

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

APPEARANCES: *(as noted by the court reporter)*

Reptg. Antrim Wind Energy (Applicant):

Barry Needleman, Esq. (McLane...)
Rebecca S. Walkley, Esq. (McLane...)
Ashley B. Scott, Esq. (McLane...)
Jack Kenworthy (Antrim Wind Energy)

Reptg. Counsel for the Public:

Mary E. Maloney, Esq.
Asst. Atty. General
N.H. Attorney General's Office

Reptg. the Town of Antrim:

Justin C. Richardson, Esq. (Upton...)
Robert Edwards, Selectman

Reptg. Harris Center for Conservation Education:

James Newsom, Esq.
Stephen Froling, Esq.

Reptg. Audubon Society:

Jason Reimers, Esq. (BCM Env. & Land)
Carol Foss

Reptg. Abutting Landowners Group:

Barbara Berwick, *pro se*
Janice Duley Longgood, *pro se*

Reptg. Allen/Levesque Group:

Mary Allen, *pro se*

Reptg. Meteorologists Group:

Dr. Fred Ward

Reptg. the Wind Action Group:

Lisa Linowes

Reptg. Stoddard Conservation Comm.:

Geoffrey Jones

1 **APPEARANCES: (C o n t i n u e d)**2 Wes Enman, *pro se*3 **Reptg. Non-Abutting Landowners Group:**4 Richard Block, *pro se*5 Annie Law, *pro se*6 Robert Cleland, *pro se*7 Elsa Voelcker, *pro se*8 Joshua Buco, *pro se*9 **Reptg. the Giffin/Pratt Group:**10 Benjamin Pratt, *pro se*

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

I N D E X**PAGE NO.****PUBLIC COMMENT BY:**

Rep. Michael Vose	8
Rep. Duane Brown	11
Howard Mansfield	18
Richard Corazzini	24
Jennifer Tuthill	26
Robert Piehler	31
Peter Moore	32
Gordon Webber	38
Al Weisswange	42
Karen Weisswange	43
Paul Stephens	45
Martha Pinello	46
Brian Beihl	50
Britain Hill	53
Bob Bernstein	54
Mike Castaldo	55
Marline Leotta	57
Jim Beard	58
Russell Blair	60

[Hearing to receive public comment]

	I N D E X	
		PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	PUBLIC COMMENT BY:	
4	Joe Wilkas	60
5	Mary Welles	73
6	Sarah VanderWende	74
7	Michael Ott	79
8	Dennis Cashman	84
9	Richard LaRochelle	89
10	Ivan Quinchia	93
11	William Jolly	101
12	Stuart Gross	107
13	Graham Enman	108
14	Justin Lindholm	108
15	Betsy Chatman	111
16	Michael Behrmann	114
17	Lori Lerner	116
18	Mark Zankel	124
19	Chris Condon	128
20	Susan Duley	129
21	Timothy Perry	133
22	Joshua Buco	137
23		
24		

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

P R O C E E D I N G

PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Good morning, everybody.

FROM THE FLOOR: Good morning.

PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Again, this is the Subcommittee for the Site Evaluation Committee on the Antrim Wind Project. What we're doing to start off today is we're allowing another opportunity for public comments. Once we've gotten through the public commenters, we will then proceed with our hearing.

If you haven't done so already, and you do wish to speak, there's a yellow sheet back with the SEC Administrator at the back table. That's Pam Monroe, who just raised her hand in the back.

I will, out of deference to (a) we'd like to -- we do need to get through the proceeding, and in deference to everybody else in the audience, I will try to limit you to no more than four minutes. So, if you can get your point across, especially if you've already spoken at one of the public sessions we've

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 already had, I would ask, again, if you could
2 keep your comments concise.

3 If somebody before you has basically
4 said the same exact thing and you just want to
5 say "I support that", we'll get that also.

6 And, finally, if you have prepared
7 written comments, that would be great. And, if
8 you -- it's not required, but, if you would
9 like, and I'm sure the transcriptionist would
10 like also, that you could hand off a copy of
11 your written notes, if you so desire. That
12 would make sure they're properly reflected.
13 And there's a basket in front here labeled
14 "Statements" just for that.

15 So, again, the proceedings today,
16 including the public comments, are being
17 transcribed. So, I will ask that you, when you
18 do come to the podium here to speak, and I will
19 call you, that if you could speak clearly,
20 relatively slowly, I know I just said I'm only
21 going to give you four minutes, but relatively
22 slowly, to make sure we can get it all
23 accurately in the record.

24 So, hold on a second.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 *(Presiding Officer Scott*
2 *conferring with Atty. Iacopino.)*

3 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: I haven't had
4 an opportunity to look through the list yet, I
5 think we have 37 people speaking. If you are
6 an intervenor, I would ask that you, frankly,
7 don't speak, in that you have a lot of
8 opportunity to testify, and that's really what
9 we're geared towards is hearing you in detail
10 in that venue. So, I would ask that also.

11 So, I will start. We have two State
12 Representatives that have asked to speak. So,
13 I'll start with Representative Vose, following
14 by Representative Brown.

15 REP. VOSE: Thank you, Chairman
16 Scott. Good morning, everyone. For the
17 record, I am Representative Michael Vose,
18 Rockingham District 9, the Town of Epping. I
19 serve on the House Science, Technology, and
20 Energy Committee. And I buy my electricity
21 from the New Hampshire Electric Co-op.

22 On behalf of my constituents, who
23 also get their power from the Co-op, I'm here
24 this morning to raise the question of whether

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 the Co-op's Purchase Power Agreement with
2 Antrim Wind is in the public interest.

3 News reports about this PPA surfaced
4 several months ago, June of this year. But a
5 recent search of the Co-op's website found no
6 documents that detailed such an agreement. I
7 have never received, as a customer of the
8 Co-op, any letter or message from the Co-op
9 about this agreement. And I find this lack of
10 transparency troubling. It's troubling on
11 quite a few levels. It leads to rampant
12 speculation about under-the-table deals and
13 cronyism, *etcetera*, which is never a good
14 thing.

15 Even more disturbing, these reports
16 state that the PPA will lock in a price of \$81
17 a megawatt for this power. Now, that contrasts
18 sharply with the Energy Information Agency's
19 ISO-New England wholesale price range of \$20 to
20 \$60 a megawatt for the month of July 2016,
21 which is the most recent data able.

22 The Co-op's website has information
23 about the Co-op's compliance with our state's
24 RPS law. It lists the following as goals for

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 such compliance: Seeking renewable energy from
2 sources that are cost-effective and appropriate
3 to NHEC's power resources portfolio. NHEC
4 continues to entertain all options and sources
5 that may provide renewable energy to its
6 members while striving to keep costs to a
7 minimum.

8 Well, given these goals, a PPA that
9 purports to pay \$81 a megawatt for power from
10 Antrim Wind would appear to be contrary to the
11 organization's goal of being "cost-effective"
12 and "striving to keep costs to a minimum".
13 Locking Co-op customers into a PPA for 20 years
14 may not contribute to the achievement of these
15 goals.

16 Given the lack of transparency
17 surrounding this PPA and its unrealistically
18 high costs, the SEC should seriously question
19 the public interest of this Application.

20 Also, in considering the public
21 interest in this case, the SEC should also
22 determine whether Antrim Wind plans to sell its
23 power and RECs to New Hampshire utilities
24 before approaching out-of-state buyers. While

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 there is no legal requirement for such an
2 arrangement, doing so would help New Hampshire
3 reach its renewable energy goals and would
4 demonstrate good citizenship.

5 Thank you very much.

6 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
7 Representative Brown, followed by Mr. Howard
8 Mansfield.

9 And, while he's coming up to the
10 podium, the other thing I'll state is the
11 obvious. This is the first time this facility
12 has ever been used for a hearing like this.
13 So, I bear your -- or, ask your indulgence as
14 there may be bugs, for instance, with the sound
15 system, that type of thing. So, if you can't
16 hear, for instance, maybe raise your hand or
17 just let us know. I'm already getting that.

18 So, Representative, if you could make
19 sure the mike's closer to you. Yes, there you
20 go. So, we'll try that. And thank you. Sorry
21 for interrupting.

