for each of these locations what the total amount of shadow flicker each of them experienced in a given year was and how much the turbines may have needed to be curtailed in order to meet that standard. So that will be produced in a report, and we're willing, as we said, to make it available to the Committee and the Town.

So I guess the question you're asking further is: How do we know that that report is correct? I don't know, and I've never heard of a way to monitor for shadow flicker at a receptor. You know, it's a thing that's kind of experienced by people and isn't, you know, really measurable as such. It's not like there's sound that we can put a sound meter out there and leave it alone and record it. So,
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-29-16\}
with respect to the reliability of the outputs of the report, I think they're reliable, in the sense that, while I think you're correct, that you could have a circumstance where the turbine is -- the light sensor is telling the turbine to shut down because it may cause flicker at a receptor, even though that receptor could be in a low fog bank, therefore we're curtailing or counting as though there's been shadow flicker perhaps when there hasn't. So we would come out being less than eight hours per year. I don't think the converse is also true. In other words, if we are not detecting sunlight at that turbine, it's not possible for us to cast a shadow onto a receptor and exceed the amount of shadow flicker that we would otherwise be allowed to.

So I think the function of the system, you know, in a way is kind of self-verifiable by the functioning of the sensor and the way in which, you know, the system has been set up and configured to operate.
Q. Thank you.

DIR. FORBES: No more questions.
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-29-16\}

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Ms. Weathersby.

QUESTIONS BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q. Good afternoon. I think there's been some concern raised about Antrim Wind's expeditious dealing with complaints. I know under the agreement with the Town of Antrim, you're required to make reasonable efforts to respond. Could you tell us what the plans Antrim Wind -how they intend to deal with complaints. And is there someone on the phone from 9:00 to 5:00? And in how much time do you respond back? What are the plans to address the citizen complaints?
A. Sure. I would like to pull up, if I can, just a reference to the Town agreement, which was our Appendix 17A of our Application.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. So the provisions are fairly general that have been set out in the agreement. And, you know, what it requires of us is to identify individuals, whose name and contact information is posted at the town office, and obviously known by town officials, along with phone,
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e-mail and address information, so they could be contacted by any member of the public who has an inquiry or complaint.

Generally, I think for relatively normal issues, we would expect those things to occur, you know, during normal business hours.

Certainly the public may call during non-business hours. But for non-emergency issues, we generally expect the response process would commence the next business day. We will be developing an emergency response plan, obviously, which will have different protocols for responses, which, you know, would very likely be immediate in every case if there's an emergency. But for just general inquiries and complaints, again, name and address, contact information posted at town hall, which is available to the public. It's difficult to prescribe very specific time lines for each different type of inquiry or complaint you might get and what the exact time frame for response may be, because in some instances there may be issues that could take some time to resolve if there's an issue with a turbine
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and we need to get a part or something of that nature. But $I$ can tell you that it would be our intention that, if we were contacted by a member of the town, to take the complaint and to respond as soon as we practically could. Ideally, it's to have a conversation with the complainant, to understand the nature of the complaint, document it and start to investigate the cause of it, you know, within a couple of days. It really depends on what else the staff is doing on site that day, if there's, you know, technical work that may require -- if Siemens techs are up tower, it may take us a little more time until we conclude that process before we follow up on it. But the expectation is we will start to look into it right away.
Q. And if someone does call after 5:00, will there be a message recording device that they can leave a message, or do they have to call back again the next day?
A. No, absolutely.
Q. And that person will receive a return phone call, assuming they left their contact info, the following day to follow up on their
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-29-16\}
concern?
A. Yes, I think typically so, yes.
Q. Thank you.

If a member of the public had a concern about noise at their property -- in Lempster, we heard testimony that the Lempster Police or sheriff received a decibel meter, special training, and they would go out to the property and actually measure the sound. Is that something that you're considering?
A. We hadn't discussed it with the Town. The Town of Antrim hadn't requested it of us. We wouldn't be opposed to it necessarily if the Town was interested in having available to it a sound-level meter that was the appropriate type of meter they could use to investigate a complaint. I don't think we would have any objection with that.
Q. Okay. Returning to the end of life of the Project, I know you're planning on 20,25 years, perhaps refitting the turbines and going for a maximum of 50 years. What happens at the end of 50 years? Is it -- are you able to then renegotiate the leases, or are those leases --
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is 50 years really the end, or may it continue beyond that?
A. It's a good question. And, you know, typically, it would be kind of, as you initially described, yes, you can renegotiate leases. They don't provide for second extension. But parties can always agree, if things are going well, that they can keep going. In this case, it's not the leases that prevents us from going further; it's the conservation easements. So, with the -- you know, the wind farm will be within the actual conservation land itself. There's no bifurcation. It is a retained right inside those lands. And therefore, that retained right has a expiration date, and the expiration date of the retained right in the easement is the date of the maximum term of the current leases. So, once we get to the end of the life of these leases, even if we renegotiate leases with these landowners, we would be prohibited under the conservation easements from continuing to operate the wind farm.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
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The access road to the property, will abutters to the access road, will they be able to use that road to access their properties?
A. No.
Q. And -- okay. So the only personnel who would be able to use that access road will be people associated with the wind farm project.
A. Yes, with one exception, which is -- so, Michael Ott is the landowner that owns the property that abuts Route 9 and extends up to the ridge where we have Turbines 1 and 2 located. And the road that is on his property from the public roadway, you know, he can personally use. He's got a right to access it on his property. He does not have a right to convey to anybody else the right to use that road because it's restricted, and it's restricted in both our agreements with him on the wind lease and in the conservation easement agreements that restrict any conveyance of a right-of-way through those eased areas, but certainly not to any abutters. And that road is going to be gated. It's a gated road for the wind farm access.
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Q. And if Mr . Ott decided to build -- to subdivide his property or to build a second home -- I guess not a subdivision, but if he decided to build a home for his children or something and there were two homes there, then there'd be two people, two families being able to use that right?
A. Well, depending on where. I mean, Mr . Ott owns about 330 acres there. And I think we visited his home at the first site visit in February. We kind of parked in his driveway there and then walked up to the power lines. That area is roughly 5-, 600 feet from where the entrance to the new access road is going to be built, a little bit further northeast. So, you know, the conserved area above where his current home is can't be subdivided. It obviously has the reserved rights we discussed earlier with Attorney Reimers. If he were to subdivide in the lower section of property that's unrestricted, could the new owner -- gosh, that's an interesting question. I don't exactly know. Sounds like maybe they would because --
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Q. I guess what I'm trying to get at is, when the Project is decommissioned, does the entire road come out, or does the bottom part of the road that crosses his property stay?
A. So the commitment we've made is that we will break up the road all the way from Turbine 9 to the property boundary between Mike Ott's property and the Antrim Limited Partnership, or Bean Family Property. So, all of that road will be, again, broken up, reseeded. The remainder of the road will not be because Mr. Ott has retained the right to build a home within that easement area and to use that road to access it. And this was a very important thing for him, and without it we wouldn't have been able to get the conservation easement on about 130 acres of his land.
Q. Concerning the turbines themselves, are they to be -- what's the surface of the pole and the blades? Is it reflective, non-reflective? Is it white, gray? Can you describe that for us?
A. Yeah, it's essentially white to -- light gray to white. I forgot what the FAA calls it. But there's essentially FAA painting requirements
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that are required. And I think it's off-white, off-white to light gray or something like that. So they're pretty uniform in color between the nacelle, the towers and the blades. Obviously they are different materials. They're not reflective materials. If that answers your question?
Q. Yes, thank you.

And the met tower, we haven't heard a lot about it. But $I$ understand that to be a lattice-type tower?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you consider any other types of towers, you know, monopole or something that might perhaps be less -- have less visibility?
A. We did. And unfortunately, you know, you can't build a tower that tall as a monopole without guying it. And so when you -- there's a 100-meter tower. We need to have wind measurement instruments at the hub height of turbines. And so we're, you know, 92-1/2-meter hub height. The met tower is slightly lower than some of the turbines. We have a 400-meter tower. And to be able to get to that height in
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[WITNESS: KENWORTHY]
that type of area, you either need a freestanding lattice tower or you need a guy tower. And those guys for a tower that tall very well could have more visibility and certainly would be an untenable interference with construction, maintenance and operations in that area.

MS. WEATHERSBY: I have nothing further.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Dr. Boisvert.

DR. BOISVERT: Few questions.
QUESTIONS BY DR. BOISVERT:
Q. Regarding sound and sound abatement, you indicated that, should there be a problem, to make sure first it wasn't a mechanical problem, that something was out of alignment or whatever and you'd want to cure it anyway. But if there was no mechanical deficiency, you would exercise you're NROs, which I would assume is noise reducing operations, something like that?
A. Yes.
Q. But what are they? Is it slowing down the blades? You said it could be done in
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increments of 1 decibel down to a total of 5 decibels. Exactly what is changing in the operation of the turbine to reduce it by 1 decibel?
A. I'll give you my best answer, and it may not include as much detail as Mr. Marcucci may have been able to provide.

But ultimately, the NRO is a series of modes that are -- they change the operational characteristics of the turbine, which means probably a combination of two things: One, it may slow the rotor rotation, and/or, two, it may change the pitch of the blades in order to reduce sound. And that's probably the best I can tell you about what it's going to do. And we can do that in varying increments.
Q. So, basically it's rotor speed and pitch of the blades, angle of the blades.
A. Yeah.
Q. I thought it might be something like that, but I was just curious.

Now, regarding shadow flicker and the rules. If you could look at 301.14(f)(2)b, not to be Shakespearean about it. And these are --
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this refers to wind energy systems apply the following standards... now, the standard down in $B$, would you read that, please.
A. I'm sorry, Commissioner Boisvert. Can you point me again? 3.14 --
Q. (f) (2)b. I think I have that correct.
A. Okay. So this says, "With respect to shadow flicker, the shadow flicker created by the Applicant's energy facility during operations shall not occur more than 8 hours per year at or within any residence, learning space, workplaces, healthcare setting, outdoor or indoor public gathering area, or other occupied building."
Q. You said that you did not read that to mean any newly constructed residences within the shadow flicker area. How do you come to that conclusion? I don't see anything in there that says, with respect to shadow flicker, "for existing buildings." I simply see a statement regarding categories, such as residences, learning spaces, et cetera. How did you come to that conclusion?
A. Yeah, it may be that $I$ was referring back to
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[WITNESS: KENWORTHY]
the requirements for what we -- what the rules tell us to evaluate in order to be able to demonstrate compliance with these rules for the Committee to be able to make a finding that was informing my statements.
Q. Okay. But that was -- obviously, we can't ask you to come up with a plan for shadow flicker for something that doesn't exist. So you have to work with what turns out to be 24 residences in that area. I read this as indicating that, if there's a new residence built over the next 20 to as much as 45 years, there would be some, and they could occur in the shadow flicker areas. Do you not agree that you would need to apply this standard to that residence?
A. I can see that that's what the rule states. It seems to state that.
Q. Yeah, but do you agree that you would need to apply it?
A. I suppose if that's what the rules state, then we would, yes.
Q. How would you go about determining that there were new residences that needed this?
A. I don't know.
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Q. Might I suggest that Antrim Wind be notified when a certificate of occupancy is created within your 2-mile buffer, that that might be a way to at least know there's a new residence, and then you could determine whether or not it might have shadow flicker?
A. I certainly would not object if we were to receive notification of a new residence within a mile, with respect to shadow flicker, for us to be able to conduct an evaluation.
Q. And if it was to receive some shadow flicker in excess of eight hours, you would then carry out the necessary mitigations?
A. Yeah, that would follow. Yeah.
Q. And let me ask also on the flip side. If a residence were to not be there, heaven forbid there's a catastrophic fire and a residence is no longer able to be occupied, would you then remove it from your shadow flicker mitigations?
A. Yeah, I think if we became aware that a residence that had been being counted for and that was being, you know, curtailed to achieve a standard that was no longer there, we would like to be able to stop curtailing for that
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residence since we wouldn't be causing an impact.
Q. And I'm only referencing this in terms of a property no longer exists. I could understand if a property might be unoccupied for a while and is between owners, if you will.
A. Sure.
Q. It would still apply to that, because I would assume that if a new buyer is going in, they would want to see what the shadow flicker looked like and know that there was an abatement. So, okay.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm sorry. If I could interrupt for one moment regarding your question with the issuance of a certificate of occupancy being a triggering event. One thing we could do, and maybe it would involve working with Public Counsel, is it might actually be helpful to find a triggering event prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, because what I'm thinking is, if somebody were contemplating building a home, they may make a choice about where to put it on a particular parcel based on a shadow flicker analysis. So
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[WITNESS: KENWORTHY]
it may benefit both sides to have that information earlier in the process.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And if I could interject, perhaps a building permit or something like that.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yeah, something like that.

DR. BOISVERT: I'm looking for a common-sense way to identify that property so that it can be included. That building permit might be just fine as well. But you would need to know exactly where it was so that you could model it. And, $I$ guess in the sense of fairness, if you're going to be adding properties in, I can understand scenarios where you might remove a property that was no longer possible to be occupied.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: That makes sense.
DR. BOISVERT: And I think that would be only fair. I guess I would look to some sort of agreement that might be crafted between you, the Applicant, and, say, Counsel for the Public that could establish that kind of procedure.
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: We can certainly work on that.

DR. BOISVERT: Is that acceptable to Counsel for the Public?

MS. MALONEY: Sure.
MR. IACOPINO: You might need the Town's input on that as well.

MS. MALONEY: I was going to say --
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes.
MR. RICHARDSON: And the Town would agree. I'll just state that for the record.

DR. BOISVERT: Good.
That's what I have. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Commissioner Rose.

CMSR. ROSE: Rose.
QUESTIONS BY CMSR. ROSE:
Q. Good afternoon. We have heard and we will be hearing more from the Town of Antrim Selectmen on their perspective. And I recall reading somewhere in your prefiled testimony that you had conversations with the regional planning commission. But I don't recall if I saw anything that stated what the regional planning
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commission's perspective was on the Project.
A. Yeah, they really haven't weighed in. So, you know, Southwest Regional Planning Commission, there have been a couple of informal conversations that date back a fair ways. They were obviously provided notice of the 2012 application and notice again of this application. Other than those informal conversations and the notices they received, they haven't offered any concerns or comments or really engaged much at all in this process.
Q. Thank you. There was some discussion earlier regarding ice throw and some examples -- or at least an example referenced ice throw of up to 250 meters -- or I think it was like 820 feet, if I recall correctly, or thereabouts. Would the SCADA -- and I may not have that pronounced -- the SCADA system, would that be able to have the capacity to sense certain ice throw conditions to shut down, to ensure that would not be the case for this particular project? Or could you give me a little perspective on the safety measures to ensure that you wouldn't have ice throw of that significant distance?
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A. Yeah, $I$ think it's somewhat a matter of degrees. There are built-in systems on the turbine that are intended to protect both the turbine and, you know, any nearby people or structures from potential, you know, hazards due to ice throw. One of them is that, if each turbine has its own anamometer that measures the wind speed on the back of the nacelle -and that's a small metal disc, and it tends to freeze up first -- if that ices up, then it triggers an alarm and shuts down the turbine. That's one thing that is designed to kind of prevent icing conditions.

Another one is what is called the TCM, or turbine condition monitoring system. It detects vibrations at numerous locations around the turbine. And if there are any -- you know, some vibrations obviously are normal, and there are ranges outside of which they become abnormal. And one of the things that can cause abnormal vibrations is ice build-up on the blades. So, there, again, depending on the degree, the turbine will either slow the rotor down or shut it down and until it's again safe
for the turbine to be operated. Those are three -- and so the TCM, just to kind of acronym you out here, it integrates with the SCADA that ultimately controls, you know, all of the wind farm. I don't think I can say that it's possible to prevent any likelihood of ice potentially traveling that far. I think it's extremely unlikely that any type of significant fragment of ice is going to travel that far. But there are, you know, certain amounts of ice, you know, rime ice build-up on blades during operation, that will build up and will be shed. And it's a normal part of the operation of wind turbines in climates like this. And it just really historically has not been an issue either for public safety or for damage to property at these type of distances.
Q. Could you give me -- so, New Hampshire has a RPS, renewable portfolio standard. And I believe it's something to the effect of 25 percent renewable energy by the year 2025. I think that's where we are at the moment. Could you give me any perspective as to how this project would have an impact towards the
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state's overall goal of meeting its RPS standard?
A. Well, it will help. I know that. It will add renewable energy here in New Hampshire. I don't think I could give you a percentage -- in other words, what's the increment by which this moves us forward. But certainly, as we were talking about earlier, there's roughly 12,000 homes -- 12,300 I think is the kind of annual average that the Project will be producing the equivalent amount of energy for. You know, as we've discussed, 25 percent of that right now is currently contracted with a New Hampshire utility for 20 years. And so we know that much energy generated here in New Hampshire is going to stay here in New Hampshire, and the remaining 75 percent certainly will be in this region. We don't know ultimately where it's going to be contracted. So, you know, when you think about in New Hampshire, delivered energy, at least 4,000, 4,050 homes from renewable energy, it's pretty significant for a single project to be able to achieve.
Q. You have made reference to the agreement that
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you have with the Town of Antrim and how it will sort of guide the response process if there were citizens complaints, anything along those lines. And I notice you have updated your PILOT with the Town. I think that was updated in 2014. I think Ms. Berwick actually pointed this out earlier today, that the current agreement referenced, I think it's 2011 or 2012. Would the intention be to renegotiate that agreement with the Town or update that agreement with the Town?
A. Yeah, I think it's a good point. And we've recently had conversations with the Town on some specific issues, and I think I mentioned this earlier, one of which is related to the amount of the decommissioning funding. The structure of the decommissioning funding amount in this agreement isn't consistent with what we have proposed in our Application here.