22 REP. BROWN: That's fine. I'll do
23 the best I can, talk about the bugs, I have a
24 little bit in my throat here. So, I apologize

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 for that.

2 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of
3 Committee. Good morning. My name is Duane
4 Brown. I'm a State Representative from
5 Wentworth. It's the Town of Wentworth founded
6 in 1766. Just wanted to mention that. It is
7 our 250th anniversary. We're celebrating that.
8 So, I represent Grafton District 16, that is
9 eight towns in Grafton County. The reason I
10 mention that is Groton is one of those eight
11 towns, and you're familiar with the Groton Wind
12 Project. That has had a huge impact on all my
13 constituents. Everyone in those eight towns is
14 affected in some way by that project.

15 The reason for me attending today is
16 to be a State Representative. I view my
17 position and my job to be the eyes and ears of
18 my constituents, to be a voice, to be a seat at
19 the table for them. They don't have high-paid
20 attorneys, they don't have lobbyists. They're
21 busy at work, at school, taking care of their
22 children or their elderly parents, or all of
23 the above. They're busy paying their bills,
24 paying their taxes. So, I'm hearing today to

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 represent them.

2 I testified before in front of the
3 full SEC Committee during the rulemaking
4 process. As you're all aware, that was a long
5 and arduous process. I think there are some
6 pretty good results came of that, not perfect,
7 not great, but pretty good. I also testified
8 in front of JLCAR to make sure that those rules
9 were adopted.

10 So, I'm not hear this morning to talk
11 about technical details. I'm rather here to
12 talk about the effects on the residents of my
13 district, the effects on their day-to-day life,
14 and how it affects all of New Hampshire
15 residents. In going door-to-door campaigning,
16 going to different events, I get to talk about
17 many issues with the folks in my district.
18 Most people are humble, proud. They just want
19 to be left alone in their day-to-day lives.
20 They want to feel safe in their home, their
21 castle. They want to be left alone.

22 In speaking with them, they have many
23 concerns, many issues: The view, for one. For
24 instance, Rumney, one of the eight towns, and

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 I'll be in Rumney this evening speaking to
2 their select board. The view in Rumney from
3 many homes is all wind turbines. The noise
4 issue, I've been to a few constituents' homes,
5 the noise is not just annoying, it is beyond
6 annoying. And I would encourage you folks to
7 get out and visit some of these places.

8 They're concerned about lights at
9 night. Don't know if anyone lives above a
10 liquor store with a neon sign going all the
11 time, these lights at night on these turbines
12 can be very annoying. I drive by them, drove
13 by them last night at about midnight, on my way
14 home from work. Drove by them this morning,
15 obviously, the lights aren't on, but I drove by
16 these wind turbines on my way here this
17 morning.

18 They have concerns about their
19 property value. I've read some things saying
20 "well, it doesn't affect property value."
21 Again, get in the car, go take a ride up there,
22 see how many places are for sale, and why
23 they're not selling; it's because their
24 property values have gone way down.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 The folks in Rumney especially are
2 concerned about fire. These wind turbines are
3 known to be a fire hazard, and these folks live
4 right there, these wind turbines are right
5 there. If these things catch on fire, they're
6 going to burn their town right to the ground.

7 Decommissioning, that is another
8 issue that they're concerned about. I believe
9 in the rules it says pretty much everything
10 must go when these things are decommissioned.
11 And I would hope that there is money or
12 something set aside to make sure that, when
13 these are decommissioned, whatever their
14 lifespan might be, that everything is taken
15 out. The steel, the cables, the cement, not
16 just to three feet, four feet, everything taken
17 out.

18 They're also very concerned about the
19 environment. We're seeing the blasting of
20 mountaintops, cutting down trees, putting in
21 roads, changing the watershed. For instance,
22 in Rumney, there's a stream right next to
23 Groton Hollow Road. It turned black for a
24 whole day when they were putting the wind

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 turbines in. Not sure what caused that, not
2 sure why, but it's changing the watershed in
3 the area.

4 To view these wind turbines from the
5 ground, one could say "beauty perhaps is in the
6 eye of the beholder". To see these from the
7 air, my day job is I'm an airline pilot, and I
8 get to fly small airplanes on the side once in
9 a while, to see the destruction that's been
10 caused on the mountaintops that you can't see
11 from the ground is incredible.

12 Many of the questions folks ask me
13 when I go door-to-door campaigning, when the
14 wind turbines come up, and, again, these are
15 right there in their face, so these questions
16 come up all the time. "Why are foreign
17 companies coming into my backyard to put up
18 these wind turbines?" "Why are they destroying
19 the land?" "Why are they sending the
20 electricity out of state?" Cap and trade seems
21 like a shell game to most people, or a Ponzi
22 scheme. They don't see any of the benefits.
23 All they see is their electric rates going up,
24 their taxes going up. A lot of these folks are

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 shut-ins, they're retired, they're on a fixed
2 income. All they see is their costs going up
3 by the day, and then they see these wind
4 turbines in their backyard destroying their
5 quality of life, and they don't get any benefit
6 that they see from it.

7 So, in closing, hopefully I'm under
8 the four minutes, I would ask you to consider
9 all the residents of New Hampshire, the SEC
10 rules that were adopted, the effect on the
11 quality of life of all the people in New
12 Hampshire.

13 Thank you. And I'd be glad to answer
14 any questions, if you have any.

15 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: I don't think
16 we have any questions. Did you have a written
17 statement you want to provide?

18 REP. BROWN: I do not, sir.

19 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Okay. It's
20 on the transcript anyways. So, thank you.

21 REP. BROWN: Thank you.

22 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Next is,
23 again, Mr. Mansfield, followed by Richard
24 Corazzini.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 MR. MANSFIELD: Good morning. Thank
2 you for hearing me. My name is Howard
3 Mansfield. I'm a writer. I have written seven
4 books about New Hampshire. I have to be
5 immodest here in the interest of stressing what
6 these books have meant to my readers. My books
7 have been part of NHPR's Granite State Reads
8 Program and the New Hampshire Writer Series
9 Program that's broadcast on New Hampshire
10 Public TV from UNH.

11 For thirty years I have been going to
12 Willard Pond in spring, summer, fall, and
13 winter. I watch as swimmers plunge in for
14 their first swim in May. It's cold; screaming
15 is allowed. I wait until later. And I watch
16 people from away arriving at the boat landing,
17 the beach, for the first time. They stand at
18 the water's edge and take it all in: Bald
19 Mountain to the left, the view down the pond to
20 what we call the "Indian campground". They
21 stand, they look, they smile. It's a quiet
22 moment. But it's everything. This is why they
23 come here. This is why Willard Pond is New
24 Hampshire, is New England, for thousands of

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 swimmers, hikers, and fly-fishermen.

2 In all this testimony and the parade
3 of consultants, it's too easy to lose that
4 quiet moment, that smile. But this is truly
5 Willard Pond. This Audubon sanctuary must be
6 valued for what it really is: A complete,
7 protected landscape. A quiet place. If you
8 take this landscape apart, you have destroyed
9 this place for thousands. No longer will it
10 seem far away. No longer will Willard Pond
11 have a quality that is in short supply
12 everywhere; the peace of wild places. The
13 peace that allows people to unplug, to be
14 quiet, to be enveloped by the loons calling, or
15 to be surprised by seeing osprey and Bald
16 eagles fishing, or snakes and turtles and
17 otters swimming. I've seen all that at
18 Willard. But I didn't set out on any given day
19 to see a family of otters emerge from the water
20 so quickly that there wasn't even a ripple.

21 Willard Pond is, after all, a
22 sanctuary. In that word is the essence of what
23 we're weighing here today. A "sanctuary", the
24 dictionary tells us, is a "refuge", an "oasis".

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 As it protects wildlife, it protects us. It is
2 a sanctuary twice over. Under the definition
3 of "sanctuary", you also find these words:
4 Safety, protection, immunity, asylum, shelter.
5 And that's what draws all the swimmers and
6 hikers. That's why people stand at the water's
7 edge and smile. They won't use any of those
8 words I just mentioned. They'll just say that
9 they're happy, that they love this place
10 deeply.