Obviously, these requirements aren't as rigorous as the SEC requirements. We've agreed to language with the Town already to kind of clarify as potential conditions in this docket what that should look like. And I think our
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intention is that, once this is concluded, this process is concluded, and we know what conditions are in the certificate, that we would amend this agreement again so that there's clean-up to be done.
Q. Okay. With regards to the shadow flicker and the technology that you're working with to try to mitigate -- and I think it was sort of "adaptive technology" I think is how I heard that -- and the fact that there are 24 homes that are likely to exceed that 8-hour threshold, so that the ability for that to work effectively is going to be pretty critical to the overall project; would you agree?
A. Sure. Yeah.
Q. And I recall Mr. Weitzner, in his comments maybe the first day, referencing that that was not something that was calculated in terms of the impacts that the shadow flicker mitigation would have in calculating, I think it was the capacity factor of 37 , if $I$ have that correct; but yet, you're relying on something that hasn't been completely validated yet in the field. So $I$ was just curious as to whether or
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[WITNESS: KENWORTHY]
not you thought that created any sort of risk associated with the financial modeling of the Project, based on sort of, say, for lack of a better term, developing adaptive technology for the mitigation of the shadow flicker.
A. Yeah, the answer is no. It's a good question. I think, again, when you look at the numbers here that we're talking about needing to reduce shadow flicker by from the expected case to the standard, for these 24 locations it ranges between 2 minutes to a maximum of, I think, 5 hours and 38 minutes. So, really, in the worst case, if we had to shut down all 9 turbines for 5 hours and 48 minutes a year, it's a very, very small impact on project energy yield. Really negligible.
Q. And I had asked Mr. O'Neal a question with regards to the shadow flicker, that that report would be an annual report, as I understand it. But it would sort of be developing the cumulative impacts in order to be able to determine when it hits that eight-hour threshold. Is that right? It would be sort of a report that would determine the cumulative
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impacts up until it hits that eight-hour window?
A. Certainly the system will be collecting data continuously. And because behavior changes once you hit that threshold, yes, it will know once that eight-hour threshold has been hit. Checkcheck I don't know that we've kind of contemplated a reporting function at that time, but the information will be logged.
Q. Would it be an inconvenience -- or would it be possible maybe is another way of asking, if that information was released, instead of annually, that it was done perhaps on a quarterly or semi-annual basis so that individuals could see the cumulative impact up to a point in time?
A. Yeah. You know, I don't think there's a whole lot of... a whole lot of effort and process associated with running a report. You know, I can't say definitively that it's completely easy to do. But I understand the request. I don't think it sounds unreasonable. I'd want to kind of understand -- I think we would not want to have to put ourselves in a position
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[WITNESS: KENWORTHY]
where, you know, we're responding to kind of constant requests for status of $X, Y, Z$. We certainly want to be able to provide information that demonstrates there's compliance with the regulatory requirements, but we just want to make sure we're not creating a situation where we can't meet, you know, reporting requirement because our guys on the site are trying to do other things.
Q. Great. Thank you.

CMSR. ROSE: No further questions. PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Attorney Clifford.

QUESTIONS BY MR. CLIFFORD:
Q. Good afternoon. I think most of my questions have been answered. I had one related to the decommissioning aspects. I'm just curious. The turbines themselves at the end of their useful life, are they sold off for scrap, or can they actually be resold and portions used in other facilities? For example: The blades, the turbines, certain components have a useful life that's greater than the expected
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life of this project.
A. Really, no. I think at the end of -- if they had more useful life, we'd keep them working here, where you didn't have to move them. For the most part, you know, there's a design life. And any material that is -- assuming we're talking about at the end of a 25-year life, it's really expected to be scrap.
Q. Okay. And then on the -- just refresh my memory on the ice throw distance. It's about 800 feet, right, give or take?
A. So, yeah, DNV GL had provided us information which we included, I think in my testimony and in data request response, that in their experience, the maximum observed distance that ice throw has been detected is 250 meters from the base of a turbine; that's about 820 feet.
Q. And in this project, there are actually no physical structures within that 800 --
A. Half a mile.
Q. Okay. So that's what I thought I heard.
A. Yeah.
Q. So, no structures whatsoever.
A. Right.
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Q. And then you talked about this TCM technology that's used to sense when ice build-up is likely or as it's happening, I suppose.
A. Yeah, the turbine condition monitoring system is always operating. You know, it's recording changes in conditions, temperature, atmosphere, how they affect the turbines. So, yes, it responds in real-time to changes that could lead to unsafe operation that would cause a turbine to shut down.
Q. And then that actually causes the shutdown. So if it senses that type of situation is prevalent or present, it cuts them out.
A. Yeah, that's usually the kind of way alarms work in these type of facilities. It doesn't require an operator to observe something and make a change. The turbine does it itself. And if it did it wrong, the operator's got to go fix it. So it's set to be kind of a default that is conservative and more cautious. So, in this case, yes, the turbine condition monitoring system has two potential responses to ice build-up on blades, depending on what it detects. And one may be to just slow the
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turbine down if that's all it's required to maintain safe operation, or the other is to shut it down if the ice build-up is more significant. And that function is independent of the anamometer, which also could shut the turbine down all by itself if it were to ice up.
Q. So you're saying this doesn't require a human to be remote with a monitor of these systems to say, oh, I think it's time to turn them off --
A. No.
Q. -- and it might turn it off and it might not, so I'm going to flip the switch.
A. Yeah, it's automatic.
Q. Okay. Thanks. Sounds like this would be a good thing.

QUESTIONS BY PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT:
Q. I'll continue with that line of questioning.

So remind me how long the blades are.
A. These are -- it's 113-meter rotor diameter. So I think they're 56 1/2-meter blades --
Q. Okay. So --
A. -- 55 1/2 meters with the rotor in between.
Q. So, clearly, to the extent there was ice on a
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blade, any significant ice that would cause an out-of-balance condition, it would be pretty detrimental to the turbine itself; correct?
A. Sure. It could be, yeah.
Q. So, following that line of questioning, that's another reason why the machine -- the circuitry in the machine would be self-regulating because it's going to damage -- it could damage the machine if there's significant ice on it; is that correct?
A. Yeah, that's right. Imagine, you know, you've got a 113-meter rotor. Ice isn't always going to necessarily build up uniformly across that rotor. So you may end up with a rotor imbalance that is going to cause, you know, potential for misalignment issues on the main rotor shaft. And so, yeah, you want to make sure this thing is shut down if it's got any kind of imbalance of any significance.
Q. Another topic. This project has had a interconnection study done with ISO-New England; is that correct?
A. Well, yes. But I guess it's a little more nuance than that. We have done -- we did a
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full study in 2012. It led to a fully negotiated generator interconnection agreement. We withdrew the Project's application to ISO-New England prior to executing, given the SEC decision at that time. We re-filed our application with ISO for this project in 2015, early 2015. That study is underway. ISO has completed the Steady State and Transfer Limit Analysis portions of that study, and the stability study is now getting started. There were a couple of delays due to some prior queued transmission projects that were clogging up the queue and taking a while to get through. Those are now cleared, so we expect our impact studies to be completed shortly.
Q. To press you a little bit, what is "shortly"? Are you thinking months?
A. January. January 2017.
Q. And I understand you can't control what they do. I understand that.
A. Can you?
Q. I do try, but...

So are you aware that -- at least in the past few years I've observed, for me, anyways,
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I've seen some wind farms in New England have to curtail, if my understanding was right, due to transmission constraints. Are you aware of that?
A. We're aware of some of it, yeah, for various different reasons. We don't expect any curtailment at this project location, or at least extremely limited. I mean, I don't think any generator can ever say it's never going to be curtailed. But certainly no curtailment on a routine basis. It's one of the great things about the location of this project being where it is, interconnected to a relatively strong portion of the 115 kV system between Keene and Jackman substations. It's not a weak part of the grid. There's no particular bottlenecks here. So, again, on kind of a routine operating basis, we don't expect any operational curtailment.
Q. What I'm remembering in particular is a wind farm out of Vermont complaining to ISO-New England about curtailment. I don't know if you're familiar with that or not.
A. I am. Yeah. Well, there's a couple in Vermont
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that have had some issues, and for a variety of different reasons. I think, one, Vermont's grid, you know, they're not New Hampshire, all right. No, it's tough. It's a whole different set of grid conditions up there. And they have had some issues. But as I say, we studied that here. We've looked at the potential for curtailment. We understand, having gone all the way through the ISO-New England procedures at the same location for a larger project several years ago, we understand very well the technical issues associated with this interconnection. It's very straightforward. There's no network upgrades that are required for us. We build a new three-breaker ring bus, and we loop it into the 115 kV line. There's a couple of relay setting changes and a change in subs, and that's all from the last time. And we have -- again, having completed the first kind of two thirds of the study this time, and in our conversations with ISO, we don't expect anything to be different this time around.
Q. Okay. Good. That was my next question. So,
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thank you.
Regarding the MOU with DHR, I found Ms. Linowes's picture of the kind of deteriorating sign in Vermont compelling. Am I safe in assuming, if we were to issue a certificate, that you wouldn't object to a condition that any sign that was constructed as part of your MOU, or even the web site, would be maintained during the length of the Project?
A. I don't have any objection to the concept of it. One of the concerns, or one of the things I'm just not clear on is who owns the sign? Do we have access to where the sign is? It was my understanding from DHR that what they were interested in is a sign that's actually on the association property, which I think is why, obviously, it's subject to their agreement. And I don't know whether we would have continued access to that site over the life of the Project, if that could change over time; if, you know, there were a small amount that we could contribute to fund the maintenance to somebody else. I think we're open to the concept. It's just we don't want to -- we want
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to avoid a situation where we get put into something we can't meet.
Q. That makes sense. And I think you're right. We'd want it subject to the Birch Point -White Birch Point Association's concurrence, obviously.
A. Yeah.
Q. And on that front, the MOU -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- does basically require that; right? To put a sign up, you'd have to have a White Birch Point Association agreement or consent to do that; is that correct?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. All right. Which is why you have the web site as an alternative. That's something you could obviously do independent of them; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So there were some concerns mentioned of some of the locals not being involved in that run-up to that MOU, the discussions. Am I correct that the White Birch Point Association, requiring their concurrence in what comes out of this, that would involve those landowners, by definition? Am I missing something?
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A. No, that's true. That is a requirement.
Q. Okay. And similarly, again, I think we've already covered this the other day. So the Antrim Historical Society also has to be involved?
A. Yes.
Q. One change to the statute and the rules for SEC is that, among the many things that Ms. Monroe has to do, is she also needs to verify compliance. So there's a lot of discussion about sounds, shadow flicker, other issues. So I'm going to ask these questions, but in the context that she or someone on her staff, if she ever gets staff [laughter] goes out. What would they look at to know there's compliance? So I think on shadow flicker, you talked about the Siemens project. So there would be data logs. Is that something that they could look at, do you expect? Or what mechanism do you think she would or her staff would look at? What thing? Would it be the annual report or --
A. Yeah, I mean, I would suspect it would have to be the annual report for compliance with shadow
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flicker, because, you know, even if Administrator Monroe were to ask us, Hey, can we come out to the site on Thursday? We'd love to look at the SCADA system and see where you are with shadow flicker, we could potentially accommodate that. But I don't think it would be indicative necessarily at that snapshot point in time of whether we complied with an annual standard, which is cumulative. It might indicate if there was a problem somehow. So, again, that's not something we can't necessarily accommodate like that. But I think in terms of the kind of routine demonstrating compliance, our expectation would be that we would deliver the report within, I don't know if we specified it or not, but some reasonable period of time at the end of the year, and in it provide the information that was necessary to determine compliance.
Q. Okay. How about sound? How is she going to know you're in compliance with the sound standards?
A. Well, $I$ think initially it's a -- the rules prescribe post-construction sound-testing
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requirements. We'll need to undertake that work and produce the necessary documentation from those reports to deliver to the Committee, that we do in fact comply with the sound standards.
Q. And you had a discussion, and I forgot who it was with, maybe Dr. Boisvert, about the Lempster experience, where we heard from Mr. Thurber, I think that the Project made a sound meter available, but it was to no avail because nobody on staff at the Town had any expertise or training. So I think the suggestion was you guys could -- your project could provide something like that to the Town. But I guess I'd throw out that perhaps -- you know, I was on that SEC Committee also. And we assumed certain things. I'm not sure they actually happened that way. So how would you rectify that in this situation?
A. We could get a sound meter for Administrator Monroe.
Q. I don't think she's liking this discussion.
[Laughter]
A. I agree. I think there's a reasonable chance
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that you spend a bit of money on a sound meter, and maybe you train one or two people, and then three, four, five years down the road it's collecting dust in a closet and nobody knows how to use it anymore. That's possible. In a way, if that happens, it's good news, because it probably means there's no sound complaints that's happening. And it sounds like that's the case in Lempster.

But, you know, I guess if there were a periodic -- you know, if we were to be required to provide some instruction to the Town on how to use the meter and ensure the meter was calibrated on a three-year basis, if that would be helpful to give them comfort that they have the ability to assist in determining, you know, at least initially, compliance from their perspective, I don't think we would object to that.
Q. Okay. And on the topic of complaints, how will the public know where to make a complaint? How will they be informed? So I'm an abutter, and I think something's happening that shouldn't be happening. How do I know who to talk to?
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A. Well, I guess we have the information for Antrim Wind officials that should be contacted for any inquiry or complaint will be posted in the town offices. And that is a continuous requirement from prior to starting construction until decommissioning is completed. So that will always be there for members of the public. And if they were to go to town hall or call the hall to determine who the right contact person is at that time, then they would have that information available to them.
Q. And I'm going to make Ms. Monroe even more unhappy. So I assume you have no objection if the SEC administrator's number was listed also, so if they weren't happy with the resolution, they could always call her?

MS . MONROE: Fine.
A. No objections.

BY PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT:
Q. I'm going to move right along, and I'm glad I'm not sitting close to her.

Similarly, on your agreement with the towns, you have certain requirements to submit reports to the towns. I assume you have no
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objection to submitting those to the SEC also?
A. No.
Q. You had a discussion about shadow flicker with Dr. Boisvert. Am I correct that that does seem -- I'm sorry. I'll elaborate.

Shadow flicker, as it relates perhaps to new construction, or as he mentioned, if somebody -- the dwelling is no longer occupied, that type of -- those changes, that does sound like a software change then, if you were to accommodate those things?
A. Oh, yeah, the actual process of being able to accommodate that change I think is straightforward. If we need to add or remove anyone at the programmed locations that were monitoring through the system, it's a software change because all the turbines are already instrumented with sensors. You know, I think we get -- yeah.
Q. And obviously we have a data request for the -regarding the sensor cut point for the shadow flicker system. And again, we'll wait to see what happens with that.

But is it your intention that those
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settings for the sensors would be on the conservative side to ensure compliance?
A. Yeah, I think so. And accurate. So I think I would want to maybe reserve any speculation beyond that until I really know what these figures are, because $I$ don't know, you know, if it's measured in, you know, watts per square meter to solar insulation or if it's some other lumens measurement that they're going to use for these light sensors. But there is a threshold. I think obviously most of the things we do in these evaluations is conservative. So it wouldn't surprise me if this was as well.
Q. On the FAA -- the ADLS system; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. If for some reason the FAA hasn't -- they're a bureaucracy, so I can pick on them 'cause I'm in one. If they haven't acted in the time frame you expect -- so, until that approval happens, am I correct it would have to be constantly lit at night?
A. Yes, it would. If there was -- if we weren't able to use the ADLS by the time these
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structures were being installed, then we would have six turbines that would have alternating red lights at night.
Q. Why six? Why not nine?
A. That's the FAA's requirement. So, you know, prior to us submitting our lighting study for permission to use the ADLS, we did, you know, file for original determinations of "no hazard." And they did originally come back to us and say you need to light all nine turbines. And we went back to them and said we really shouldn't have to, according to your regs. So they modified those letters to identify six of the nine turbines that would be required to have lights.
Q. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr.
Iacopino.
QUESTIONS BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Let me pick up on the ADLS.