11 They come to Willard because it is a
12 sanctuary. They find refuge, peace, and the
13 holy that we seek out in churches, sanctuaries,
14 as they have been known since the Middle Ages.
15 All were granted immunity from worldly
16 prosecution in sanctuaries.

17 Can we no longer afford a sanctuary?
18 Are we that poor as a society? I'm not going
19 to argue numbers here today. You've got a
20 binder full of numbers. I'm here to plead for
21 that which we have trouble assessing in
22 economic terms. I'm sure that, if we had a
23 bucket load of money, we could fly in some
24 consultant to say, as dryly as possible, that

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 an hour in a nature sanctuary results in
2 millions of dollars in savings for treating
3 depression, and that, after a morning
4 fly-fishing, workers return to the office and
5 factory floor as economic superheroes.

6 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

7 MR. MANSFIELD: Sorry. I was told
8 four minutes.

9 Maybe. But their life is certainly
10 better, richer, and more humane. And making
11 life better is why you're serving in our state
12 government. It's what we all really want to do
13 for this generation and the next.

14 What we have to remember is that this
15 Audubon sanctuary is unique. It can't be
16 replicated. As we continue to slice up our
17 country, and load more traffic on the roads,
18 and jam our every waking moment with texts and
19 videos and emails, what Willard Pond has to
20 teach us is ever more important. The amount of
21 land we are developing is growing faster than
22 our population. From 1982 to 2000, the U.S.
23 population grew 19 percent, but the amount of
24 developed land jumped an astonishing 42

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 percent, according to the U.S. Forest Service.
2 Just as our houses are getting bigger, so are
3 we consuming our countryside.

4 This is not the place for 40-story
5 tall towers.

6 As a writer and historian, I have
7 written a lot about the 19th Century. At that
8 time in America, there was an absolute mania
9 for railroads. Railroads were going to make
10 everyone rich. They were going to bind the
11 republic with iron bands. Railroads were the
12 answer to every problem in the union.
13 Americans built railroads everywhere: Up steep
14 grades, through mountains. We tore apart the
15 country building railroads. You can walk and
16 bike on thousands of railroad beds today. So
17 many, many railroads failed, so many investors
18 were bankrupted. So much was destroyed for
19 nothing.

20 European visitors were astonished. A
21 young Andrew Carnegie wrote home to a cousin in
22 Scotland: "This country is completely cut up
23 with railroad tracks, telegraphs, and canals.
24 Everything around us is in motion."

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: I'm going to
2 need you to wrap up please.

3 MR. MANSFIELD: I am. Today, we're
4 cutting up the little that's left undisturbed,
5 or has healed from the last technological
6 enthusiasm. These industrial windmills are our
7 century's railroads. We are building them in
8 the wrong places; we are destroying millions of
9 acres. If we cut up the land near this
10 sanctuary, we'll continue the ugly American
11 tradition of using and destroying the country.

12 One last scene from Willard: I was
13 returning from an afternoon paddle in my kayak
14 watching two loons feed their chick. As I
15 pulled my boat out at the landing, a father was
16 trying to coax his daughter, maybe two years
17 old, to go home. She was wearing inflatable
18 water wings and a beseeching look that said
19 "Why leave? This is the best." "We'll come
20 back tomorrow," he said. "It will still be
21 here."

22 That's the promise that could be
23 posted at every nature sanctuary, land
24 easement, state and national park. If we build

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 these windmills, that's the promise that we
2 will have broken.

3 Thank you.

4 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

5 Mr. Mansfield, what town are you from?

6 MR. MANSFIELD: Hancock.

7 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Hancock.

8 Thank you. He said "Hancock".

9 Mr. Corazzini, followed by
10 Ms. Jennifer Tuthill, please.

11 MR. CORAZZINI: Thank you for the
12 opportunity to speak to the Committee and also
13 to the public.

14 My name is Richard Corazzini. My
15 wife Kathleen and I moved here 17 years ago
16 last week. We live on Salmon Brook Road, as I
17 say. This area of Antrim, after much input by
18 residents, was zoned Rural Residential. This
19 was to protect and keep open land and limit
20 commercial use. Many of the Antrim residents
21 worked hard at this a few years back.

22 The proposed wind project is an
23 aggressive business investment. Larger
24 turbines, taller towers, mean more power

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 generated and more government funds from
2 subsidies that are due them. This is not an
3 environmental benefit for the Town of Antrim or
4 the State of New Hampshire.

5 There are seven homes on our road.
6 It's a very quiet area. This is one of our
7 concerns. What's the noise level from the
8 proposed large turbines?

9 Ownership of Antrim Wind has changed,
10 from what we understand. I don't know all the
11 details. But have the new owners or the Town
12 or the State officials had any contact with the
13 new owners, so that we know what's going to
14 happen in the future, if this did pass?

15 Four hundred (400) plus foot towers
16 will overshadow the area. We're now just
17 starting the foliage season here, and the buses
18 used to stop and they would look up at the
19 hills there. It's going to change completely.

20 I'd just like to know if there are
21 any other towers in New Hampshire that are as
22 big as this or as tall that could be seen, for
23 our own sake, to see just what they look like,
24 or for the Committee's sake.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Please think hard about the natural
2 beauty that will be changed forever, and vote
3 "no".

4 Thank you.

5 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
6 Again, Ms. Tuthill, followed by Mr. Bob
7 Piehler, please.

8 MS. TUTHILL: Good morning. And
9 thank you for the opportunity to speak.

10 My name is Jennifer Tuthill. I am a
11 resident of Alexandria, New Hampshire, and I'm
12 presently Vice Chair of the Alexandria
13 Conservation Commission. I would like to
14 address briefly the topic of wildlife studies
15 by the Applicant for the Antrim Wind Project.

16 As we all know, many long,
17 painstaking hours have been spent creating the
18 present rules and regulations to which all
19 applicants for wind projects proposed for New
20 Hampshire must adhere. These rules and
21 regulations are expected to be met by every
22 applicant for every proposed project in good
23 faith.

24 I have, as part of my statement,

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 copied a large section of the specific
2 requirements for applicants for certification
3 that relate to wildlife studies, with specific
4 mention of wildlife and wildlife habitat
5 highlighted. But I won't read it. It's just
6 attached.

7 A letter was written by Carol
8 Henderson of the New Hampshire Fish & Game
9 Department in May of 2016, addressing issues
10 regarding the Ebony Boghaunter, Marsh wren, and
11 Wood turtle, which were species of concern in
12 terms of habitat and the effects on these
13 species that might occur from the proposed
14 project. These particular animals were found
15 not to inhabit the region affected by the
16 project, and thus of no concern to the state.
17 The rules were followed in this instance in
18 good faith.

19 But then what happened? In an
20 adjudicative hearing, with Geoff Jones of the
21 Stoddard Conservation Commission, while
22 questioning the Antrim BOS, it was agreed that
23 the Antrim Wind Project will be in the middle
24 of a wildlife habitat, an area Fish & Game has

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 listed as highest ranking habitat in New
2 Hampshire.

3 Despite very clear rules addressing
4 wildlife and habitat concerns, there is no
5 record of any research on mammals, with the
6 exception of bats, large or small, in the area
7 of the proposed project. During previous
8 testimony heard by this Committee addressing
9 noise, it was noted that wildlife wasn't
10 considered at all during the noise impact
11 study.

12 Furthermore, on the September 15th,
13 2016 hearing, with Presiding Officer Robert
14 Scott, Mr. Valteau, TRC Environmental from
15 Augusta, Maine, was questioned by Mr. Brock
16 [sic], an abutter to the proposed project.
17 Mr. Brock stated: "But I can't find an awful
18 lot in there about the study of land-based
19 wildlife, such as amphibians and mammals, bear
20 moose, and bobcats. Has there been much study
21 done for that, for this Application? And, if
22 so, where is it? Berwick mentioned the bear
23 hibernation dens and things. So none of that
24 or the effects on those habitats have been

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 looked into or examined, have they? MR.