What safeguards are built into that if that should fail?
A. It is essentially a failsafe. If the ADLS fails, the lights go back to normal operation.
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Q. So they all go on.
A. Correct.
Q. I want to turn my attention to the subdivision of the property where the Public Service substation is going to be located.

In the Application, I believe you provided us with a map of that property. And has that subdivision actually occurred at this point in time? Because the map actually doesn't appear to be a subdivision plot at all; it appears to be an access map.
A. Yeah, I'm actually not sure exactly which map you're referring to. But yes, the subdivision has been completed at this time.
Q. And it's been approved by the Town?
A. Correct.
Q. If I understand correctly, you essentially have your collector substation sitting on the property of a Mr. Hutchins, and it abuts right up against the property line where the PSNH substation is; correct? They're almost conjoined?
A. Yeah, it's all right now property that's owned by Hutchins is Ott -- so, Michael James
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Hutchins Ott.
Q. Okay.
A. And all of this land is owned by Mike Ott. We lease all of this land currently, and we have an option to purchase the area that we have subdivided. So we've subdivided it, but it's still owned by Mr. Ott.
Q. Okay. But my question is: You've got these two facilities that appear to be conjoined. Was there any kind of variance, special exception or other type of authority you needed to get from the Town for that plan?
A. Well, this --
Q. I mean, normally there would be setbacks, lot setbacks and things like that.
A. Well, the facility was not part of the subdivision approval.
Q. Okay.
A. So the subdivision approval just created the lot. Like the siting is really what we're bringing here before the Committee.
Q. Okay. So I just want to make sure I understand this. You're asking us to approve, in place of a town site plan, for property that is located
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY]\{09-29-16\}
on property that you lease, but then property that's owned by Public Service? You know what I'm saying? On the Public Service lot, there's a substation that's being built in the corner of that lot. At least according to the plan that you have here, it appears that it's right on the property line of the subdivided lot on a corner. And it appears to be conjoined with your collector substation, which is on the Ott property. And I guess my question is: Has that site plan, because it's on the PSNH lot, has that been approved by whatever board has authority to do that in the town of Antrim?
A. No, that's part of this facility. So, that substation for PSNH and for our collector sub are all part of the facilities that we've described in this application. It's all on land that is currently owned by Mr. Ott. And we have subdivided that, that property, so that it can be conveyed to PSNH, which is required to be done after, roughly within 30 days after construction is completed on that lot.
Q. So the subdivision occurred without regard to the placement of the buildings then?
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A. Correct. It's just a creation of a new lot. Q. And at this point in time, Mr. Ott's land, which will be the new Public Service lot, is still owned by Mr. Ott, and part it's leased to you? Is that what you're saying?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. One of the questions I had about that, too is once all of this has occurred, the Public Service substation is along the access road at that point. Is it the intent to have Public Service employees have access to the upper portions of the access road as well, or only up to the point of the substation?
A. No, just to the substation.
Q. You've talked a lot or been asked a lot of questions about things like ice throw, noise, shadow flicker. And, you know, the common response to all of those concerns is that one way to curtail is basically to shut down, which obviously has an impact on the ability of the Project to produce electricity.

Will any of the employees of Antrim Wind, or any of your contractors on site, be paid in relation to production of the facility?
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A. No. No.
Q. You referenced the anamometer that might freeze up and be a safeguard by freezing up in terms, you know, icing. Is there any way for that anamometer to be turned off by employees, so that if it iced up, it wouldn't stop the production of electricity?
A. I don't believe so, no.
Q. Is there any way for the employees to override any of the automatic shut-offs that you mentioned -- not the correct term -- but for your employees on site to override? So if a turbine shuts down because it has perceived some irregularity, is there any method for your employees to override that?
A. Well, if by "override" you mean can they change the system so that those safety triggers will no longer be in effect, $I$ think the answer is no. If there is a trip, if there is an alarm that shuts a turbine down -- could be anything; could be a heat sensor nacelle; could be a fire alarm that goes off; could be a vibration issue in the $T C M$, and the turbine shuts down -- the procedure is for a -- in the first instance, if
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[WITNESS: KENWORTHY]
the remote operators who are $24 / 7$ monitoring this thing can reset it remotely, they will, if there's no issue there. If there is a problem that actually led to -- in other words, it's not a false problem -- then, no, it can't be overridden until the condition that caused it in the first place has been addressed. Does that make sense?
Q. Yes. But my next question is: Are there situations where that condition can be addressed by somebody sitting either in your operation and maintenance building or in your remote SCADA building? You know what I'm saying? In terms of it's -- let's say there's an imbalance because of ice, all right. So the turbine shuts down. The operator is going to have some kind of notice of that. I assume that somebody is going to go out and look at that turbine. My concern is, can that turbine be turned on without somebody going out and doing that part of the process? Or how would you address it is a better question? I mean, are there protocols that there will be a visual inspection, things like that?
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A. I don't think there's a need for a visual inspection in that particular circumstance. I mean, if a turbine is being curtailed or shut down due to icing conditions, the remedy is to wait until those icing conditions subside, if it is necessary to shut down for safety reasons in those circumstances. You know, it's not to try remove the ice and get it back to an operating condition. It's not part of the response protocol that we have. If there's some question as to what caused a particular alarm to trip that caused the turbine to shut down, then certainly it may require an inspection from operations personnel.
Q. You mentioned response protocols. Are those published? Are they in a book or in a computer program? I mean, what are the -- where would one go if they wanted to -- if Ms. Monroe wanted to check up on your response protocols, where would she have to go?
A. Well, she could certainly come to me. We will have copies of the ERP on site, you know, in our corporate offices as well. We'll have digital copies of them available. So, yes, I
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|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | mean, they're there and being developed in |
| 2 |  | conjunction with the Town of Antrim Fire |
| 3 |  | Department and the state fire marshal's office |
| 4 |  | as well. So 1 presume they'll both have copies |
| 5 |  | of the ERP as well. |
| 6 | Q. | Well, that's an emergency response plan, right, |
| 7 |  | that you're talking about right now? Let's go |
| 8 |  | beyond the emergency response plan. I'm just |
| 9 |  | talking about your operational responses. |
| 10 | A. | Yeah. |
| 11 | Q. | I mean, every time that you get one of these |
| 12 |  | triggers, it's not necessarily an emergency; |
| 13 |  | right? You're not necessarily -- |
| 14 | A. | Sure . |
| 15 | Q. | -- going to involve the fire department or |
| 16 |  | police department. |
| 17 | A. | The vast majority of the time. |
| 18 | 2. | So is it the same answer? If Ms. Monroe wanted |
| 19 |  | to see how you're going to respond to a frozen |
| 20 |  | anamometer, what are you going to show her to |
| 21 |  | show her what your protocols are? |
| 22 | A. | Yeah, so the detailed, site-specific operations |
| 23 |  | plan and kind of EHS plan, environmental health |
| 24 |  | and safety plan, will be developed with Siemens |
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and Antrim. I honestly can't tell you today if every piece of that is public information. I think probably not. There's likely to be sensitive information about operational parameters of Siemens turbines that may be included in there that they wouldn't want their competitors to have access to. I certainly don't think we would object to having the Committee be able to inspect that plan if there were any confidentiality issues that we could address --
Q. Well, the rules in the statute allows the Committee to do that.
A. Sure.
Q. But my question is, and I'm trying to educate Ms. Monroe, too, as to what she's going to be looking for when she comes up to your facility, if you get a certificate. Is this going to be a book? Are we going to be directed to a computer database? What kind of resources is she going to need to do her job to regulate you?
A. No, coming on the site there will be physical copies of the plan.
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Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears.

I want to go to -- you were asked some questions, and I forget by whom, but you referenced the wetlands plan. And your question was about how to identify whose property is whose. And I think you explained that on the one page that we were dealing with was the map, and then on the page behind it was the names. All the properties were listed and the name of the owner. That's Page 36 in the PDF of Appendix 2A to the Application. And you were asked questions about the area where the road goes very close to that 300 -acre wood lot. That wood lot is identified in your filing as Parcel 211-4. And if I go to the second -- to Page 37 on the PDF, that appears to be an LLC by the name of Ellen Pastels and Art House, LLC. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And then if you look at that 211-4 in the northwest corner, there appears to be another small piece of property that you're leasing, which $I$ assume is a laydown yard or a maintenance yard of some kind?
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A. Yes. Just north of the 211-4?
Q. Yeah.
A. Yes.
Q. Is that on the property of 211-4?
A. No, it is not.
Q. So that's a different landlord there or the same landlord?
A. It is a different landlord.
Q. Okay. All right. Does your company have any agreements with the owner of Lot 211-4?
A. No.
Q. Does Mr. Ott own the land where that hunting camp is located?
A. No, he does not.
Q. Do you know who owns that?
A. Yes. Just give me one second. I can tell you. It's referenced in my supplemental testimony, I believe.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. Sorry. I'm just scrolling through here and I'm not finding it quickly.
Q. From my look at your wetlands plan, it seemed to me that it was either on the Ott property or the Christian property. But I couldn't tell.
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A. I think it's actually Couturier.
Q. So you think it's on Parcel 212-26?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. All right. Now I'm going to leave that subject.

You've been questioned a fair amount about why are you still working on a 2011 agreement with the Town of Antrim. It is a little bit surprising that you wouldn't come in with a new agreement for the new project. Does the reason why there's not a new agreement have anything to do with Judge Garfunkel's decision with respect to public meetings?
A. No. We updated our PILOT agreement with the Town at the end of 2014. Mainly that update was just to change the expiration date of the PILOT.

You know, candidly, we didn't see a need to update the agreement with the Town of Antrim. By the time we filed our application, no new rules had been adopted by the Committee. Those were adopted after we filed our application. We obviously amended our application in response to that. And pending
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the outcome of this proceeding, we certainly expect to make some clean-up changes to this agreement, just to avoid any confusion down the road. But I think the basic components of what are in this agreement, in principal, all still apply at the time that we made this application to the Committee.
Q. And then my last line of questions is you were questioned about the Nature Conservancy letter and the two Sierra Club letters. During the course of your cross-examination, you mentioned other environmental groups. And I don't know if you had meant to suggest that there had been other groups that support the Project.
A. Yeah. Well, I think --
Q. Can you tell us who they are?
A. Sure. The New England Forestry Foundation, they have submitted a letter recently -- I think it was either the end of July or beginning of August -- addressing, again, the issues, you know, the benefits this project is bringing to the region and the region's conservation interests. So, I think in terms of direct support and supportive comments that
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have been offered by conservation NGOs in this state, you have the Sierra Club; you have the Nature Conservancy; you have the New England Forestry Foundation. I think it is worth pointing out that, with respect to the Harris Center, while they have taken no position in this docket either for or against, and we recognize that, they did make a determination that it was in their best interests to enter into a series of agreements with us to permanently conserve this land which they have acknowledged will bring significant conservation benefits to this region if the Project goes forward. So, very kind of broad set of different types of positions that environmental organizations have taken on this project.
Q. Do you know if the Nature Conservancy is a partner in the Quabbin-to-Cardigan, Q2C Partnership?
A. All three of those organizations are partners. So, the Nature Conservancy, the Harris Center and New England Forestry Foundation are all members of the Quabbin-to-Cardigan Partnershp.
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Q. Do you know if the Sierra Club is?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: I don't have any further questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr.
Clifford, I think you had some more.
QUESTIONS BY MR. CLIFFORD (cont'd):
Q. I just had a couple of questions -- actually, really one related to security.

Are there any plans to either alarm or have some sort of video monitoring of the turbines and the facility post-construction, just for your...
A. Yeah, that's a good question. We don't specifically have any plans right now for any particular security measures, you know, beyond the fact that there will be motion-activated lights on the buildings and motion-activated lights, you know, near the entrances to the turbine doors themselves. There will be a fence around the substation. You know, doors will be locked at the O\&M building, and the gate will be locked at the only access road to
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this site. Beyond that, we really -- I think the general take is if there's not a security issue we need to address, to probably not go much beyond that. But certainly we can respond to, if necessary, security issues with remote monitoring or with additional measures if necessary.
Q. I'm just going to suggest to you that if this type of project is approved, it might be some sort of attractive, you know, curious place for people to go because it hasn't been there before. So you may get the occasional hiker or group of kids that are out interested in seeing if they can hike up to the windmills. Just would be a suggestion.
A. Yeah.
Q. And an alternative might be that you could actually monitor situations that you're not picking up from your turbine monitoring that may impact their operations, such as, you know, a thunder and lightning storm that starts a fire. Just a suggestion.
A. Hmm-hmm. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Before we
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go to redirect, similar line.
QUESTIONS BY PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT (cont'd):
Q. Do you expect to be putting signs up or posting the area?
A. Yeah. So the agreement with the Town describes putting up signs on the access road. It talks about roads and trails in the area, but really there is one access road. So, on that road, I believe it's within 750 feet of the base of any turbine, and then, on informal trails in the area, also to have signs that are really to inform the public that there's turbines nearby. You know, particularly in winter icing conditions there could be risks associated with being in those areas. So that's the level of signage we've talked about, in addition to obviously any electrical equipment that needs to be marked as such will be. But other signs on the site would be as described in that agreement, which I think is 750 feet on roads and 500 feet on trails.
Q. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Is there
any redirect?
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: No. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. So, next is the Town; is that correct?

MR. NEEDLEMAN: I believe that's right.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Then, Mr. Richardson.

MR. RICHARDSON: That's fine. The Town is ready. We'll put them up next.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Well, when I tried to go to Mr. Enman, I think I was -- I think you raised your hand and said the Town was next instead. Did I miss something?

MR. RICHARDSON: That's true.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So the Town's next. Let's go off the record while we move the panelists.
(Witness excused)
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Back on the record. Mr. Richardson. And we need to swear in the witness; right?
(WHEREUPON, ROBERT EDWARDS, JOHN
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ROBERTSON and MICHAEL GENEST were duly
sworn and cautioned by the Court
Reporter.)
MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. RICHARDSON:
Q. Good afternoon. Could I ask each of you to state your names, and spell your last name and state your positions with the Town, please.
A. (Edwards) My name is Bob Edwards. Last name is E-D-W-A-R-D-S. And I'm a new member of the select board.
A. (Robertson) John Robertson, R-O-B-E-R-T-S-O-N, and I'm chairman of the select board.
A. (Genest) Mike Genest, $G-E-N-E-S-T$, and I'm a member of the select board.
Q. Thank you. Do you each have in front of you a document which we've identified as the Antrim Exhibit 2, which is the May 23rd, 2016 testimony of Antrim Board of Selectmen?
A. (All panelists) Yes.
Q. And is this testimony true and accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. (All panelists) Yes.
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Q. Are there any changes to it?
A. (Robertson) No.
Q. Now, Mr. Robertson and Mr. Genest -- or Selectmen, I should say -- do you also have in front of you a document that's been marked as Antrim Exhibit 3, which is the Supplemental Testimony of Antrim -- testimony of the Antrim Board of Selectmen dated August 18th, 2016?
A. (Robertson) Yes. Yes.
Q. And are there any changes to that testimony that you'd like to offer?
A. (Genest) No.
A. (Robertson) No.
Q. And is that true and accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
A. (Genest) Yes.
Q. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
Does the Applicant have any questions?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Yes, just a couple.
I don't know what exhibit number this is. Is one copy okay?
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Exhibit 39 marked for identification.)
MR. IACOPINO: That page is going to be marked Applicant's 39.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: All set?
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I think the Committee is all set.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. So, gentlemen, I've handed you Applicant's Exhibit 39, which is a document that contains some new language that $I$ understand the Applicant and the Town have worked out with respect to certain decommissioning funding requirements. Is that correct?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And you've had an opportunity to review this and confer with Antrim Wind regarding this language?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And would the Town object to the Committee adopting this language and including it in a certificate, if it decided to issue one for this project?
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A. (Robertson) No.
Q. Okay.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you. That's my only questions, Mr . Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you. Mr. Enman.

MR. ENMAN: Just a couple of questions.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ENMAN:
Q. Regarding the PILOT, was it the intent of the board at the time of accepting the PILOT to be in the best interest of the town at that time?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And would it also be fair to say that if the Antrim Wind Project does not move forward, that there would be no financial benefit to the town?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: And I
assume there's still nobody here for Mr. Pratt or Mr. Giffen?

MR. PRATT: No questions.
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PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Harris Center, any questions?

MR. FROLING: No questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Ms. Berwick.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. BERWICK:
Q. What would be the financial effects on the Town when the windmills cease operation, if this project were to go through?
A. (Robertson) Could you ask the question again?
Q. Sure. What would be the financial effects on the town when the windmills cease operation?
A. (Robertson) When the windmills cease operation, we would no longer be receiving the PILOT payments.
Q. Could you not foresee a situation where taxes would increase for families after years of receiving money from Antrim Wind Energy and then suddenly not receiving them?
A. (Robertson) $I$ can't -- or we can't conceive of a board of selectmen not planning for that eventuality so that that doesn't happen.
Q. Antrim Wind has admitted under oath here to
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participating greatly in writing the zoning ballot question in 2014. Is it not true that this 2014 ballot question was voted down by a clear majority of Antrim voters?
A. (Genest) Yes.
Q. Mr. Thurber, from Lempster, mentioned that he could hear the sounds of the wind turbines at 2 miles away as a low drumming; yet, he assures us of how the turbines hardly produce any noise, or at least far less than major road construction. This is obviously a man with a major hearing deficit, and even he could hear the turbines at 2 miles away. Should we take confidence in your witness?
A. (Genest) I can't speak for Mr. Thurber, but I know I've gone up there to Lempster a number of years ago. And from the bottom of the hill where the kiosk was, $I$ could not hear anything.
Q. And how old are you?
A. (Genest) Fifty-five.
Q. How are you prepared to evaluate excessive noise and flicker issues?
A. (Robertson) I think that is in the realm of determination by Antrim Wind because they have
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a plan in place to deal with that.
A. (Genest) And it's also under the purview of the SEC. That's why we are here.
Q. How often, according to the agreement that you made between the Town of Antrim and Antrim Wind Energy, LLC, will you evaluate complaints that are made to Antrim Wind?
A. (Genest) I believe in the contract it mentions one year we will get the reports. But it sounds like, from what I've heard at the hearings here, that maybe that might get shortened up a little bit. It sounded like Antrim Wind might be agreeable to that.
Q. So my question is that, when you wrote this agreement between the Town of Antrim and Antrim Wind, which was before the SEC was involved, were you truly concerned about any complaints possible from your residents?
A. (Robertson) We were concerned about complaints. This is why we negotiated with Antrim Wind to have a plan in place, as Mr. Kenworthy described in his testimony today.
Q. The plan that $I$ read that's in place for the Town of Antrim is simply that you would receive
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an annual report and that they would keep our names and addresses... all right.

Why is there nothing stating -- never mind.

In your agreement with Antrim Wind, the Town further agrees that it will support the Project during the SEC process. At the beginning of this document, 1.1 Agreement, "This agreement between the Town of Antrim, New Hampshire, and Antrim Wind Energy, LLC, and its successors and assigns, which shall apply from the effective date until the end of useful life of the wind farm..." This would seem to bind any freely-elected selectmen to having to support this plan, regardless of their own thoughts. Am I reading this incorrectly?
A. (Genest) Well, we signed the contract with them, and there's stipulations in here they need to follow. But if we had concern about an issue, we could surely bring it up.
Q. That wasn't really my question. My question was, does that -- does not that agreement say that the Town will support the Project during the SEC process and until it's decommissioned?
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1.1. Perhaps I'm reading it wrong. I'm asking you.
A. (Genest) You said 1.1?
Q. 1.1, the agreement between the Town of Antrim New Hampshire and Antrim Wind Energy and its successors and assigns, which to me means you, your successors, as well as theirs.
A. (Genest) Well, that's under the definitions. And actually what I'm referring to -- or what I thought you were referring to was Item No. 16, at the end of it.
Q. Who drafted this document?
A. (Genest) I believe Robert Upton at the time helped us.
Q. Do you feel that you could be in conflict in regard to representing your citizens and constituents in complaints from Antrim Wind when you will be receiving such large sums of money from them as a town, and you would have signed a document demanding your support, as well as all selectmen who succeed you for the life of this project?
A. (Robertson) No.
Q. Currently, would you say that you are
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disinclined to believe the people who are here in this court bringing forth negative issues associated with the wind turbines?
A. (Genest) Could you repeat the question?
Q. Currently, would you say that you are disinclined to believe the people who are here in this court bringing forth negative issues associated with the wind turbines?
A. (Genest) I would say we have a difference of opinion.
Q. How can $I$, as a citizen of Antrim, believe that you will fairly represent me or even believe me in regard to excessive noise or flicker issues in the future?
A. (Genest) I think from the discussions we just recently heard, that, you know, we will plan on any complaints, making Antrim Wind follow any requirements that the SEC makes of them and to protect our citizens first.
Q. Do you feel you represent all the citizens of Antrim, or are some residents more important than others, for instance, those in the center of town versus those on Reed Carr Road and Salmon Brook Road?
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A. (Edwards) It's my belief that we represent all the residents in the town of Antrim, not just special groups.
Q. And is that the belief of Mr . Robertson and Mr. Genest?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
A. (Genest) Yes.
Q. Do you believe that property owners -- excuse me.

Would you support a wind energy project if turbines were put on the -- very near downtown Main Street?
A. (Robertson) I would not.
Q. Why? Can I ask you why not?
A. (Robertson) Because that's not an appropriate place, given the population density and so on.
Q. So it's a matter of population density?
A. (Robertson) That's one factor.
Q. Thank you so much.

Do you believe that property owners like us who have property that is 954 feet from the center of a turbine base, do we have the right to use all our property, or is it only our
house location that is important?
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A. (Genest) No, you should have a right to use all of your property.
Q. Jack Kenworthy wrote that Antrim Wind Energy has significantly increased the mitigation associated with the Project by adding additional on-site and off-site land conservation and entered into new agreements for additional community benefits, such as the agreement to fund recreational and aesthetic enhancements at the Greg Lake Beach area and the agreement to make annual contributions to the Antrim Scholarship Committee. Can I ask you who came up with that mitigation plan?
A. (Robertson) Antrim Wind.
Q. Do you think that there is any building, structure or scholarship that can truly mitigate for the destruction of nature and beauty?
A. (Robertson) Could you repeat the question?
Q. Do you think there is any building, structure or scholarship that can truly mitigate for the destruction of nature's beauty?
A. (Edwards) I think it's a very generous offer of Antrim Wind to make these offers for
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scholarships and so forth. But the specific answer to that is I don't believe that mitigates an issue. I think it's just a very generous opportunity.
Q. Do you feel that the increased revenues for the town justifies hurting or even destroying some of your citizens' lives?
A. (Genest) Could you repeat the last part of that?
Q. Do you feel that the increased revenues for the town justifies hurting or even destroying some Citizens' lives?
A. (Genest) I don't feel that we're destroying or hurting people's lives.
Q. Can you tell me if this question was ever brought up in your conversations when you were considering the windmills: Was there a number of residents living in areas zoned rural, not business district, that it would be okay to alter their lives in exchange for an amount of money? Was there a certain number of people it would be okay?
A. (Robertson) That question did not come up.
Q. All right. I have no further questions.
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PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Block. MR. BLOCK: Yes, thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. BLOCK:
Q. I'd like to refer mostly to your supplemental testimony, Town of Antrim Board of Selectmen, dated August 8, 2016. On Page 2, you discuss the opinion survey from March 9, 2010, which is attached as BOS Attachment 1. On Page 2, Lines 20 and 21 state, "The results were overwhelmingly supportive of the Antrim project."

Can you show me where in this survey that the Antrim Wind Project is specifically mentioned?
(Witness reviews documents.)
A. (Genest) It is not specifically mentioned on the poll. But at the time, this was the topic in town, and it was Antrim Wind was trying to come into town. So it was pretty obvious what this poll referred to.
Q. I would like to suggest that on March 9th, 2010, there wasn't much of a proposal put together yet at that point. It was still
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pretty vague.
I'd like you to read on the survey itself Question 2, the second question. Would one of you please just read the question out loud.
A. (Genest) Now, are you on the selectmen's straw poll?
Q. No, I'm talking about Antrim Planning Board Land Use Survey.
A. (Robertson) Here it is.
Q. First survey there.
A. (Genest) The second question you said?
Q. Yes, second line.
A. (Genest) "Are you in favor of wind energy? Would the view of the wind towers from your home bother you?"
Q. Now, I believe that's a "Yes" or "No" question. Does that question make sense to any of you as a "Yes" or "No" question?
(Witness reviews document.)
A. (Robertson) It does to me.
Q. Somebody who wants to say, Yes, I'm in favor of wind energy, but a view would bother me, is that possible?
A. (Robertson) I suppose.
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Q. So how would somebody with that opinion answer this question?
A. (Genest) Well, I think the results of the question somewhat speak for themselves. And I think I've heard at this hearings, either you're -- "Wind energy is something you're either for or against." So it is two questions within one there. But basically, I think the results speak for themselves, as far as the answers to the question.
Q. Well, I suggest that questions like this are extremely confusing, and maybe the results don't speak for themselves, since I'm not sure how I would answer that question.

Let's go on to Page 3, where you refer to the straw poll, which is in the back, also listed as BOS Attachment 1.

Can one of you describe the process by which this straw poll was conducted, if you recall that?
A. (Genest) Yeah. The selectmen -- it was voting day at town hall, and the selectmen sat outside of the polls where the residents would come after they voted. And we maintained that there
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were two of us there, and we had ballots for people to fill out if they chose to.
Q. Do you know whether or not all voters who came out were handed ballots?
A. We were there, and anybody that wanted one was offered one.
Q. How did you know whether or not people wanted one?
A. (Genest) Because as people were going by, we had a sign there, and we let people know what we were doing. And if they didn't want to participate, that was fine, but we would like them to participate.
Q. So, for instance, when my wife, my son and I left the polling place after voting and walked past there and nobody handed us a ballot, is that -- do you think that was appropriate?
A. (Genest) Well, if people chose not to acknowledge that we were sitting there or walk by us, we couldn't really force them to fill out a ballot.
Q. Were you aware that Gordon Webber, who I believe at that point was the chair, did hand ballots to a number of people saying, "Here,
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you have to vote for the Wind"?
A. (Genest) I am not aware of that.
Q. Well, let me go on to Page 5 in your testimony. Here you're referring to the ballot issue that came up in November of 2011. And on Lines 15 through 18, you state, "The proposed amendment was known by supporters of wind energy to be too stringent, while some residents believed it was not stringent enough. The November 8, 2011 ordinance, Article No. 1, was defeated because the voters did not want to adopt an ordinance that would prevent the Project from being constructed."

What information do you have that makes you sure that the residents voted "no" because they thought this amendment was too stringent?
A. (Robertson) That was the feeling of many people at the time.
Q. Is that a valid fact, though? I mean, do you have any justification, any proof of that, that that was "the feeling"?
A. (Robertson) In talking to many residents in town.
Q. Would it surprise you to know, to learn that I
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myself and quite a number of people I know voted "no" because we felt that any amendment at that point which allowed industrial wind turbines was inappropriate?
A. (Edwards) I think your representation is correct. I don't think it was one-sided. I think it was clear that many people in town thought it was too stringent and others thought it was too restrictive. So I think it's a combination of both that caused the defeat.
Q. I agree with you on that. But that's why I'm questioning why you would state that it was defeated because the voters did not want to adopt an ordinance that would end the Project.
A. (Edwards) I did not.
Q. Down the bottom of that page, the very last line there, continuing on the next page, "The town residents did not support the planning board's amendment because it 'was designed to restrict wind in the Town of Antrim.'" This is a quotation. Can you identify the source of this quote?
(Witness reviews document.)
A. (Genest) And what was the question there?
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Q. In your testimony, the bottom of Page 5, on to the top of Page 6, you got a sentence that says, "The town residents did not support the planning board's amendment because it 'was designed to restrict wind in the Town of Antrim.'" And I'd like to know where that quote came from. What was the source?
A. (Genest) That was an opinion of the board of selectmen.
Q. Okay. Continuing on Page 6, Lines 7 through 9, I'll read part of that. "It was widely known that the 2012 ordinance prepared by the planning board would have made the Antrim Wind Project impossible because it was too restrictive." What is your evidence that this was "widely known"?
A. (Genest) I think similar to the previous questions, talking with residents at town hall or around town, that was the feeling that the board had.
Q. So it's opinion; is that correct?
A. (Genest) Having attended the hearings prior to the vote and stuff, that's what we heard from the residents.
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Q. Okay. Continuing on Lines 9 through 11, "The failure of the 2012 amendment to the zoning ordinance must be understood in the context of the 2010 and 2011 surveys which showed that an overwhelming majority of residents supported the Antrim Wind Project."

Are you basing your conclusion on these two highly inaccurate, highly biased and extremely unscientific surveys?

MR. RICHARDSON: I object to the form of the question.

MR. BLOCK: I will go on.
BY MR. BLOCK :
Q. Let's turn to Page 7. On Lines 7 through 10, it states, "In our opinion, the March 11, 2014 vote" -- let me digress for a second and introduce that this is referring to the vote that was brought forth by petition of citizens. Let me continue back.
"In our opinion, the March 11, 2014 vote reflects the fact that many town residents do not support petitioned zoning amenities which are opposed by the planning board. We do not believe that this vote indicates that a
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majority of town residents oppose the Antrim Wind Project."

And my question is: Why do you feel that the 2011 and 2012 ballot issues, which were written with the intention of adding broad guidelines for large-scale wind turbines to our zoning ordinance, both were directly related to the Antrim Wind's proposal; yet, the defeat of the 2014 amendment, which was actually written by Antrim Wind to expressly allow their project, was not related to this project?
A. (Genest) I think there's a few reasons here. One was, and you just spoke on it, that the townspeople didn't feel that the developer should be writing the ordinance.

The other thing here is I think it would have been nice at the time if the planning board had put the vote on the bottom, where they only list it on the ballot, "The planning board does not approve the petitioned amendment." If the vote had been there, this may have been come out a little differently, because the vote was 4 to 3 . I know I've been a selectmen for 15 years, and when we have a
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2-to-1 vote on a warrant article, we submit that with the warrant so the townspeople know how the board felt.
Q. Let me go on to Page 11. Here you're talking about conservation land and potential development. Lines 8 through 9 says, "In the absence of the Antrim Wind Project, the 908 acres of conservation land could be developed." What kind of development are you referring to here?
A. (Robertson) I think that's been discussed several times during these hearings. The rural conservation district does allow for constructed roads to be built to these homes, wells to be drilled, septic systems to be put in, land to be cleared. So I think that's the reference that's being made.
Q. Okay. Let me continue the next sentence there. "The development of this land could have impacts on aesthetics, habitat fragmentation, lights, invasive species and other impacts." Would the development of this land by Antrim Wind have "impacts on aesthetics, habitat fragmentation, lights, invasive species
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and other impacts"?
A. (Robertson) I don't believe that it will, to the extent that, say, 20 houses along that ridge would have with roads built in that are permanent
Q. Okay.
A. (Edwards) May I comment? May I comment on that, Mr. Block?
Q. Yeah.
A. (Edwards) I think one of the concerns $I$ had was that we have no idea what may be coming before the planning board in subsequent years. So, in my personal feeling, I can't judge whether it will be 300 homes or will be a car-crushing operation or any other commercial venture that I'm not aware of today. So I think it was a broad statement, but it was only meant I think just to show that there were other possibilities, although we just don't know what they are.
Q. Does the rural conservation district zoning permit residential development?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. Does the rural conservation district zoning,
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under its permit uses, allow major industrial development to the scale of this wind turbine project?
A. (Robertson) It does not, but that's the reason for asking the SEC to take jurisdiction because their rules overrule our zoning regulations.
Q. It's my belief that a zoning ordinance is approved by the town meetings, in other words, the people of Antrim. So, if the people of Antrim approved residential development as a permitted use in the rural conservation district, but did not allow major industrial uses like a wind turbine installation, what makes you think that a massive industrial installation would be preferred by the people of Antrim over allowed residential development?
A. (Genest) I think we could go back to that planning board survey. I realize it was just a survey, but there was a question about whether or not you would want them in the rural conservation district, the windmills. If you let me find the survey, $I$ can give you the numbers.