2 VALLEAU: New Hampshire Fish & Game, which is
3 the agency that's tasked with managing black
4 bears in the State of New Hampshire, didn't ask
5 us to perform these studies, and the project
6 footprint is relatively small and not likely to
7 have an adverse effect on bears on this state
8 -- site. MR. GRAVEL: That's because the
9 bears, for example, have a home range of 50
10 square miles or so. What we're talking about
11 at Antrim, and that is the bears may use Antrim
12 as a portion of their habitat, but their
13 habitat is very large, and it would only be a
14 small portion of their habitat."

15 "So, likewise, I assume there's been
16 no examination into the effect of the project
17 on migration paths for various animals, has
18 there, such as moose or anything else? MR.

19 VALLEAU: No. We didn't survey that."

20 I would like to point out today that
21 Fish & Game, and any other organization in the
22 state, do not bear the responsibility of asking
23 a proposed project group to conduct any
24 particular study. It is the responsibility of

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 the applicant group themselves to adhere to the
2 rules established by the New Hampshire SEC, and
3 to use the resources available to them to make
4 an honest, scientifically based study.

5 The rules are clear. Bird studies
6 have been addressed by the Antrim project
7 proposal. Land-based mammals have not. This
8 is a blatant disregard of a requirement, not a
9 minor "whoops". The land-based animals
10 [mammals?] depending upon those ridgetops and
11 forested lands are a significant part of New
12 Hampshire wildlife. The footprint of this
13 project is not insignificant, and the effects
14 of the construction from start to finish are
15 huge, in terms of all wildlife and their
16 habitats. The changes to the topsoil,
17 watershed, water flow, vegetation and more will
18 not disappear when the towers have been
19 erected.

20 This lack of a proper wildlife study
21 for the area is an omission that makes the
22 Antrim Application incomplete and contrary to
23 the rules the SEC requires for all such
24 projects. I respectfully ask that the SEC make

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 note of the lack of adherence to their own
2 requirements, and make sure that a proper
3 wildlife study be made and be included in the
4 formal Application.

5 Thank you for your time.

6 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
7 We'll next go to Mr. Piehler, followed
8 Mr. Peter Moore.

9 I will ask at this time if everybody
10 could just check their cellphones, and make
11 sure they're silenced, even if you think they
12 may be. We'd like to hear the speakers, not
13 your cellphones please.

14 MR. PIEHLER: Good morning. This is
15 Robert Piehler, from Alexandria. I'm a
16 Selectman in our town, Planning Board, and
17 Conservation member. From previous meetings,
18 you'll know that I've been here and talked
19 about how the impact on towns projects can be.

20 I'll stick to setbacks. The setback
21 is important for your property ownership. If
22 you have a project, an industrial project, too
23 close to your property line, it will null and
24 void the value of your property. So, using

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 minimum standards may not be enough to protect
2 from ice throw, a potential fire, or a fall.
3 Any time that my land is restricted, or others
4 are restricted, by a project, meaning I can't
5 use my land 24/7 365 days a year, my land has
6 been taken, or other people's property has been
7 taken. And I think that's a serious
8 miscalculation on a lot of people's parts of
9 how it will affect you going forward.

10 You may have subdivision problems, if
11 you want to subdivide your land, or insurance
12 reasons, if you have out buildings. So, using
13 a setback for your domicile versus property
14 line is something that should be addressed.

15 I pay taxes on all my land, and I
16 think it should be protected 24/7.

17 Thank you very much.

18 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
19 Again, Mr. Peter Moore, followed by Mr. Gordon
20 Webber.

21 MR. MOORE: Chairman Scott and
22 members of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation
23 Committee, thank you very much for giving me
24 the opportunity to share my opinion. I'm a

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 35-year resident of the Town of Antrim.

2 Many claims and representations have
3 been made by the Applicant and its supporters
4 as the process has evolved, as a way to bolster
5 their effort, and to convince the SEC and the
6 people of Antrim that the Tuttle Wind --
7 Tuttle-Willard Range is an appropriate site for
8 the industrial-scale wind facility. And those
9 opposed to the project have argued for their
10 interests to include sight, sound, and scenic
11 degradation, and personal real property
12 devaluation as a potential result should this
13 Application be approved. I, for one, want to
14 speak for the land and the habitat that it
15 supports along the range, and the effects they
16 will suffer should development take place.

17 The wind farm operated by Iberdrola
18 on Lempster Mountain has often been referred to
19 and compared to the proposed Antrim Wind Energy
20 Project site on the Tuttle-Willard range by
21 proponents of the plan. However, I urge the
22 SEC not to generalize this comparison, or to
23 consider it as valid, certainly not in this
24 case. The Tuttle-Willard Mountain range is

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 very different from Lempster Mountain; both in
2 its geological make-up, the unique habitat upon
3 and around the range, and, perhaps most
4 importantly, in this project's very challenging
5 construction access and narrow ridge-summit
6 development scheme.

7 The fragile rocky ridges and talus
8 slope that make up the heights and geology of
9 the Tuttle-Willard are of a precious and
10 irreplaceable nature. It is these two related,
11 but distinct habitats, of which few exist in
12 New Hampshire, that have been identified and
13 sought for protection in the profile of the New
14 Hampshire Wildlife Action Plan. Development of
15 the Antrim Wind Project, should it go forward,
16 will completely compromise and degrade this
17 important area and the wildlife species that it
18 supports. And, despite claims that in 20 to 50
19 years everything will "return to normal", this
20 premise and its promise cannot be honestly
21 substantiated. And, despite the developer's
22 assertion that these projects have to be built
23 in "somebody's backyard", this area's
24 undeveloped value and its view belong to all of

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 us, not just to "someone".

2 From the information submitted by
3 Antrim Wind in its first ill-fated attempt to
4 get approval for this development, and this
5 present effort, it is implied that the
6 Tuttle-Willard range should be a good site for
7 their 500-foot towers and wind turbines. Ideal
8 perhaps in its proximity to high voltage power
9 lines and a pretty fair nighttime wind source,
10 but that is where the idealism ends. It cannot
11 be denied or overlooked by the SEC that the
12 substantial alteration of terrain and
13 devastation to this rocky ridge/talus slope
14 will be required; to build access roads to the
15 summits, create link roads between tower sites,
16 the leveling of acre-sized areas of on-site
17 concrete production facilities, and immense
18 blasting and excavation to create the 40-foot
19 deep foundation cavities required to hold these
20 towers and turbines aloft.

21 I am very concerned that many of you
22 on the SEC, if any at all, have actually been
23 up on the range to see for yourselves firsthand
24 the unique geology, nor the delicate, beautiful

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 and irreplaceable ecology that exists there.
2 Only by actually going up on this ridge can you
3 envision what would result should you approve
4 this project. This is not a good or
5 appropriate site for the limited short-term
6 gain these turbines will provide. The gain is
7 minuscule, compared to the irreparable
8 destruction of this geologically significant
9 range.

10 I want to advise and remind everyone
11 in the room that the SEC's own Mission
12 Statement, as set forth in RSA 162-H, sets
13 threshold limits for determining the type and
14 magnitude of proposals put before it. In this
15 charge, it is clearly set out that "essential
16 to maintain a balance between the environment
17 and the possible need for new energy
18 facilities". The directive goes further, and
19 more specifically sets the guidelines for
20 appropriately sited projects to have the
21 characteristics, among other considerations:
22 That are compatible with local land use plans
23 and regulations; that avoid or minimize
24 degradation of the quality of life for local

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 residents; that avoid or minimize disturbance
2 of populations of, or habitat for rare plants
3 and animal species; to avoid areas that create
4 a high risk to birds and bats; to avoid or
5 minimize disturbance of uncommon or high
6 quality wildlife habitat; to avoid or minimize
7 fragmentation of large blocks of natural
8 habitat; to avoid and minimize disturbance of
9 steep and fragile soils; and to avoid and
10 minimize disturbance of areas with high
11 recreational use, especially that which is
12 focused on the natural environment; and,
13 finally, to avoid or minimize degradation of
14 scenic views, especially from areas of
15 recognized high scenic value that depend on the
16 undeveloped natural environment for their
17 appeal.