MR. RICHARDSON: Just for the
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Committee's benefit, if you look at the supplemental testimony, which is Antrim Exhibit 3, there's an attachment, I think it's the first one. It's BOS Attachment 1, and I believe that's the survey the witness is referring to.
A. (Genest) From this survey from the planning board, the question was: Do you think that wind turbine towers should be excluded from any zoning districts? It had all the zoning districts listed. Under the rural conservation district, the numbers from the survey were 29 "yes" and 64 "no."
Q. It also listed all the other districts. Are there any districts there that people thought it would be okay to put turbines in -- or rather, I'm sorry, the other way around. Are there any districts -- which districts would -did the majority of the citizens say should be excluded?
A. (Genest) Wetlands. I only see wetlands.
Q. That's correct. It's only the wetlands. In other words, the people of Antrim said it would be all right to put turbines, if there were
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turbines, in any district in town. Didn't single out the rural conservation district, did they?
A. (Genest) No, but if you look at the numbers, that was the second highest, along with the rural district itself.
Q. How long has the western part of Antrim been zoned as rural conservation?
A. (Robertson) Not sure, but the zoning ordinance was written, when, in 1974?
Q. Okay. The rural conservation zoning ordinance part was adopted March 14, 1989.

If I may, I'd just like to read the principal permitted uses in the rural Conservation zone: Single-family dwellings; public and private schools of all levels; churches; home-based businesses; kennels, boarding and/or breeding; public and private recreational facilities; farms and agricultural activities; roadside stands; stables and riding academies; farm employee housing and manufactured housing units.

So the question is: In the 27-1/2 years that the rural conservation district has been
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in existence, can you outline how much of this development has already occurred?
A. (Robertson) Some single-family homes, and I know of one kennel that's on Loveren Mill Road.
Q. I know that kennel, too. [Laughter]

I'm going to jump to another topic for a second that's on the same page, Page 11 of your testimony. Line 14 and 15, you mention there Ms. Connelly's visual assessment, where she does not recommend the option of granting off-site conservation land as a means for mitigation in land development projects.

You go on, then, on Line 20 to start by saying, "We believe it's critical to consider what would happen to the 908 acres in the absence of the Project."

Do you understand what Ms. Connelly is talking about in terms of "off-site conservation land"?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. Can you explain it?
A. (Robertson) I think she's talking about the $\$ 100,000$ that was offered.
Q. Okay. Is there a reason why, then, your
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|  |  | 102 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | response only refers to the 908 acres of the |
| 2 |  | Project? |
| 3 | A. | (Genest) Because we don't agree with the whole |
| 4 |  | statement there, pretty much. |
| 5 | 2. | Okay. Lines 21 and 22 state -- or you |
| 6 |  | mentioned the impact that residential or other |
| 7 |  | development would likely have on scenic or |
| 8 |  | conservation resources. I assume at this point |
| 9 |  | you're referring again to the possible |
| 0 |  | development that could happen without the |
| 1 |  | conservation easements; is that correct? |
| 2 | A. | (Robertson) Yes. |
| 3 | Q. | Do you believe that residential homes would |
| 4 |  | have a greater impact on the ridge than a |
| 5 |  | series of 500-foot turbines and towers with |
| 6 |  | foundations going as much as 40 to 50 feet deep |
| 7 |  | and an access road of over $3-1 / 2$ miles blasted |
| 8 |  | through a major boulder field? |
| 9 | A. | (Robertson) I think I also answered that |
| 0 |  | question, saying if someone put a development |
| 1 |  | of 20 homes up there, 30 homes, then they would |
| 2 |  | be doing blasting, they'd be drilling wells, |
| 3 |  | putting in septics, building roads that would |
| 24 |  | be permanent. This project is for a specified |
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period of time, and that's as much as can be done to return to its natural state.
Q. Speaking realistically, how much demand is there for development in Antrim?
A. (Robertson) We don't know what it will bring in the future, do we?
Q. No. But historically, isn't the more accessible land, the land that's most likely to be developed?
A. (Robertson) All I know is they're not making any more of it.
Q. All right. I would like to introduce an exhibit. Maybe we should go off the record for a moment so I could do this.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Yes, let's go off the record.

MR. BLOCK: Thank you.
(Exhibit NA 18 marked for identification.) PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Back on the record.

BY MR. BLOCK:
Q. This is Exhibit NA 18. It's a letter from 10 Antrim residents, dated September 12th, 2016, directed to the board of selectmen. Do you
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recognize this?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. If you'd indulge me, I'd like to just read a few excerpts from this into the record.

Dear Members of the Board of Selectmen: It has not been clear to us why the BOS has chosen to support this development so strongly while ignoring the pleas from its own citizens. The BOS has asked the SEC to override the wishes of the voters in town to get this industrial wind facility constructed. Throughout all of this, we, the most affected residents in Antrim, have been living with the fear that this massive industrial development will ruin our homes and our lives; yet, the BOS has ignored our concerns. We come to you to ask for your help with restitution should this wind farm be built. We, the undersigned, respectfully request that if Antrim Wind Energy is allowed to construct their wind farm on Tuttle Ridge, that the selectmen arrange with Antrim Wind so that, if we desire, the company will pay us the full appraised price for our houses and properties so we can leave our homes
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and rebuild our lives somewhere else. We expect that the full appraised price would be the price our properties would be worth without the turbines present, as determined by one or more certified appraisers acceptable to us and Antrim Wind. This property value guaranty should be a required condition by the Town of Antrim in conjunction with the overall operating agreement contract between Antrim Wind and the Town. Actually, this proposal is a "no-lose" proposition for the Town, Antrim Wind and the affected property owners. If Antrim Wind has been accurate and truthful in its promises that the construction of an industrial wind facility on Tuttle Hill will have no adverse effect on neighboring property values, then they will have no problem reselling any properties for what they've paid us. Since they have argued that their project will not decrease property values for any abutter, or anyone else in town, the firm should be willing to back up that statement with buyout agreements to relieve the affected residents of risk, uncertainty and worry. If
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the board of selectmen sincerely believes that Antrim Wind has been honest and truthful in their promises that their development will not adversely affect property values in the town, then you should likewise have no problem adding a property value guaranty requirement to your conditions of operation. The BOS has never come to the defense of the property owners and taxpayers who will be most affected should the wind farm be built. We now come to respectfully but firmly request that the selectmen do the right thing for the residents of Antrim and step up and negotiate this arrangement for us with Antrim Wind.

This letter was presented at a board of selectmen meeting two and a half weeks ago, and I would like to add that it did receive a very hostile reception.

Has the entire board discussed this since then?
A. (Edwards) Yes, we did.
Q. To date, we have received no response. Do you have a response for us on this?
A. (Edwards) Well, we spoke about that at the last
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meeting as we read the minutes from the previous meeting. And I brought the question up, "Have we responded to that?" And the answer was we have not done -- the answer was that our town administrator was on vacation. It is not our intent to ignore or not respond to you. We simply haven't done it at this point. But I'll bring up what I remember saying at the meeting, and that is that we're very sensitive to the homeowners up there that are affected, or soon to be affected by the different issues that have been raised here over the series of the hearing. But in order to be damaged by it, we have to show that you have been damaged by it. And the facility has not been constructed at this point. And please don't misunderstand me. I'm not suggesting that there won't be some adjustment in property values, depending on the stipulations that may be imposed by the SEC to protect your interests. We just don't know the outcome of that. But as you know, there are methods that you can take to come forth to the town and document your damages to the property values.
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But I think to ask the Town to support a buyout of everyone's property before we ascertain what the impact is $I$ think is unreasonable, and $I$ believe I tried to convey that. However, I did encourage you to bring it up to the SEC when you speak here during these hearings. And that was my position.
Q. Let me just follow that up with one last question. As you mentioned, there is a possibility that there might be some property value adjustments that need to be done. What is your belief as to who should shoulder the responsibilities for any lost property values?
A. (Edwards) If someone constructed a -- I'll get an answer to your question. But if someone constructed something next to your property and it wasn't a turbine, an industrial turbine, but
as I mentioned earlier, a car-crushing operation, and it resulted in a reduction in your assessed value or the ability of you to sell your home at market value, then you can file for an abatement through the town. That, as I understand it, is the process. We would not go to the car-crushing operation and ask
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY] \{09-29-16\}
them to shoulder the burden. So the hope is, and the intent is, $I$ believe here, is to implement the safeguards that have been discussed here so it will have none or little. We can't ascertain whether we'll have none or little until we see some trends on the resale of property. So it's just premature.

But to answer your question, I don't think it should be the developer or the commercial property owner. I think there's a process, especially where we don't know what the impact may be or may not be.
Q. I understand that in terms of property value. But what would your reaction be to someone who came to the town and said, because of the construction of something next door near my property, I can no longer live there? What would your reaction to that be?
A. (Edwards) I would ask the question as to why you could no longer live there. Is it health-related? Is it your own personal desire?
Q. I do have answers to that. I don't think this is the appropriate time or place. When I'm
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testifying, $I$ would love to be able to speak to that issue. Thank you.

MR. BLOCK: I have no more questions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. Lost myself here. Mr. Levesque.

MR. LEVESQUE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have a few questions. Thank you for taking our questions.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. LEVESQUE :
Q. First question is for Mr. Edwards. And we're looking at the prefiled testimony, the supplemental testimony, then the Master Plan which we looked at earlier today. But on this first question, Mr. Edwards, it appears that you did not sign on to the supplemental testimony that was filed by the board of selectmen. Why is that?
A. (Edwards) I'll explain that. First of all, I want to say that I was in general consensus with the select board on items that were matter of fact. And what $I$ mean by that is, when we released the numbers on the count, regardless
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of whether you believed in the process as to how the town voted, in surveys back in ' 10 and '11, I don't think we can -- I can dispute that. I do think there were other matters that are contained in that document that $I$ was not $a$ part of because $I$ was not a selectman. And I will not represent statements being accurate if I was not a party to it or determined how they were determined or calculated. I think I objected to some of the characterizations that were in there. And I think, in my opinion, personal opinion -- and I'm not speaking for the board now; I'm speaking for myself -- that the general beliefs $I$ had in that did not accurately reflect my thoughts on it. Unless I can be in a hundred-percent consensus with all the information in there, $I$ felt that $I$ shouldn't sign the document. And we discussed that with counsel.
Q. Thank you. I wonder, Mr. Edwards, if you could go to the supplemental and point out some of those places where you didn't feel they characterized your beliefs, not the ones that were factual issues or historical or you
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weren't involved with.
A. (Edwards) I made some notes on it. But maybe John can help me here.

But one of the items in there was the quote. This is on Page 3, and it refers to the 2011 survey. And then it goes on to say, "What is your opinion today?" And when we talked about that, we initially had some different wording in there. And it ended up being printed as, "The majority of Antrim residents continue to support the Antrim Wind Project." And I think you've heard testimony here today by others and Antrim Wind, as well as ourselves, that my feeling was that many people in the town of Antrim remain supportive of the wind project. I cannot represent that's a majority because I have no documentation to prove it. We have not done a survey to show that that's a valid thing. When we talk about "overwhelming majority," I think that's a stretch. So we are different in opinion, but I would represent that there are many that still support the Project. That was one item. If you go to Page 5, I guess on Line 3,
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the testimony by John, representing Antrim Wind, I had a problem with making characterizations of the acoustics standard being made "so no one would be able to drive a car" and other things that were personal opinions. And I didn't hear that testimony. I think it's represented as a quote. But I didn't care for the characterization of that statement.

If you -- we talked about -- in our documentation, I think it was brought up earlier about the article that was submitted that was a petition article in 2014. I think we talked about the defeat and the purpose and reason for that. And I think some of the reason for that was that it came up at the eleventh hour and that the planning board didn't have a chance to weigh in on the comments that were in that petition. And I felt that I didn't support that and I voted against it just because of the manner in which it was presented, without having the Town having an opportunity to vet that.
Q. You realize, of course, that the planning board
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actually, as required by law, held a public hearing on that petitioned warrant article that was attended by probably over a hundred people. I don't have the number off the top of my head. Were you in attendance there? Because that was the opportunity for folks to voice their thoughts about the proposal.
A. (Edwards) I cannot represent whether I was there or not. I honestly don't recall.

When we talk in here about possibilities -- and I apologize for saying "when we talk about it" in here -- but we talked about what might happen to the property in the event that the wind farm isn't constructed. I think it's fair to represent that it is subject to development, permitted uses which were described here earlier by Mr. Block. But I do think that the planning board, through its site plan review process, has an opportunity to look at any development that might go up there, even one that they asked for a variance on. So I don't want to over-characterize it and say that if you want 350 homes up there instead, because I don't
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think that fairly represents what could be done up there. And each application before the planning board is independent of itself and would be judged on its merits. So there were characterizations like that, that I can't -- I couldn't support to the extent of signing it.

And one of the others was Ms. Connelly's comment on the 908 acres. I don't know that we answered the question properly. I think the intent was good, to try to address an answer on that. But I don't -- as I said earlier, I don't think that off-site conservation commitment, however generous, is ever -- it may be an authorized mitigating method, but I don't think it offsets any adverse impact, if there is any, on a project.
Q. Thank you for taking the time to go through those. I just have a few more questions.
A. (Edwards) Is this of me?
Q. Actually, it'll probably be of the chairman since I -- and others could respond. But I think this goes back to Mr . Robertson, if you would, please.

So, in a location -- I think it's not
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necessary to really go to it. But in a place in your prefiled, $I$ think it was Page 4, and in the supplemental on Page 9, you do make reference to the Master Plan. And in both of those locations, or at least in the supplemental, you only specifically talk about the Energy Usage and Conservation section of the Master Plan. And when you do it in the prefiled, you talked about that section as well.

Were you here this morning when I was asking Mr. Kenworthy about that very topic and the fact that there is another section, a Natural Resources Conservation section of the Master Plan that is relevant to this proposal? Did you hear that discussion and that question and answer?
A. (Robertson) Yes, I did.
Q. So, just as in Mr. Kenworthy's testimony -- and maybe we can forgive him because he doesn't live in Antrim and doesn't know the Master Plan like the board of selectmen would -- I'd ask you the same questioning, and that is -- and I won't reread it because $I$ read it this morning
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```
    1 1 7
-- but there were two very specific recommendations that are part of the Natural Resources Conservation section of the Master Plan that refer to this area of town. And in essence, they recommend permanent conservation of this part of town.
Why is it that you didn't include that portion or reference to that section in the Master Plan when you filed your prefiled or your supplemental?
```

A. (Robertson) I do not know.
A. (Genest) I believe that's a section that also talks about the open space area, creating more open space and such. And some of our feelings -- I mean, we may have not have mentioned it here, but in the sense that we realized this project has a shelf life and then it will be gone and then that will be open space then at that time. So we felt that it was a win-win.
Q. So you believe, then, what would be the largest development in the history of Antrim, even though you're saying it would last only 50 years, you believe that that's consistent with
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the recommendation in the Master Plan that says "permanently conserve" this part of town?
A. (Genest) It may not be totally consistent, but we're still trying to get to the end goal with having that conservation land tied up. In 60 years from now, people will look at that and it will always be open space.
Q. Thank you. Just two more questions.

I asked this in another form, and Mr.
Block sort of got around this. But in 2009, when Antrim Wind came to town, did the zoning at that time allow for a large-scale industrial wind farm as being proposed here before the SEC?
A. (Robertson) No.
Q. And in 2016, after three votes on the zoning ordinance to change it to allow this kind of activity, does the zoning ordinance today allow for large-scale wind?
A. (Robertson) No.
Q. Okay. Thanks.
A. (Genest) If I could follow up a little more on that question. It seemed like after the 2012 vote, the planning board decided not to
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continue to move forward with any ordinances. And that's kind of disappointing. We went three years. It's been three, almost four years since then. The planning board could have followed up with another try. I mean, I guess they were tired and disgusted with the whole process. But that was kind of discouraging as a selectman, that the planning board didn't continue to try to put together an ordinance that would pass.
Q. Isn't it true in Antrim, that one of the members of the board of selectmen is always a member of the planning board, a sitting member of the planning board?
A. (Genest) Yes, it is.
Q. And over those years since 2012, because you didn't mention the 2014 one that was by petition, but it says 2012, did any of you -and it wouldn't be Mr. Edwards because he wasn't on the board -- but did either you, Mr. Genest or Mr. Robertson, make a pitch to the planning board during that period to have another try at an ordinance to allow for large-scale wind?
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A. (Genest) I did talk about it at one meeting once, and I just got the feel from the board. I didn't move it as a motion or anything. But I got the feeling from the board that they weren't interested; let the SEC deal with it.
Q. And when was this?
A. (Genest) I sat on the board last year. Not this current year, but the year before.
Q. This was after the 2014 vote?
A. (Genest) Yes.
Q. Is it possible that the voters of Antrim really, you know, made it clear to the planning board that they had no interest in amending the zoning ordinance, and since there were kind of three strikes already, the planning board considered this an "out" issue?
A. (Genest) I guess that's possible.
Q. Good. One last question. The handout that Attorney Needleman provided right at the beginning when you all sat down, which was an amendment to the agreement, I think it was characterized as something that was "negotiated" between the board of selectmen and Antrim Wind. Did this negotiation occur at a
\{SEC 2015-02\}[Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY]\{09-29-16\}
[WITNESS PANEL: EDWARDS|ROBERTSON|GENEST]
full board of selectmen meeting?
A. (Robertson) This was done through counsel, through Antrim Wind. We met with counsel to draft this. We did not meet with Antrim Wind.
Q. And so you're saying that this issue and the document itself was never discussed and put forth at a board of selectmen meeting that was fully warranted?
A. (Robertson) It was not.
Q. No further questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
Mr. Ward, any questions?
DR. WARD: I have, I hope, two very quick ones.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY DR. WARD:
Q. Are you aware that the center of the town of Stoddard is closer to Tuttle Hill than the center of the town of Antrim?
A. (Robertson) I guess I never thought about that.
(Court Reporter interrupts.) DR. WARD: I can just talk louder.

It's on red.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: You just
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need to get closer.
MR. IACOPINO: You need to pull it very close.

DR. WARD: I'll try it again.
BY DR. WARD:
Q. Are you aware that the center of the town of Stoddard is closer to Tuttle Hill than --
A. (Robertson) I think you've already mentioned that to me before, Fred.
Q. Are you aware of that?
A. (Robertson) I'm not -- I do not know that as a fact.
Q. Then let me ask a simple hypothetical. If you had been aware of that, would that have made any difference in your decision?
A. (Robertson) No.
Q. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. Ms.
Linowes.
MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I don't have a lot of questions.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. I'm looking at the contract that you signed
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between Antrim Wind and the Town. And first off, with regard to the two paragraphs that were handed out today, are they intended to replace Paragraphs 14.2 .2 and 14.2 .3 of the contract -- I'm sorry -- Appendix 17A of APP 33?
A. (Genest) Yes.
A. (Robertson) Yes.
A. (Edwards) Yes.
Q. Okay. And in Paragraph 14.1.1 -- hold on a second. Actually, before I say that -- no.

Okay. Yes. In Paragraph 14.1.1, this is referred back to by one of the paragraphs that was provided, and it talks about the requirement to update the estimates every three years. Do you see that?
A. (Edwards) Yes.
Q. It also has a discussion about salvage value, which was part of the original agreement that you had. The salvage value would be netted out from the decommissioning fund. Do you recall that?
A. (Edwards) Yes.
Q. And you know that the Site Evaluation Committee
\{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY]\{09-29-16\}
[WITNESS PANEL: EDWARDS|ROBERTSON|GENEST]
requirements for decommissioning funds now no longer allow for that.
A. (Edwards) Yes.
Q. Is it your intent to still support a salvage value netted out or --
A. (Edwards) No.
A. (Genest) I believe in the application that they put in for this project in this docket, the salvage value was not in their application.
Q. Okay. I just -- the reason I'm asking is, you know, this contract obviously still exists. The Site Evaluation Committee has its own requirements. Are you making the assumption -or will you be acting in the future so that it's the Site Evaluation Committee's requirements that would prevail in any doubt --
A. (Edwards) Yes.
Q. -- if there were any doubt?
A. (Edwards) Yes. The intent of that, just so you know it, the Town of Antrim, from my perspective, is not interested in salvage value, nor interested in doing any decommissioning on its own. So we think this is a far better situation that's just occurred
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and will be part of this decommissioning funding assurance.
Q. Is there any intent to update the current contract to reflect that, or you'll just leave the wording as is?
A. (Edwards) Whatever the SEC feels is the appropriate scope of work on that. We've looked at that. And I'm comfortable with it. I'm not going to second-guess the SEC's ability to assess that.

And I think you'll read in there that the initial funding that will be put aside in the irrevocable letter of credit will have a floor in it of that number. So that number will only increase based on cost assessments done by a third party every three years.
Q. Okay. So -- and thank you. That's helpful.

I believe in prior examples, and I could be wrong, that the Site Evaluation Committee has simply included the -- I'm not sure how consistent the Committee has been with regard to contracts like this. So this contract may stand on its own, separate from the Committee's requirements. And you're saying that won't
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create confusion for you.
A. (Edwards) No. I don't believe so, no.
Q. Okay. Now, in Paragraph 14.1.3 -- and maybe this is more of the same. But it says here, "The owners shall provide a decommissioning plan to the Town no less than three months before decommissioning is to begin." Do you see that?
A. (Edwards) Yes.
Q. Now, as you likely know, the Site Evaluation Committee has required a decommissioning plan to be part of the Application.
A. (Edwards) Yes.
Q. The reason is $I$ have some questions on this with regard to an understanding of what decommissioning is all about.

Do you agree that the requirement for a decommissioning fund and decommissioning plan is to address abnormal events, such as the Project has been abandoned?
A. (Edwards) Yes. Yes.
Q. So the idea of allowing for a decommissioning plan to be made available three months before the Project is to be decommissioned suggests
\{SEC 2015-02\}[Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY]\{09-29-16\}
[WITNESS PANEL: EDWARDS|ROBERTSON|GENEST]
that the Project owner's still running; the Project is still -- it's still three months away from its useful end of life, and there's no problem. That would -- in general, would not a decommissioning plan be required long before that event happened?
A. (Edwards) Well, my understanding is that there will be a decommissioning plan in place, yes.
Q. Okay. All right. Now, if we could go to Section 8.2.1. And this paragraph talks about the wind farm access roads. It says, "The owner shall construct and maintain roads at the wind farm that allows for year-round access to each wind turbine at a level that permits passage and turnaround of emergency response vehicles." Do you see that?
A. (Edwards) Yes.
Q. Are you aware that at the Groton Wind Energy facility a similar requirement was built into the contract with the Town of Groton -- between the Town of Groton and the wind company, and it was determined after the Project was built, or almost after it was built, that the steepness of the roads were problematic for emergency
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vehicles, and they chose -- they actually amended their agreement to allow for not plowing year-round, but to use a Sno-Cat? Are you aware of that?
A. (Edwards) I am not.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that that -that this might come forward in the future, a concern that the roads themselves and emergency access year-round is problematic?
A. (Edwards) I have no reason to think so at this point. But I think what I'd like to see is some involvement during the construction process. This is not part of the agreement. I think Mr. Kenworthy said that we were talking about some other things. He hasn't heard this yet, but I would like to think that, through a cooperative spirit, that the board of selectmen can, without interfering, be a part of the construction process, just to be able to be aware of what's going on. Obviously, we have to have an emergency EMT and fire component to this. The highway department's involved. And I just think in the spirit of cooperation, that it would be helpful to me, as a selectmen, just
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to make sure everything is going as planned and so forth without playing a role in the development. So we would want to make sure that those things didn't happen. And they've happened before in subdivisions that we've been involved with.
Q. Now, when the gentleman was here, the witness talking about the construction, the road layout and public health and safety related to the construction, $I$ had asked him if Antrim, if the Town of Antrim's fire department or emergency personnel had access or were consulted with regard to the road profile and their concerns. And I think at first he said no -- or he didn't know, and then he said he thought they had been.

Are you aware, from your experience, has your fire department or any of your emergency personnel been consulted as to the road profiles?
A. (Edwards) I'm not aware of it, but I'd ask the other selectmen if they are.
A. (Genest) I know Antrim Wind sat down with the fire department to discuss the whole wind farm
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|  |  | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | itself. As far as the road specifically, I do |
| 2 |  | not know. |
| 3 | Q. | Do you know when that happened? |
| 4 | A. | (Genest) I cannot say. I want to say about a |
| 5 |  | year ago, but that's -- I'm not a hundred |
| 6 |  | percent sure. |
| 7 | 2. | Okay. And does the Town of Antrim -- and I |
| 8 |  | can't remember the word for it, but it's |
| 9 |  | where you -- where emergency -- the fire |
| 10 |  | departments and emergency vehicles from other |
| 11 |  | towns come -- |
| 12 | A. | (Genest) Mutual aid. |
| 13 | A. | (Edwards) Mutual aid. |
| 14 | 2. | Thank you. Mutual aid. Are you part of a |
| 15 |  | mutual aid program? |
| 16 | A. | (Genest) Yes. |
| 17 | 2. | Do you know if those communities that |
| 18 |  | participate in mutual aid have been notified |
| 19 |  | and made aware of the Project and the road |
| 20 |  | profiles? |
| 21 | A. | (Robertson) We don't know. |
| 22 | Q. | And one of the questions that Attorney Maloney |
| 23 |  | had asked this gentleman who was a witness |
| 24 |  | about what would happen in the event there was |
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a catastrophic -- I mean something -- someone was hurt at the end of the nine-turbine string and getting vehicles there and -- have you talked about -- it will be your emergency vehicles and/or mutual aid vehicles that would be responding; is that correct?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. Okay. Have you run through any scenarios regarding a fire at the Project site or someone needing any kind of assistance?
A. (Robertson) No, we have not. I don't know how they would do that, having -- not being there, how they would practice a response if there's no road there and no access, no turbines, no facility.
A. (Edwards) If I may speak, what I might suggest is, and this goes back to my comment on involvement by the select board at an appropriate level. What I typically see there is a preplan filed by emergency personnel once they understand the scope of the job and the Project and the risks and the elements that may play a role in it. So $I$ think at the time it's appropriate, our fire department and emergency
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personnel, along with the highway department, will get together and make sure there's a plan in place, so that if what you're suggesting does occur, we'll have a plan in place to respond to it.
Q. And would that have -- you're expecting that would happen sometime before the Project becomes operational, or would it be at the time -- I would think -- would it be during construction as well?
A. (Edwards) I would like to think that it would be well in place long before the actual operation begins.
Q. Okay. Are you aware that, if this project is certificated, that the Applicant has suggested he will start construction fairly quickly after?
A. (Edwards) I believe I heard him testify that they'd like to get going a couple of months after the approval.
Q. So that would be the window that you'd be talking about.
A. (Edwards) Yes, I would believe so.
Q. And then just one more question. The gentleman
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that was the witness, I had asked him regarding the number of construction vehicles that would be coming through the community during construction. So there are nine turbines, and each one has a component -- many components, and then truckloads of concrete and all sorts of materials. Have you had any conversations with Antrim Wind to discuss how much construction equipment would be coming through and the number of truckloads over a course of multiple months? Have you had those conversations and discussed what the possible impact would be to your community?
A. (Robertson) I think some of this was presented in prior technical sessions, whatever, but --
Q. Excuse me. Technical sessions as part of the Site Evaluation Committee or --
A. (Robertson) Yes, technical sessions here.
Q. Okay.
A. (Robertson) Most of the materials will be coming down Route 9 and will not be coming through the center of Antrim. They'll be traveling along Route 9.
Q. Does that mean they'll be coming through
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Stoddard?
A. (Robertson) Maybe coming through Route 9 through Stoddard or Route 9 bypassing Hillsboro from Concord, which is a road that does not pass through any villages or towns.
Q. Okay. And I don't really have a map in my head of what that looks like. Have those other communities -- do you expect to inform those other communities that there may be fairly significant construction traffic?
A. (Edwards) I can't answer your question. But my experience has been, if you travel on Route 9, many mornings you'll find mobile homes. Now, I'm not trying to compare mobile homes with the turbines. However, there are state and federal regulations in place, in terms of flag cars, safety measures and so forth that they have to abide by, by what $I$ would say as a layperson is DOT regulations. So the fact that they're not traveling on back roads or Class VI roads in Antrim, I think it's great that they're traveling on Route 9. But those safeguards are in place, and I'm certain that they will get the proper permits before they start
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transporting that, as would the transporter.
Q. And I appreciate that. I'm sure that they will. What I'm trying to impress upon or trying to get an understanding of is the sheer volume of traffic. I mean, the turbines alone could be 63 separate loads. So I don't know. I have not talked to Antrim Wind.
A. (Edwards) And I respect that. But I think when they apply for the appropriate permits, those questions will be asked. And they will --
"they" being DOT or the regulatory authorities -- will ascertain what needs to be done in order to be compliant, and they would be compliant with that or face violations.
Q. Okay. So you're not requesting that there be some -- as the Town, I guess you're saying it's not going to be a problem for Antrim, because you don't expect them to come through the town of Antrim.
A. (Robertson) We don't believe so.
Q. And I just want to check one more thing. Maybe you could help me here. It says here in Section 9.7.1, it says -- the paragraph says, "The owners shall notify the town at least 24
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hours before any construction vehicle with a gross weight greater than 88,000 pounds is scheduled to use the road."
A. (Genest) That's a town road.
Q. Use a town road. Okay. So it's not Route 9.
A. (Edwards) Route 9 is a state highway.
Q. Okay.

MR. RICHARDSON: I was just going to say, I think the witness testified before that there's no town roads that are involved in moving the materials. So I don't think the board has any authority over those highways.

MS. LINOWES: NO, I understand that that might be the case, Mr. Richardson. But I also understand that they are before the site Evaluation Committee. If they had concerns regarding that, there still can be separate requirements placed on the Applicant.

MR. RICHARDSON: No, I understand that. I think it's an appropriate question to ask. I just want to make sure that both the witnesses and the Committee was aware that it's not a town road that the town has any regulatory power over.
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PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you.
BY MS. LINOWES:
Q. And then my last question. You had agreed in the contract that construction will only be conducted between 6 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on Saturdays, unless prior approval is obtained from the Town -- or 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. unless prior -- on Saturdays, unless prior approval is obtained from the Town. Construction will not be conducted on Sundays.

Is it your intent to consult with -- or actually, those hours, have you consulted with any of the residents that live around the property who will be most impacted by the Town -- by the noise or construction as to whether or not they're comfortable with that? And is there any mechanism, to your knowledge, where that could be changed so that they can start not as early as 6 a.m. or not go as late until 7 p.m.?
A. (Robertson) It would -- we would certainly listen to anyone that lives nearby that says, Hey, you know, I like to sleep in until 9:00,
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so can they please start a little bit later in the morning or quit earlier in the afternoon. We would listen to that and see if it's possible. But we thought these times were, given that construction during good weather in the spring, summer, that a lot of construction companies like to work beyond, you know, the 8 to 5.
Q. And I appreciate that. So I guess the answer is you did not consult with anyone in advance.
A. (Robertson) We thought these times were reasonable.
Q. Okay. And what opportunity -- other than asking nicely to Antrim Wind since you signed the contract, what opportunity do you have to change those hours?
A. (Genest) Probably not an awful lot. But these conditions here are very similar to other conditions that have been placed on other construction projects in town, as far as the timing.
Q. And then one last question. Is there any construction in the years that you've been selectmen of this scale?
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A. (Robertson) No.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. LINOWES: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr. Jones,
I apologize. I skipped the Stoddard
Conservation Commission. Do you have any questions?

MR. JONES: Yes, sir, I do. Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. JONES:
Q. Does the Town of Antrim have a conservation commission?
A. Yes.
Q. Have they taken a position on the Antrim Wind Project?
A. (Robertson) Not that we know of.