18 There are appropriate places and
19 lands on which to generate wind energy with
20 large industrial wind turbines, such as perhaps
21 Lempster Mountain, and there are places that
22 will be altered beyond recognition should these
23 facilities be built on them. Tuttle-Willard is
24 without question an inappropriate location for

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 this project. I respectfully request and urge
2 the Site Evaluation Committee to deny the
3 Applicant, Antrim Wind Energy, the building of
4 their proposed industrial-scale wind facility
5 in Antrim, as they once again seek to do.

6 As a friend of mine commented on the
7 previous denial of Antrim Wind Energy's
8 application and appeal, "It's not that wind
9 energy in itself is a bad idea, it's just too
10 bad that they chose Antrim's Rural Conservation
11 Zone and the Tuttle-Willard Mountain range to
12 plan their industrial development." Often,
13 when industry wins, people, the land, and the
14 environment lose.

15 Thank you for your time and
16 consideration. Respectfully submitted, Peter
17 Moore.

18 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
19 Mr. Gordon Webber, followed by Mr. Al
20 Weisswange. I'm sure I got your name wrong, so
21 I apologize.

22 MR. WEBBER: Good morning. As a long
23 time resident of Antrim, a former Selectman of
24 two terms, an avid hunter, fisherman, and

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 trapper of 50 years, and a licensed New
2 Hampshire Guide, I believe I have a very good
3 sensitivity of animal habitat in general, and
4 the requirements for that wildlife, and
5 especially on the Tuttle Hill ridgeline, as I
6 have hiked and hunted and trapped that area
7 since I was a boy, and I continue to do so.
8 I've fished Willard Pond for over 40 years.
9 These are some of my main areas to guide
10 hunting and fishing.

11 With my professional outdoor
12 experience, I do not believe this Project will
13 have an adverse effect on the wildlife. Not
14 only do I hunt Antrim, I hunt Lempster,
15 Washington, Unity, Marlow, Goshen, all towns
16 surrounding the Lempster Wind Farm. I haven't
17 seen any wildlife impact since the Lempster
18 Project went on line.

19 I'm not inclined to give out the
20 location of my best fishing holes, but these
21 areas are very good hunting. I hunt right
22 behind the Jolly Roger Motorsport Park, in
23 Lempster, on Route 10. On weekends, for miles,
24 you can hear the dirt bikes racing. Within a

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 half a mile of the park, there are bear, moose,
2 deer, turkey, coyote, bobcat, grouse, and
3 woodcock. The Antrim Wind Project, in my
4 opinion, will have very little impact on
5 wildlife.

6 I know most people in Antrim. I'm a
7 pretty outgoing person, I like to talk to
8 people. Often I talk about the Antrim Wind
9 Project. I typically know if people support
10 the Project or oppose it. I like to ask them,
11 because I want to know. The main reason I hear
12 from those that oppose it is that they don't
13 want to look at, which is fair enough. Those
14 that support it have a variety of reasons;
15 considerable revenue for the Town of Antrim,
16 jobs that will help stimulate the local
17 economy, the production of clean renewable
18 energy for the region, while at the same time
19 moving away from fossil fuel energy production.
20 Both sides have their reasons.

21 Two points stick out in my
22 conversations with Antrim residents. First is
23 the overwhelming support this Project has among
24 Antrim residents. Three polls were conducted

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 showing a clear majority of voter support.

2 While some who oppose this Project question the
3 validity of those polls, they have never
4 conducted their own polls to refute the
5 results.

6 There have been some wind ordinance
7 amendments voted on in the Town that have
8 failed. The Planning Board Chairman at the
9 time, Mr. Levesque, when asked in a newspaper
10 why he thought that the ordinances failed, his
11 response was "we don't know the intent of the
12 voters." And that's true. When you vote on
13 those, there's not a comment section explaining
14 why you voted one way or the other.

15 In the polls, it was asked "Are you
16 in favor of the wind farm on Tuttle Hill, yes
17 or no?" It's pretty easy to tell the intent of
18 the voters in those polls.

19 The second point is the multitude of
20 benefits this Project offers, which far
21 outweigh the short-term visual impact that some
22 may feel this Project will have, until it's
23 decommissioned and the land is preserved
24 forever.

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 This Project is good for Antrim.
2 It's good for the region. It's good for the
3 State of New Hampshire. It's good for the
4 United States. And it's good for our planet.

5 Thank you. And I hope you approve
6 this Project.

7 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you,
8 Mr. Webber. That was exactly four minutes,
9 so --

10 MR. WEBBER: I timed myself when I
11 read it.

12 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Okay.
13 Mr. Weisswange. And I'm sure I have your name
14 wrong, I apologize.

15 MS. WEISSWANGE: That's close enough.

16 MR. WEISSWANGE: My name is Al
17 Weisswange. I live on Old Hancock Road, in
18 Antrim. And I'm in favor of this Project.
19 I'll be very brief.

20 A short list of the positives that I
21 think this Project will bring: Wind generated
22 electricity is renewable energy. The
23 electricity it generates does not create the
24 greenhouse gas carbon dioxide. Wind generated

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 electricity is cost competitive with coal,
2 nuclear, and natural gas. Wind generators are
3 a proven technology, which can lessen our
4 dependence on fossil fuels. Wind energy can
5 greatly reduce environmental impact compared
6 with conventional power plants, such as nuclear
7 or coal. The cost of fuel will never change or
8 need to be imported.

9 There are too many positives to
10 ignore and too much at stake if you do nothing.
11 And it's hard for me to believe that aesthetics
12 are more important than clean air.

13 Thank you.

14 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
15 Now, I'll see if I can get it right this time,
16 Karen Weisswange. No, I got it wrong again. I
17 apologize. And she will be followed by Paul
18 Stephens.

19 MS. WEISSWANGE: Good morning. Thank
20 you. Karen Weisswange. I live in Antrim, on
21 Hancock Road. The Town of Antrim has been
22 fighting for wind energy for at least five
23 years. I have kept records as far back as
24 April 2011. Antrim Wind sent a questionnaire

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 to all the people of Antrim in the very
2 beginning to ascertain if the Town would want a
3 wind farm. The majority of the people said
4 "yes". Unfortunately, it is the squeaky wheel
5 that gets the grease. At most of our meetings,
6 only those against would show up.

7 The SEC turned Eolian down on
8 aesthetics only, but said, if changes were
9 made, you would reconsider. Changes have been
10 made, and I ask that you seriously reconsider
11 and vote "yes" to clean renewable energy.
12 There is too much at stake to turn them down
13 again.

14 Now, this I've added to my
15 aesthetics: There's ski resorts on these
16 mountains. There's -- where they torn down
17 trees and big paths where the trees were.
18 There are big, where the woods were, there's
19 lights, big lights that shine every night in
20 the winter, that light up the sky, you can't
21 even see stars in the sky. But that's okay.

22 We must consider what is best for the
23 Town of Antrim. We all know what burning
24 fossil fuels are doing to this word we live in.

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Continuing to pollute the air for generating
2 electricity is very selfish and deadly. I want
3 to see cleaner air for my grandchildren and
4 future generations. It's too late for me, but
5 hopefully not for them.

6 Thank you.

7 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
8 Mr. Paul Stephens, followed by Martha Pinello.

9 MR. STEPHENS: Thank you. I
10 apologize, I don't have a written statement.
11 So, it's just going to be off-the-cuff.

12 My name is Paul Stephens. And I live
13 on White Birch Point, in Antrim. And which I
14 believe is considered a historic district that
15 is eligible for inclusion in the National
16 Register of Historic Places. And I am against
17 this Project, because of the adverse effect
18 that it will have on -- by the introduction of
19 incompatible visual elements to the area,
20 specifically installing these towers or these
21 turbines that are almost three times the size
22 of the Statue of Liberty.

23 I'm also offended that the people of
24 the Antrim Wind Project have not taken or made

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 any effort to speak to the White Birch Point
2 Association or the people that live in that
3 area on this subject.

4 And I'm also offended by the fact
5 that they feel that, just by sticking a sign up
6 that this is an "historic district", that that
7 is equitable *quid pro quo* for this visual
8 atrocity.

9 Thank you.

10 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

11 Martha Pinello, followed by Brian Beihl.

12 MS. PINELLO: My testimony has been
13 emailed to Ms. Pam Monroe.

14 Good morning. My name is Martha
15 Pinello. And I have lived in Antrim for over
16 30 years. During that time, I've served on
17 numerous committees, boards, and groups,
18 including the Antrim Planning Board, the
19 Conservation Commission, the Main Street Sign
20 Committee, which has enormous visual impacts in
21 a small town, various ad hoc committees of the
22 Board of Selectmen. By training I'm an
23 archeologist, who studies and interprets
24 historic landscapes. My concerns relate not to

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 the pros and cons of wind power, but rather
2 administrative ones and completeness of the
3 record.

4 Among the areas that this Project
5 will affect, with construction and visual
6 impacts, are hilltops. The Tuttle family came north
7 to Deering, New Hampshire, to settle on
8 hilltops, Tuttle Mountain, in Antrim, and then
9 on to Jacquith Road, in Hancock, all before
10 1790. Unfortunately, there is no review of the
11 Tuttle family and why they traveled and settled
12 on hilltops of this area in the development's
13 Application.

14 I have studied the Tuttle family on
15 the Jacquith Road site with local researchers
16 prior to the proposed -- this proposed Project.
17 The Tuttle family lived a complex mixture of
18 kin-shared neighborhoods on the hillside and
19 traveled the world.

20 Reflecting on this, I returned to the
21 Antrim site and reviewed the Pine Rust Blister
22 Maps at the State Archives. These maps were
23 made in the mid 20th Century to record the
24 presence of white pine and to monitor the

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 progress of the infestation offered detailed
2 views of the landscapes, because of the
3 meticulous drafted maps, which include the
4 types of trees, wetlands, streams, and cultural
5 features.

6 The sloping hills of Tuttle and
7 Willard Mountain to Willard Pond contain a
8 dense array of stonewall enclosures, roadways,
9 cart paths. These are not mentioned in the
10 review of the cultural resources, perhaps not
11 giving the context of the cultural history of
12 the Project area during the time of European
13 settlement to the present.

14 I had the privilege of serving on the
15 Antrim Planning Board during the previous SEC
16 consideration of the Project. I and members of
17 the Board created local zoning ordinance for
18 wind energy facilities. Another ordinance was
19 crafted for the developer's benefit. All of
20 the ordinances' proposals were rejected in
21 successive town meeting ballot votes. After
22 the last wind ordinance was rejected, the
23 public utility was -- words "public utility"
24 was removed via the 19 -- excuse me, the 2013

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Town Meeting ballot vote from all zoning
2 districts in town. These Town Meeting ballot
3 votes do not indicate a support for Antrim Wind
4 Energy, LLC, Project by ballot vote.

5 Additionally, the SEC has considered
6 this Project in the past. As many of you have
7 been told over and over again, this Project has
8 not significantly changed; one tower removed,
9 one tower shortened. Essentially, the Project
10 is the same.

11 And this is an administrative concern
12 I have that has profound impacts, I think, for
13 future SEC consideration. What is the purpose
14 of the SEC, and the time and effort of the
15 panel, staff, and public, if a project
16 developer can repeatedly come before the SEC
17 and request a different outcome for the same
18 project?

19 Please consider with care the
20 authority, the rules, and the appeals process
21 for the SEC when considering this case. What
22 are the implications, when a previous decision
23 is overturned for a project that is not
24 significantly changed over its previous

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 submission?

2 Thank you.

3 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

4 Mr. Beihl, followed by Britain Hill.

5 MR. BEIHL: Good morning, Chairman
6 Scott and good morning, Commissioners. My name
7 is Brian Beihl. I live at 17 Jameson Avenue,
8 in Antrim. I'm a 31-year resident and former
9 chairman of Antrim's Chamber of Commerce, the
10 local Scoutmaster, and I'm active in many town
11 affairs. I'm also an environmentalist and
12 nature photographer who was active in the first
13 Antrim Wind SEC case.

14 While I'm a proponent of renewable
15 energy generally, I continue to be specifically
16 opposed to the approval of the Antrim Wind
17 Energy, now Walden Green Energy, Project.

18 In the first Antrim Wind Energy case,
19 the visual impact on the landscape from Gregg
20 Lake, from Pierce Lake, from Island Pond, in
21 Stoddard, and from the pristine Willard Pond,
22 resulted in the denial of the certificate by
23 the SEC commissioners.

24 Having reviewed the new visual impact

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 materials, I see no substantive change in the
2 impact from the original case. By my count,
3 seven towers or rotors can still be seen from
4 Willard Pond, one of the most pristine bodies
5 of water in southwest New Hampshire, and a
6 pivotal area in the regional Super Sanctuary.
7 I am unwilling to compromise this New Hampshire
8 jewel so that ex-bankers and German investors
9 can make a quick buck.

10 One thing that has changed is the
11 financing of this project. In the first case,
12 Antrim Wind Energy pressed their case with
13 little backing, on the prayer that they would
14 receive a certificate. Now acquired by Walden
15 Green Energy, their partner in the new project
16 -- and their partner in the new project, RWEST,
17 subsidiary of German utility RWE AG, the SEC
18 commissioners are supported to feel confident
19 in Walden's ability to finance the project.
20 But a reading of the first-half 2016 investor
21 report from RWE AG shows a 73.8 percent drop in
22 net income, a 251.2 percent drop in operating
23 cash flow from their existing operations, and a
24 423.7 percent drop in free cash flow. From

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 there -- I'm no financial genius, but I urge
2 the commissioners to take another long, hard
3 look at the financial viability of this
4 project.

5 Finally, the Antrim Selectmen have
6 given you the impression or tried to give you
7 the impression that the residents are in full
8 support of this project. Let me assure you
9 this is not the case. In 2014, using a
10 petitioned warrant article, as you know, that
11 requires 25 signatures in town, Antrim Wind
12 Energy personnel attempted to orchestrate a
13 favorable change in Antrim's zoning ordinance,
14 trying an end-run around the SEC's 2012 Antrim
15 Wind Energy decision. The warrant article
16 language was written by Antrim Wind Energy and
17 used an Antrim resident to submit it. This did
18 not sit well with me, did not sit well with the
19 voters, and they voted it down, they voted down
20 the change 390 to 278.

21 Commissioners, I know this has been a
22 long and arduous process for you. But, after
23 the reports have been submitted and the
24 testimony has been heard, there's no

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 significant difference from the 2012 case. The
2 visual impact on the pristine landscape is too
3 great, and the financial viability too weak, to
4 grant this certificate.

5 Thank you for your service to the
6 State of New Hampshire. Respectfully
7 submitted.

8 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
9 Britain Hill, followed by Bob Bernstein,
10 please.

11 MS. HILL: My name is Britain Hill.
12 I'm in Francestown, New Hampshire. I've
13 followed this wind project for over five years.
14 And I think that it would set a precedent
15 similar to seizure of private land --

16 *[Interruption due to brief power*
17 *failure in the building.]*

18 MS. HILL: I think it would send -- I
19 think that it would send a very, very bad
20 message to all the people of New Hampshire.
21 Seizure of private property for what has not
22 been established as a public utility is
23 unconstitutional and should be seen in that
24 light.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Thank you.

2 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

3 And I apologize. So, as I mentioned, this is
4 the first time we've used this facility. So, I
5 think we're going through some growing pains.

6 Mr. Bernstein, followed by Mr. Mike
7 Castaldo. Again, I apologize if I got your
8 name wrong.

9 MR. BERNSTEIN: Good morning, Mr.
10 Chairman, and members of the Committee. I'm
11 Bob Bernstein, an Antrim resident of the last
12 25 years. I've been traveling past this site
13 the entire time. I agree with the previous
14 speakers in opposition to this Project. And
15 will add only from my perspective as a
16 community economic development practitioner.

17 For the last 30 plus years, I've been
18 working in New Hampshire, elsewhere, bringing
19 together public and private financing in
20 support of workforce housing, public
21 facilities, farmlands and such. All long-term
22 projects, all based around 20-year projections,
23 all balancing the public interest with the best
24 possible use of available resources.