Q. And if they had taken a position and it was against it, what would your reaction be?
A. (Genest) We would have had a discussion with them and tried to address their concerns.
Q. And state statute establishes conservation commissions as advisory boards in the town so
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A. (Edwards) I think that's an independent question. But I am, yeah.
Q. Others?
A. (Genest) I am.
A. (Robertson) I am.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of a bobcat study that was done by UNH and the fish and game department?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And are you aware that one of the collared cats which appeared on the Stoddard town report had a GPS collar on it and that part of the core habitat of this bobcat is Tuttle Hill?
A. (Edwards) I was not.
A. (Robertson) I was not.
Q. Are you aware that the Fish and Game Wildlife Action Plan has identified much of the land on top of Tuttle Hill as having the
highest-ranking habitat in New Hampshire?
A. (Robertson) For what?
Q. For wildlife.
A. (Robertson) That whole area between Route 9 and Route 123 has been recognized for that.
Q. As having high-ranking wildlife habitat.
A. (Robertson) Yes.
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Q. And that this Antrim Wind farm will be right in the middle of this high-ranking wildlife habitat, are you aware of that?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. Do you understand what "forest fragmentation" is?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. Can you explain to me what it means in your terms?
A. (Robertson) In my terms, it means destroying and separating parts of the forest habitat.
Q. And wildlife habitat.
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. Well, by every definition of what "forest fragmentation" is, this wind farm and its road system creates a linear edge effect which fragments the habitat, and it's going to adversely impact the wildlife that use this area. We know that people know political boundaries, but do wildlife?
A. (Edwards) Are you asking me to interpret what the wildlife understand?
Q. I'm asking -- we all understand what political boundaries are between Stoddard and Antrim and
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Hancock.
A. (Edwards) Yeah. I can't represent what the bobcat knows on property lines, but I can understand your position.

And let me just say this: This is another reason why I supported it to go, this application to go to the SEC. I assume that the Committee members consider those factors better than we're qualified to consider them. And when I tell you something about bobcat habitat, you'll know that I'm not talking -- I don't know what I'm talking about. So we rely on the expertise of New Hampshire Fish \& Game and others that are related to your concerns to weigh in to these issues to make sure that if there is an approval, they've made those considerations.
Q. All right. Are you aware that on August 22nd, the Stoddard Selectmen voted 3 to nothing to support the Stoddard Conservation Commission's intervenor status against Antrim Wind Farm?
A. (Genest) Yes, I am. During the technical sessions, that was discussed. And I thought we were going to be invited to that meeting, and
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we never were.
Q. You'd have to talk to the town administrator. He was the one that was responsible for that. Do you understand why they took this position? Let me --
A. (Robertson) All we understand is what was put in print.
Q. They wrote that the proposed project "disturbs a significant wildlife area which is centered on Stoddard and also has significant visual impact to a large portion of our community, all this without providing any benefit, financial or otherwise, to our property owners and residents. Stoddard is a town that derives much of its present value in quality of life through having large tracks of land that have been voluntarily set aside for conservation purposes. This project will only serve to have a negative impact on these values."

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: SO,
Mr. Jones, $I$ know this is the first time for this Committee, so, again, this is not time to testify. So you have to ask questions. This is your time to question the board, all right.
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MR. JONES: Right. I was just asking them if they understood the reasons why the selectmen wrote this letter and took this vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So is that the question now? Is that your question to them now?

MR. JONES: Yes.
A. (Edwards) Yes, we do.

MR. JONES: That's all I have. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Thank you. The Audubon Society?

MS. VON MERTENS: No questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Counsel for the Public.

MS. MALONEY: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. MALONEY:
Q. Good afternoon. I just wanted to ask you questions about your supplemental prefiled testimony with reference to some comments made about Ms. Connelly's opinion report, and I think, in particular, on Page 10. The question that you have is, "On Page 6 of her
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testimony" -- and I'm reading from that -"Counsel for the Public's Visual Impact Assessment expert, Kellie Connelly" --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
MS. MALONEY: Oh, I'm sorry. It's
late in the day.
BY MS. MALONEY:
-- "states that the conservation land and associated educational facilities in the wildlife sanctuary are permanently affected by the proposed industrial installation." And then you say, "This will have an adverse impact," and then you pick up a quote again, "on the local population's passion and investment in purchasing, connecting, protecting and preserving local conservation lands as a means to protect the regional landscape, which goes beyond national and state significance."

And it confused me a little, because I went to her report and where that came from. And I'm looking at -- and I'll read this so that everybody doesn't have to scamble to get it. But you can if you want. It's Page 6 of
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16 of her prefiled testimony. And I think it's Page 6. I'm sorry. I had it here.

MR. RICHARDSON: Would it be possible to show it to them? I'm not sure they have it but --

MS. MALONEY: I know they have it because they have quoted it. And I hit the cursor and I lost the spot. I'm sorry. But I will --

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Why don't we go off the record while we get everybody oriented.

MS. MALONEY: Yeah, thanks.
(Discussion off the record.)
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: We're back on.

BY MS. MALONEY:
Q. I'm looking at Page 6, Line 6 of Ms. Connelly's prefiled testimony, and the sentence, "conservation land and associated educational facilities," that picks up midway. That was the beginning of your quote. Do you see that?
A. (Edwards) Yeah.
Q. Do you see that?
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A. (Edwards) Yes.
Q. Are you there?
A. (Edwards) I'm sorry. Yeah.
Q. What I didn't see is sort of a cause and effect, where you sort of cut up the quotes. 'Cause you say, "as a result, that will have an adverse impact," and then you talked about the conservation land. I think that you needed to -- I think this is the clarification. I think you needed to take a look at the sentence prior to the one you began with, which does talk about the sanctuary, and then what they're referencing -- what she's referencing right there. So if you look up above, it says, "While the various sensitive resources studied in this VIA," beginning on Line 4, "indicate varying levels of potential visual impact, it is the DePierrefeu-Willard Pond Wildlife Sanctuary as a whole that is most significantly impacted by the installation of the wind turbines." Do you see that?
A. (Genest) Yeah.
Q. Then the sentence begins where you quoted, and you left out the sentence following that
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sentence, where it starts with "Terraink acknowledges..." Do you see that? You left that out. And I think if you'd left it in, it might have made more sense. Because the last sentence that you include in the quote actually refers to the DePierrefeu Wildlife Sanctuary. So your question confused me and your answer confused me. And I was just wondering if you understood that clarification or if you understood that's what that was about.
(Witness reviews document.)
Q. Because you finish the quote --
A. (Genest) I think some of what we got out of that was that she's saying she feels that this will stop people from donating towards the causes in that area and towards doing any conservation --
Q. I'm sorry, I'm sorry --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. (Genest) That's what we got out of that.
Q. Okay.
A. (Genest) The answer is accordingly to that, I believe.
Q. Okay. So if that was misconstrued, do you see
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how, if you had included the front, that you misconstrued that paragraph?
A. (Genest) I don't know that we misconstrued it. We just took some out of it of what we felt, that part about the adverse effect on the "local population's passion."

Well, actually, "and this will have an adverse impact," that's not in that. That's not a quote. That was your -- you included that. The section -- it seems like you took a section out of context. It says, "the local population's" -- when it starts with "the local population's passion [and] investment in purchasing, connecting, protecting and preserving local conservation lands as a means to protect the regional landscape which goes beyond national and state significance," that refers back to the sanctuary; in other words, she's talking about the sanctuary. So this question did confuse me. And you're telling me now that you understood that to mean something else.

MR. RICHARDSON: To be clear, the selectmen didn't write the questions. I wrote
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the questions. They're responsible for the answers. And the question that they're responding to is what impact is the Project having on conservation lands. There obviously was a reference. But $I$ just want to make sure. The selectmen didn't write these questions. You know, I did. And if I've misquoted or misconstrued her testimony, that's not their doing, that's mine.

MS. MALONEY: Well, I'm not
suggesting it is. I'm just saying that a clarification was in order, that's all.
A. (Edwards) I didn't sign the supplemental comment on it. But the way I interpreted the question was what we just discussed, and it was that if I was a potential donor of land and the properties up there get fragmented and there's commercial development, would that discourage me from offering my 300 acres if something similar is going to happen up there and I can't be convinced that there will be a continuation of uninterrupted conservation land. That's the way I interpreted the question. So...
Q. I appreciate that --
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A. (Edwards) And I apologize if --
Q. No, no. No apologies necessary. I was just trying to clarify that because it appears there was some confusion about what was in her report based upon the question that was posed to you. So...

MS. MALONEY: And that's all I have. Thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay.
Questions from the Subcommittee. Mr. Forbes? Ms. Weathersby?

QUESTIONS BY MS. WEATHERSBY:
Q. Good afternoon. Do you gentlemen have any concerns at all that you'd like to share with the SEC about the effects this project might have on town resources?
A. (Edwards) Yeah. I don't want to take it away from John, but --
A. (Robertson) Go ahead.
A. (Edwards) I don't -- did you mean resources, such as police, fire and that type of resource? Or gravel or --
Q. Right. Police, fire, roads, infrastructure -A. (Edwards) Yeah, I think the feeling was that it \{SEC 2015-02\}[Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY]\{09-29-16\}
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will have little impact on demands on our infrastructure or resources. I think the important thing is that we can be assured of two key things: One is the revenue source, which is the PILOT, and the other is the decommissioning funding assurance. I think those items uninterrupted and actually realized upon as we expect them to be would be a benefit certainly. It's, you know, my feeling as a select board member that $I$ have to do everything possible to make sure the taxpayer receives the benefit that we anticipate, both on the financial side and economic side and so forth. So what we talked about earlier with the decommissioning assurance fund and the language that we worked together on, it's been a very positive thing, in terms of that irrevocable letter of credit. The other side of it is the continuation uninterrupted of the PILOT payments. And that's critical to us as well because that's what gives us the income. So...
Q. And do you also feel as though you have -- that Antrim has the resources it needs to host the
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Project, as far as equipment or personnel? Do you have any concerns that you might need more things or people, et cetera?
A. (Robertson) Maybe we can pay selectmen more? No, I guess a couple thoughts I have is that right now the town is facing a couple of very large investments in infrastructure, and that could -- the revenue from this project would be enough to pay for those and have them paid for by the end of the 20 years.

MS. WEATHERSBY: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Dr.
Boisvert.
QUESTIONS BY DR. BOISVERT:
Q. This question $I$ guess would be best to the chair of the select board. You're the longest serving member of the select board; is that correct?
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
A. (Genest) No, I am.
Q. Okay. Then you're probably perhaps the best to answer this then. The election in March of 2014, was the voter turnout average, above average, below average? Just looking at it,
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was that a good turnout, a low turnout?
A. (Genest) You're talking about 2014; right?
Q. 2014, yes.
A. (Genest) Looks like it was probably about average, 700.
Q. Okay. A good deal has been made in these hearings as to whether or not the people of Antrim have expressed support or opposition in various forms regarding the Antrim Wind Project. And reference was made to straw polls and ballot initiatives and so forth.

Your interpretation -- and any of the three of you can answer this. Is that the rejection of Amendment 5 in 2014 was not a rejection of the Antrim Wind Project but a response to how the amendment was written?
A. (Genest) Correct.
Q. It seems to me that, in looking at the total votes on this page for the zoning amendments, that it's about 630 votes for the other "for," but 668. So there seemed to be more interest in this amendment. Is that a fair observation?
A. (Genest) Looking at the numbers, yes.
Q. I heard earlier this afternoon that the Antrim
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Board of Selectmen preferred to send this project to the SEC for review in granting a certificate as opposed to leaving it as a decision within the town, which you had the option to do, given the overall size of the Project, the kilowatts coming out. It was not required that it come before the SEC. Is it accurate to say that you felt that the Town of Antrim was not capable of fairly reviewing the Antrim proposal?
A. (Genest) For any of us.
A. (Robertson) I think that was the consensus of the board and the planning board and so on, yes.
A. (Edwards) I was not on the board at that point, but I did support it, as I said earlier, coming to the SEC. My feeling is that the expertise of the local boards, although hard-working and well-intended, when you hear the technical aspect of this and the shadow flicker and noise and so forth, I personally feel -- and I've been chairman of the planning board twice in my past -- that it rises to a level that's above our expertise, and I think it's far better
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suited to be in front of this Committee. DR. BOISVERT: I guess that's all I have.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Commissioner
Rose.
QUESTIONS BY CMSR. ROSE:
Q. Thank you for being here this afternoon.

Couple of questions for you.
Are your terms -- could you give me a
little perspective? Do you have two-year terms for each member of the board of selectmen? How does that stagger out?
A. (Robertson) They're three-year terms, and one term expires each year. So, theoretically, the board turns over every three years. But some of us are a little stupid, you know. [Laughter]
Q. Glutton for punishment?
A. (Robertson) Yeah. Strike that.
Q. Yeah, I guess that wasn't a question.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Too late to strike.
Q. And Mr. Genest, you've been serving contiguously since 2002?
A. (Genest) Yes. I'm at that 15-year stage that \{SEC 2015-02\} [Day 7- Afternoon Session ONLY]\{09-29-16\}
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Mr. Thurber talked about.
Q. And Chairman Robertson, you've been serving since 2010?
A. (Robertson) 2011.
Q. So this is your second term?
A. (Robertson) It's the last year of my second term.
Q. And in your -- I would assume that the positions that you've taken in the town have been pretty well identified by the various voters?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And that you have been successfully re-elected --
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. -- with those public positions? Did you have opposition in those races?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
A. (Genest) Yes.
A. (Edwards) Oh, I'm sorry. I'm new on the board. I ran against the previous chair, Mr. Webber.
Q. Shifting gears a little bit. With regards to the agreement that you have with Antrim Wind, the document that we've seen is dated 2012 I
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think is what it was. It's your anticipation to be -- to renegotiate that agreement with Antrim Wind?
A. (Edwards) I think it's been alluded to by Mr. Kenworthy that there are some things that we're still talking about that may get modified. I think -- and I think it's very important. Because if you look at the PILOT and you look at the agreement that was signed between four and five years ago, even based on regulatory impact, as well as agreements that were voluntary or stipulations put in by the SEC, those documents are going to be well out of date, that they don't represent some of the factual information. And it would be wonderful to get all of those documents in concert with what's being decided here. And one of the main purposes is so that we don't try to interpret something the SEC did and something we did, and if we can get them consistent, it's helpful. As we've discussed, the longest lease is going to be 50 years, going back to 2009. I'll be 115 years old at that time and probably will find it difficult to remember what we did. So
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The PILT [sic], or payment in lieu of taxes, that you have an agreement on with Antrim Wind is for 20 years; is that correct?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And the anticipated life span of the Project is approximately 25 years, give or take a few years, and potentially extending it beyond that 20-year period at least. Would it be the Town's anticipation that they would renegotiate a new PILT beyond the 20 years?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And there's been a lot of discussion regarding a Master Plan and what's permitted and local zoning ordinances and what's permitted. And just so $I$ have clarity, is the Antrim Wind or the industrial wind project permitted within the Master Plan?
A. (Robertson) No.
Q. And is it permitted within the local zoning plan?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr.
Clifford.
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MR. CLIFFORD: I don't have any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I have a couple.

QUESTIONS BY PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT:
Q. So, obviously you've heard, not just here, but I think you'll agree there's some anxiety certainly from abutters and people in the area if this project goes in, about potential noncompliance and impacts to them. Is that a fair statement?
A. (Edwards) Yes.
Q. Has the town taken any -- plan on taking any measures to be a little more robust on how they handle complaints or -- you know, for instance, you may get complaints. You've already talked about your current agreement with Antrim Wind submitting reports to you. Are you doing anything different to accommodate those extra things that would happen in the town?
A. (Edwards) I think at this time we have not. But I think it would be, if I'm speaking correctly, and they can interrupt me, but it would be my intent to make sure we have a plan
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in place to be responsive to any complaints that come in. And regardless of the regulation and the ability to go to the SEC with complaints, I've always found that the first place to come is the town hall. And so we need to have a plan in place, a point person and a response plan to those, whether it's forwarded to you or we talk with the developer or whatever. But it would be in place, yeah.
A. (Robertson) Yeah.
Q. Thank you, 'cause that's where I was going. My personal view, I see the SEC compliance as not necessarily the first line, but certainly a control on a facility. But obviously, the Town and the Project are the ones who are interacting on a daily basis.
A. (Edwards) This is why it's important to me, anyway, to have an ongoing rapport with Antrim Wind, if it's approved, so that we know things that are going on with them, without interfering with them, so if the public comes in and asks us, we know how construction's going and what the plan is to accommodate any complaints.
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Q. So that was actually my next question. So I listened with interest on your desire to have the board of selectmen involved, apprised of the construction process as you just mentioned. I was curious. To the extent we were to award a certificate -- again, this is a point where we can put conditions in, where we could make people do things, not that you need to -- but is there language you would want in a certificate that --
A. (Edwards) You know, there's no greater urge than to change someone's text. But I think we could come up with wording that would not be intrusive to the construction aspect of it or ongoing ability to be able to meet periodically just for updates. And, you know, I always hate to just have meetings when there's issues. I'd like to be proactive with it. And if someone comes into the town hall and says what's going on with the construction and we say we don't know, I don't think that's a good public response. But I do think it's important that we're there for listening and advice -- to be advised of what's going on as opposed to
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interfering with plans that have already been approved and be disruptive.