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 While no reasonable person I think
2 can be opposed to clean renewable energy, there
3 are far better ways and far better sites than
4 this. Considering the proposal, and along with
5 what others have said, I feel that the
6 cost/benefits are just not there for the
7 sacrifices culturally, ecologically, and
8 financially, to something that brings outside
9 capital in, the vast majority of which will not
10 stay in the community, and which has a
11 significant likelihood of leaving the area
12 holding undue consequences in future years.

13 Thank you for considering, and
14 appreciate consideration of this being opposed
15 to the public interest.

16 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
17 Mr. Castaldo, followed by Marline Leotta.

18 MR. CASTALDO: Good morning, ladies
19 and gentlemen. My name is Mike Castaldo. I am
20 from Dover, New Hampshire. And this year I am
21 running to represent Dover and Somersworth as a
22 State Representative.

23 And, with respect to the first two
24 speakers, Representatives from their

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 communities, what's right for Antrim is not
2 right for Dover, and what's right for Dover is
3 not right for Antrim, I think the -- you name
4 the town.

5 If I had the support of my community
6 for a wind farm, I would do my very best to
7 represent those interests in Concord. Four of
8 the Representatives from Antrim, Marjorie
9 Porter, Gilman Shattuck, Richard McNamara, and
10 Frank Edelblut, have all signed on to support
11 this Project.

12 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: You need to
13 get closer to the microphone. People in the
14 back can't hear.

15 MR. CASTALDO: That their jobs are at
16 stake with representing their constituents
17 accurately. If they don't do that, then they
18 won't get reelected, and their hopes and dreams
19 won't be achieved.

20 So, all I have to say is that, if the
21 folks in Antrim want this so much, the Board
22 should seriously consider giving them what they
23 want.

24 Last Tuesday, we passed the 400 parts

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 per million CO2 number for the first time in
2 4 million years. If we don't reduce our carbon
3 footprint quickly, we are going to have much
4 bigger problems than the fears that have been
5 outlined by many of the speakers here today.

6 Thank you.

7 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

8 Again, Marline Leotta, followed by Jim Beard.

9 MS. LEOTTA: Good morning. This will
10 be short. I'm Marline Leotta, from Stoddard,
11 New Hampshire. And I'm here today to express
12 my support for the position of the Stoddard
13 Conservation Commission and the Stoddard Board
14 of Selectmen in opposition to this Antrim Wind
15 Farm proposal.

16 Thank you for taking comments from
17 the public.

18 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

19 Just to clarify, you're supportive of the
20 opposition, correct?

21 MS. LEOTTA: Right. Right. I'm
22 opposed to it. I support the opposition.

23 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Okay.

24 Mr. Beard, followed by Mr. Joe Wilkas.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman and
2 Commissioners, my name is Jim Beard. I am a
3 resident of Lempster, New Hampshire. I live on
4 Sand Pond. And, from part of our view from
5 Sand Pond, we can see four or five of these
6 windmills on Lempster Mountain. And I must say
7 that we, people that I know and communicate
8 with, feel that Iberdrola is a good neighbor.
9 They are very active in supporting part of our
10 town in a different sense. They have done
11 things for our school. They have done things
12 for our library. I should mention that I'm
13 Chairman of the Trustees of the Library. And I
14 also chair the Conservation Commission in
15 Lempster.

16 As you know, the windmills abut
17 conserved land, the Ashuelot Headwaters
18 Project. And, recently, as Chair of the
19 Conservation Commission, we were able to take
20 640 acres of town-owned land and put it into a
21 conservation easement. This also abuts the
22 windmill project in Lempster.

23 And I must say, we have done a
24 wildlife action plan. We don't see any

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 variance from that action plan since the
2 windmills went into operation.

3 I'm here in support of the windmill
4 project for Antrim. As you may know, I ran for
5 the Senate seat, District 8, and Antrim is part
6 of that district. I spent a lot of time in
7 Antrim knocking on doors, and, when residents
8 were home and they wanted to talk, and they
9 learned that I was from Lempster, that was the
10 first issue they wanted to talk about, my
11 feelings on the Antrim Wind Project, based on
12 my experience in Lempster.

13 And I must say that the majority of
14 the people that I spoke with were very
15 supportive of this wind project. As a matter
16 of fact, Antrim was one of the towns that I won
17 in the Senate race.

18 I should also go on and mention that
19 I recently joined the Board of Monadnock
20 Conservancy. And they're fully familiar with
21 this project, and would be supportive.

22 So, I don't have much more to say,
23 other than I hope you will make the right
24 decision and come forward. It's about clean

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 energy, and that was part of my platform, was
2 energy solutions for New Hampshire, which
3 include wind and solar, biomass, and even
4 water, hydroelectric.

5 Thank you very much.

6 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
7 Mr. Wilkas, followed by Joshua Buco.

8 MR. WILKAS: Hi. I'm Joe Wilkas,
9 but I don't have a time constraint, and one of
10 my associates does. Is it okay if I swap
11 with Mr. Tripp [sic] Blair and take his time
12 later.

13 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Sure. Just
14 want to make sure we get the name. Well, you
15 can say your name.

16 MR. BLAIR: Yes. I have ten copies.

17 *(Mr. Blair distributing*
18 *documents to Subcommittee.)*

19 MR. BLAIR: Thank you. Thank you
20 for -- I have to get out of here. So, I
21 appreciate your time.

22 My name is, Chairman Scott and
23 Committee members, my name is Russell Blair.
24 And I have a home in Bridgewater, New

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Hampshire. For the past several years, I have
2 participated in the SB 99 process and part of
3 the SB -- I was part of the SB 99
4 Pre-Rulemaking Subcommittee discussion
5 regarding appropriate noise, shadow flicker,
6 and ice throw for wind energy. I want to thank
7 you for the opportunity to speak with you as
8 you contemplate Antrim Wind. All of my
9 comments today pertain to sound and the
10 Applicant's adherence to the SEC criteria.

11 Specifically, I'd like to comment
12 about the Sound Level Assessment Report, which
13 is Attachment 9, does not include property
14 lines of abutters and no estimated sound levels
15 at the abutter' property lines. As you know,
16 the new language agreed to in the Rulemaking,
17 301.14(f)(2), which states that sound shall be
18 measured "on property that is used in whole or
19 in part for permanent or temporary purposes at
20 locations between the nearest building on the
21 property used for such purposes and the closest
22 wind turbine."

23 During the rulemaking deliberation,
24 Mr. Wiesner commented "and that language I came

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 up with, it intended to make both" -- "intended
2 to both make it clear that we're not just, you
3 know, seasonal housing is included, which was
4 concern for a number of commenters, and also
5 capture the concept that "wherever people are
6 trying to sleep, we're going to measure the
7 sound". So, that's "permanent or temporary
8 residential purposes". It could cover an inn,
9 perhaps a campground. So, that was the purpose
10 for including this expansive language." That's
11 a quote from his -- the transcript dated
12 8/27/2015.

13 The Applicant has failed to provide
14 the property lines of abutters that would
15 permit the Committee to make an informed
16 decision. "Seasonal housing" would include a
17 tent. The intent of this language was to allow
18 abutters of a wind project the complete and
19 full use of their property free of adverse
20 noise impacts.

21 Number two is a little bit more -- is
22 as technical, but I think is relevant. In the
23 Supplemental Prefiled Direct Testimony by Mr.
24 O'Neal, they -- I'm going to paraphrase some of

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 this, since you have the documents in front of
2 you. Mr. O'Neal testifies that there's a --
3 that a correction of three decibels was
4 impermissible, was not allowed. And,
5 therefore, what he submitted was correct.

6 However, in the Applicant's Sound
7 Level Assessment Report, the Applicant asserts
8 that the wind turbine sound originates from two
9 sources, mechanical and hydrodynamic
10 [aerodynamic?] wind noise. Mechanical noise
11 originates from the hub, while aerodynamic
12 noise originates from "the wind turbine blades
13 with localized airflow inhomogeneity" --
14 "inhomogeneities, whatever that word is, "and
15 wakes from other turbine blades and from
16 airflow across the surface of the blades,
17 particularly the front and trailing edges.
18 Aerodynamic sound generally increases with
19 increasing wind speed."

20 Therefore, the entire blade should be
21 considered as a sound generator, and in
22 particular the blade tips that are going the
23 fastest will generate the most sound.