Q. I think my final question is again for you, Mr. Edwards. Just to clarify, I know you had interaction with Mr. Levesque about not signing the supplemental testimony. Am I correct, though, you do support the Project? Is that correct?
A. (Edwards) Yeah, the Town has supported the Project, and they have right along. And I guess I reported earlier that I was an intervenor last time. So, people have asked do I personally support it. And I support renewable energy, by all means. I'd just like to see -- I'm supportive of the Project as the select board. But I'd just like to see how it all comes out with all the terms and conditions and safeguards for the property owners. And I know a lot of that is in the rules and so forth. But we all are sensitive to the importance of the homeowner and those issues that you've all been discussing here that are technical. So...
Q. And I think everybody agrees, no matter what
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decisions are made, these are weighty decisions that impact people. So we appreciate that.
A. (Edwards) Yeah, right.
Q. We got second bite at the apple from Dr. Boisvert.

DR. BOISVERT: Yes. Sorry. I should have brought this up earlier, but...

QUESTIONS BY DR. BOISVERT (CONT'D):
Q. Your mention of complaints coming into the town hall makes me think that in my town, a great deal of the business that we do with the town is done either electronically or through the mail: Car registration and dog registration, paying the taxes and so forth. For many of us, it's difficult to get to the town offices while the town offices are open. We have jobs that have hours that completely overlap the town open hours.

Would you consider having the opportunity for people to register their concerns and complaints on the town web site? I went and checked. You have a nice web site. Seems to me it would be possible to use that, as well as coming in to the town offices. Would you be
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open to making that opportunity available to the citizens of Antrim, as well as coming into the town office?
A. (Genest) Very much so. And that would be an opportunity also for us to put updates of where the Project is, especially through the construction stages.

DR. BOISVERT: Okay. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay.
Commissioner Rose.
CMSR. ROSE: Thank you.
QUESTIONS BY CMSR. ROSE (CONT'D):
Q. Just one other question. I can't recall it specifically, but $I$ was trying to find it in my notes now. It was pertaining to the blasting plan that would be forthcoming before the construction. And I believe Antrim Wind would come before and notify the town, I believe it's 10 days prior to any blasting were to take place. Does that sound right to you?
A. (Edwards) There is a time requirement in there. I think it is 10 days, but we could check that.
Q. And is it your interpretation that that would be 10 days from the very beginning of any
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blasting, and/or do you expect that they would need to come back if there was a duration of time between blasting, that they would need to come back to the Town to inform you of any additional blasting? Or is it just sort of a one-time meeting where they would outline their blasting plan?
A. (Edwards) I don't understand the blasting plan at this point. But $I$ would think if they're blasting for four and a half months, that it wouldn't be a one-time notice. And there will be interruptions between the blasting schedule, and if they're going to start re-blasting again after a week, that somehow we'd get notified so that we're aware of it.

CMSR. ROSE: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Mr.
Iacopino.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
QUESTIONS BY MR. IACOPINO:
Q. Mr. Edwards, you mentioned that you had previously intervened in the 2012 docket. My recollection of your purpose for intervention at the time was the effect of the PILOT on the
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school tax and what would happen under those circumstances. I also understand that the law has changed.

Has the change in the law completely settled your concerns about that issue?
A. (Edwards) Well, I think we spoke about the school and the impact. I think Mary Allen did more so than I. My concern was the quality of the irrevocable letter of credit and the format in which it was in the agreement. And I did object to that. I think it could be strengthened on behalf of the Town. And I think we've accomplished that now.
Q. Okay. Back to the tax issue. Are you happy with the current situation with respect to the tax, the PILOT?
A. (Edwards) Yes. The way it operates now is that we will collect the PILOT payment, and we'll disburse that according to the county and the school and for the town. So it worked out, yes.
Q. And you have a banking background; is that correct?
A. (Edwards) Yes, I'm a retired banker.
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Q. Last time around, gentlemen, we had you sitting on one side of the room and your planning board sitting on the other side of the room. The planning board does not appear to be here in this proceeding. Is the -- have you consulted with the planning board about your positions in this particular proceeding? I'm not talking about just going to the SEC. But your testimony clearly says you support the Project.
A. (Robertson) This was a discussion that was discussed at planning board meetings. And the present planning board agreed with us that it should be here, and they support the Project.
Q. And was there a vote taken for that, or was that just by discussion?
A. (Robertson) It was a vote taken.
Q. And what was the vote, if you recall?
A. (Robertson) As I recall, it was unanimous.
A. (Genest) And that was to send it to the SEC.

They didn't take any stand, as far as supporting or not supporting the Project in case it ever came before them again, if my recollection is correct.
Q. Okay. So that was my question. So they didn't
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say that they agreed with you in terms of your support for the Project, which is contained in your first testimony. They said they agree with the SEC determining whether the Project should be built.
A. (Robertson) That is correct.
Q. Okay. And we've heard today about the Antrim Conservation Commission. And one of you gentlemen referenced that you'd had a conversation with the chairman of the Conservation Commission. Who is that?
A. (Edwards) The one I spoke with was Peter Beblowski.
Q. Okay. And did the Antrim Conservation Commission take any votes with respect to either issue, whether the Town should support the Project or whether it should come before the SEC?
A. (Genest) I don't believe they took a stand.
Q. Okay.

MR. IACOPINO: I have no other questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Before we break for the night, we'll reconvene Monday,
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October 3rd, at 10:30, at 47 Donovan Street -excuse me -- 49. I apologize. 49 Donovan Street. Some of you can go there. I'm sorry. So, 49 Donovan Street. It's a new facility. It's never been used for a hearing. So I suggest, for a lot of reasons, some of you may want to show up a little bit early to get oriented and make sure you're all set to go. We will start, again, at 10:30 with an opportunity for public comment. I don't know how long that will last. After that, we will then restart our panels. My understanding is we will go immediately to the Audubon Society panel.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We're not going to do Mr. Enman first?

MR. ENMAN: Where do $I$ fit?
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Well, I was just going to say, with you next. Does that work, or --

MR. ENMAN: Yes, I will be here Monday.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Let me ask you this --
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MR. IACOPINO: Not here.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Yeah, we will not be here Monday. Or if you do, you'll be alone.

So, Ms. Foss, do you need to go first, or do you just need to be done on Monday?

MS. FOSS: I just need to be done on Monday.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: All right. Then, out of fairness, we'll start -- I'll correct myself. We'll start with Mr. Enman, and then we'll do the Audubon Society and then see how far we get beyond that. So, any questions on that before we adjourn?

MR. JONES: What would be the order on the next one, if you make it --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: SO I'm showing after that would be the Abutting Landowners. So that would be the --

MS. BERWICKS: And Ms. Longgood is going to be --

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I'm sorry.
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That was my short form.
MS. BERWICK: Okay.
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: So, again,
Mr. Jones asked if we were able to get beyond the Audubon Society panel, my understanding is then we would go to the Abutting Landowners panel, with the Berwicks, Craigs, Longgoods. And would Mr. Schaefer be able to attend Monday?
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: One at a time, please.

MR. RICHARDSON: Mr. Chairman, it sounded like you were imminently about to adjourn. I did have questions on redirect.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: I apologize.

MR. RICHARDSON: I'm mindful of the hour, and I'm wondering how I'm going to fit them in, 'cause I probably have maybe 10 minutes, five minutes of stuff to do.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Yes, we'll give you a chance for redirect before we actually leave.
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> So, any other administrative questions?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: Okay. Mr. Richardson, redirect.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. RICHARDSON:
Q. Thank you. We'll try to go as quick as possible.

So, member of the board, whoever feels they want to respond, please go ahead. A lot of questions about complaints. And I'm wondering what role you envision the town administrator would play in those.
A. (Genest) I think she would be probably the easy first contact for the residents in the town, and then she could contact Antrim Wind, and that would probably expediate the whole process up.
Q. And you anticipate that Donna Hanson, the current town administrator, will make sure the complaints were resolved?
A. (Genest) Well, I think she would forward them to Antrim Wind. We would also be, you know,
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explained what the complaints are, and it would be our responsibility to make sure they were followed up on.
Q. Right, right. So she'll be the communication for the board, and the board will make sure the complaints are resolved appropriately. Is that your intention?
A. (Robertson) That is correct.
Q. And all of you, please.
A. (Edwards) Yes.
A. (Genest) Yes.
Q. And the agreement requires Antrim Wind, I think Section 6.1.2, to have a report prepared every year as to what the complaints were that Antrim Wind received and how they were resolved. Would it be your intention to just wait until the end of the year for the report to come and see how things were resolved? Or how would you deal with that?
A. (Robertson) Well, I think it would be to our advantage and helpful to everyone if there was a communication -- periodic communication on a regular basis with Antrim Wind, as to how things are going, you know, what glitches are
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there in the operation and what have the complaints been that you've gotten directly that we don't know about, that kind of thing. I think we need to do that, especially the first few years, to make sure that we communicate in the best possible way.
Q. Well, sure. And so that's one option. And let's say that the complaint is that there's a noise issue or there's a shadow flicker issue. And I think you identified the first option. But is there anything that would prohibit, if a complaint isn't being resolved in a timely manner, from asking the SEC to address the issue?
A. (Robertson) I kind of look at addressing the SEC -- I was in the insurance business, and Bob was a banker. I think if one of my clients -if I couldn't solve or the company couldn't solve the problem, then, as the last resort, it goes to the insurance commissioner. And I kind of see that working the same way here. If you can't resolve it with Antrim Wind, then maybe Mr. Scott gets the phone call.
A. (Edwards) I just comment that, although the
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agreement doesn't call for it, it might be helpful if we could all meet together at some point to establish perhaps a better, more early notification process, so that we're in the loop and we understand what the resolution is. And I understand it's not in the contract as it stands today. But I think in the spirit of making sure that these things get resolved, I would think that it wouldn't be overbearing to set up a little program on how we might do that sooner than a year.
Q. Right, right. And my question really gets to the agreement doesn't require the Town to accept the resolution that Antrim Wind comes up with. If you hear from your residents, you have the authority, and, in fact, likely would take additional action to make sure those concerns are being properly addressed.
A. (Robertson) Yes.
A. (Edwards) Yes.
Q. Okay. You were asked some questions by Mr. Block about how you knew the planning board's proposed ordinance in 2011 was too stringent. And I want to show you a document,
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I think that Mr . Levesque and Mr. Block may have both referred to, and that's the March -excuse me -- the November 8, 2011 vote results, which is BOS Attachment 3 to your supplemental testimony. Could you turn to that page. It's Page 18.
A. (Genest) Yeah, we have it in front of us.
Q. And I want to ask you about Article No. 2 at the bottom. And you see where it says that that proposed article would "prohibit construction" of wind energy facilities in the rural conservation? Do you see that, and do you agree with that?
A. (Genest) Yes.
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And you see where it says at the bottom that it was "recommended" by the planning board?
A. (Genest) Yes.
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. So you were asked how do you know the ordinances that were proposed in 2011 were anti-wind. In fact, this article would have completely killed the Project.
A. (Robertson) Yes, it would have.
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Q. And when you compare the votes of this one to the one above that merely regulated the Project, that was also believed to be too stringent, what do you see?
A. (Genest) It was even defeated by a larger margin.
Q. Article 2 was defeated --
A. (Genest) Article 2 was.
Q. Thank you.

You were asked about Non-abutting Property Owners Exhibit 18. Do you have that document in front of you? That's the property values guaranty --
A. (Robertson) Letter?
A. (Genest) Yes.
Q. And there was a reference in there, I believe you were also asked a question about, you know, this is being driven by the fear of what $I$ would describe as "the worst consequences" or "the worst possible outcome." Is that how you would characterize what's driving this?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And are the -- is the Town of Antrim going to allow Antrim Wind to violate the conditions of
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a certificate? If that were to happen, are you going to stand by and say it's not our problem?
A. (Genest) No.
Q. And in fact, you had to deal with violations of town zoning ordinances or junkyard statutes before; right?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And the Town has brought enforcement actions to address those.
A. (Genest) Yes.
Q. Okay. And if the -- one of the options the selectmen would have if the Project was violating its certificate would be to ask for revocation of that certificate; isn't that true?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. In fact, in order to protect the Town against that, isn't it going to be your role to ensure that the decommissioning fund is going to be adequate?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And so if there were to be problems that weren't being satisfactorily resolved, one of the things you're going to be looking for is
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how to protect the Town's interests?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. Okay. You were asked by Mr . Levesque, and he made a reference, but I don't think you actually read the document, to Page 9 of your supplemental testimony. Could you go to that page, please. And I believe the comment that you were asked about was why did you only focus on the Energy Resources section of the Master Plan. Do you remember that?
(Witness reviews document.)
A. (Genest) What lines are you on?
Q. Okay. Line 8 of Page 9, where you're discussing the Master Plan. You see the question there, "What about the promotion of open space reflected in the Master Plan?"
A. (Genest) Yes.
Q. And you see there where it says, and I'll read it to you for speed, not too fast, "The Antrim Wind Project will promote open space, including easements for protection of 908 acres as conservation land." And I'll let you just note the remainder.

So, is it your -- do you agree that the
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Energy Section of the Master Plan was the only part that you considered?
A. (Genest) No.
Q. Okay. You were asked, also by Mr. Levesque, about the decommissioning condition which Antrim Wind showed to you today and asked if you would agree to that as a condition of the certificate. Do you remember that?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And Mr. Levesque asked if you had ever put that forth in a meeting that had been duly warranted. And just because there have been legal issues before, $I$ want to make sure this is clear on this record.

The Town has noticed the board of selectmen's attendance at all these meetings; right? It's been posted?
A. (Robertson) All these meetings here, yes.
Q. And that was posted under the requirements of RSA 91-A; is that right?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And the discussions that were referred to between -- involving that decommissioning, those were between the board of selectmen and
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its legal counsel; right?
A. (Robertson) Correct.
Q. Okay. Did the board of selectmen ever meet as a quorum with all three or a majority of you there to discuss this with Antrim Wind?
A. (Robertson) No.
Q. Okay. And so when those conditions were showed to you and you looked at them, other than discussions with counsel, had those ever been evaluated as a board before?
A. (Robertson) No.
Q. So you all agreed with them on the stand today, having just reviewed those with counsel.
A. (Robertson) Yes.
A. (Genest) Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

You were asked a question by Ms. Linowes, if those conditions replaced a specific section of the contract or particular paragraphs.
A. (Robertson) Yes, we were.
Q. Did you mean that in a legal sense, that those conditions or paragraphs were no longer valid, or were you just talking in general, that if the Committee's condition was more stringent,
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Q. Okay. And another option, fair to say, would be to go back to Antrim Wind and say, Wait a minute. We don't agree that the estimate meets all the requirements of the plan, the decommissioning plan?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And another option, perhaps the final option, would be to go back to the SEC and say, Look, we don't think these estimates are meeting the requirement.
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. And is it fair to say you'd explore those or any other options that were needed to make sure the public's interests were protected?
A. (Robertson) Yes.
Q. You were asked questions, and I don't remember by whom, about fire protection and the fire chief's review.
A. (Genest) Yes.
Q. And I believe, Mr. Genest, you indicated the fire chief had met with Antrim Wind.
A. (Genest) I believe it was him and some of his officers met with Antrim Wind.
Q. Okay. And have you heard any negative feedback
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or concerns as a result of those meetings?
A. (Genest) No.
Q. Is that something you would expect the fire chief would bring to the selectmen's attention if that were the case?
A. (Genest) I think if he had any major concerns, he would have addressed with us.
Q. And you understand the fire chief can also consult with the state fire marshal who's issued recommendations in this case?
A. (Genest) I believe -- or actually, I know he's already had conversations with him.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

You were asked by the gentleman from Stoddard, and I believe he said in response to your comment, Selectman Genest, that if the board of selectmen wanted to meet with the Town of Stoddard, I think he said you would have to talk to the town administrator about that. Is that what was said or represented during the technical session?
A. (Genest) No.
Q. In fact, an official from Stoddard represented that the board of selectmen would be invited to
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that meeting; is that right?
A. (Genest) Correct.
Q. And who was that? Was that the gentleman asking you the question?
A. (Genest) I thought it was. I believe he was on the phone that day. But I believe -- then it must be Mr. Jones?
Q. Okay. And did he also indicate he would invite the Applicant to that meeting?
A. (Genest) To be honest, I do not recall about that. But I do know that we were supposed to be invited.
Q. Yeah. And do you recall my telling you that $I$ contacted the town administrator, Jim Coffee, the day of the technical session and asked to be invited to that meeting?
A. (Genest) Yes.
Q. And the Town never heard anything back, I assume?
A. (Genest) Not a word.
Q. Okay. Were you aware that other people were invited, that the press was there and Mr .

Levesque was there?
A. (Genest) No.
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Q. Okay. So would it surprise you if the Town was just left out?
A. (Genest) Yes, it does.

MR. RICHARDSON: One second. I'd just like to flip through my notes. I think I've covered everything, but I've gone faster than $I$ intended.
(Pause in proceedings)
MR. RICHARDSON: That's it. Thank you very much. I appreciate your patience.

PRESIDING OFFICER SCOTT: All right. Thank you.

And again, before we adjourn, I want to modify what $I$ said earlier. So my intention, again, would be to start with Mr. Enman after the public comments on Monday. If, however, the public comments go a lot longer than I expect, to accommodate Ms. Foss, we'll swap the panel. So we'll have to play that a little bit by ear. But I'm going to hope that the comments don't last all through the afternoon. That would probably get in the way of things. But we'll see where that goes. So, thank you all, and we'll see
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you Monday, the 3rd.
(Whereupon Day 7, Afternoon Session ONLY, was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.)
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