24 Applicant erred in assuming that the hub of

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 turbine generated the sound and did not
2 consider that blade tips also generate
3 aerodynamic sound. Therefore, the sound source
4 for the turbines with a hub height of 79 and a
5 half meters, minus the length of the blades,
6 results in 20 -- a 23-meter height for the
7 sound generator. This is well within the
8 30-meter range required in the ISO 9613-2
9 model. Thus, the plus or minus 3 dB adjustment
10 should apply.

11 My third comment, and this is it, the
12 Applicant and its consultants want you to
13 believe that their sound projections are
14 accurate and conservative in nature. They cite
15 projects in Maine, where the post-construction
16 sound measurements are less than projected, so
17 you should believe them.

18 However, there are other projects,
19 such as Sheffield Wind, in Vermont, Hoosic Wind
20 and Falmouth Wind, in Mass., where people were
21 forced out of their homes or continue to suffer
22 from sleep disturbances due to turbine noise.
23 Please consider the attached report by S.E.
24 Ambrose & Associates, where wind turbine noises

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 have exceeded model predictions by 3 to 12
2 decibels. Thus, having a conservative approach
3 to sound generated by wind turbines is truly in
4 the public interest.

5 Thank you for your time.

6 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
7 Mr. Wilkas, was Mr. Blair speaking in your
8 space or are you -- you'd like to speak?

9 MR. BLAIR: No, no. I came in late
10 and he --

11 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Okay. So,
12 Mr. Wilkas, would you still like to speak?

13 MR. WILKAS: Yes.

14 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: All right.
15 Now is the time.

16 *(Mr. Wilkas distributing*
17 *documents to Subcommittee.)*

18 MR. WILKAS: Here you go. I can
19 e-mail you one, if you'd like.

20 MR. PATNAUDE: That's okay.

21 MR. WILKAS: I'm Joe Wilkas, from
22 Bridgewater, New Hampshire. And thank you for
23 accommodating Mr. Blair.

24 I'll start with referencing 162-H:1,

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Declaration of Purpose. "The legislature
2 recognizes that the selection of sites for
3 energy facilities may have significant impacts
4 on and benefits to the following: ...the
5 population...air and water quality." I'm going
6 to speak about the benefits. Much time has
7 been spent on impacts, so let's address the
8 benefits.

9 From Antrim Wind's SEC submission:

10 "Accounting for all losses, Antrim Wind
11 estimates that the Project will have an average
12 annual net capacity factor of approximately
13 37 percent. Based on this projected capacity
14 factor, the Project is expected to produce
15 approximately 93,346 megawatt-hours of
16 electricity per year. The Project is
17 anticipated to produce enough electricity for
18 the average annual consumption of approximately
19 12,300 New Hampshire homes."

20 So, let's look at this. For a
21 capacity factor comparison, the Groton Wind SEC
22 Application "estimates that the Project will
23 have an annual" -- "an average annual net
24 capacity factor of 33 to 36 percent." But, for

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 the year 2015, it actually produced at
2 27.3 percent. Another New Hampshire project,
3 Granite Reliable, produced at 27.8 percent
4 capacity factor. So, assuming Antrim Wind's
5 capacity factor would be similar to these other
6 New Hampshire wind projects, Antrim Wind's
7 estimated capacity factor may be almost
8 40 percent optimistic, and therefore similarly
9 optimistic about the number of New Hampshire
10 homes it could power.

11 And, unlike conventional power
12 plants, wind power is unpredictably
13 intermittent, unreliable, changing minute to
14 minute depending on varying wind speed and
15 direction, occasionally operating at full
16 power, but more often at zero output, or
17 anywhere in between.

18 And I attached or included below on
19 the printout a year 2014 example from a one and
20 a half megawatt Scituate Wind project, along
21 the ocean, where winds are usually higher and
22 steadier than inland. And that graphic shows
23 about four days of power output from what
24 should be a more reliable output source, and it

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 varies all over the place. And it shows far
2 more time, over these four days, at zero output
3 than at full power.

4 Because of this intermittent power, a
5 quick responding, dispatchable "backup" power
6 source must operate along with the intermittent
7 wind power to keep the lights on. This backup
8 power source has to continually adjust to the
9 wind power output, increasing output when the
10 wind power drops, and decreasing output when
11 the wind power increases, to maintain an even
12 power level to these New Hampshire homes.

13 So, Antrim Wind is proposing to
14 replace power from a conventional power plant
15 with power from their intermittent power
16 source, and we know power -- and we now know
17 power from a quick responding backup power
18 plant will also be needed. Since Antrim Wind
19 can provide 100 percent at peak, but only
20 37 percent average of the power needed, the
21 required backup plant must provide the other
22 63 percent to equal 100 percent of the needed
23 power over time.

24 Most electrical power generation in

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 New Hampshire, ignoring Seabrook Nuclear, is
2 from Combined Cycle natural gas power plants.
3 So, Antrim Wind's power, along with the backup
4 power, would replace power from this type of
5 plant. The cost-effective, fast-reacting
6 backup power plant used for this backup is an
7 Open Cycle gas power plant that emits 50
8 percent more emissions than the Combined Cycle
9 plant to be replaced. Since the backup plant
10 needed with wind has to generate 63 percent of
11 the power that was previously generated by the
12 Combined Cycle plant, and the Open Cycle
13 plant -- backup plant emits 50 percent more
14 emissions than the Combined Cycle plant did,
15 the Open Cycle plant used as a backup to wind
16 will generate about the same emissions as the
17 original Open Cycle plant running continuously
18 powering these homes. There will be minimum
19 emissions savings from adding wind power with
20 the required backup power plant, and no savings
21 if Antrim's optimistic capacity factor is more
22 in line with other New Hampshire wind projects.

23 So, we're being proposed -- what's
24 being proposed is minimal or no emission

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 savings. But what will it cost the electricity
2 users and taxpayers of New Hampshire?

3 We'll have to pay for the wind power
4 itself, usually by a 2013 PPA priced in the
5 Northeast at about 6 cents a kilowatt-hour.

6 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: I'm going to
7 need you to wrap up.

8 MR. WILKAS: And we heard earlier
9 it's 8 cents. Okay. Running the required
10 backup power plant; federal wind subsidies;
11 Renewable Energy Credit; losses from
12 long-distance transmission needed; and there
13 are also Forward Capacity Market payments. So,
14 significant impacts and increased costs for
15 negligible, if any, savings of emissions.

16 So, this Antrim Wind Project, like
17 others in the relatively low wind Northeast,
18 offers little-to-no power generation or
19 emission reduction benefits and increases costs
20 to electricity users and taxpayers.

21 Thank you.

22 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you. I
23 called Mr. Buco. Mr. Buco, are you the same
24 that I granted intervenor status to?

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 MR. BUCO: I believe you did.

2 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Okay. Do you
3 still feel a need to speak? If so, I'm going
4 to put you at the end, since, you know,
5 intervenors, again, have a larger voice than
6 the rest of the public, and I wanted to give
7 this opportunity right now for the public that
8 aren't intervenors.

9 Ms. Berwick.

10 MS. BERWICK: Josh did not allow his
11 prefiled testimony, so I didn't think he could
12 do the intervenor status anymore.

13 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: No. He's
14 still listed as a non-abutter intervenor.

15 MS. BERWICK: And can testify?
16 Because I was told he could not testify.

17 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Well, you're
18 speaking with this -- for him, I believe.

19 Hold on. Mr. Iacopino.

20 MR. IACOPINO: It's not just
21 testimony. At the end of the case, there's
22 going to be argument, that the intervenors will
23 have the opportunity to make arguments for or
24 against, depending upon which side of the issue

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 you're own. And Mr. Buco can certainly
2 participate with your intervenor group in doing
3 that.

4 He cannot give testimony, because he
5 did not file prefiled testimony. However, he
6 can participate in the proceeding, and make an
7 argument along with your group, as part of your
8 group, about what the Committee should do.

9 MS. BERWICK: Could I just ask --

10 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

11 MS. BERWICK: Would you be able, with
12 your work situation, to take any more time off?

13 MR. BUCO: No. Not at this time, no.

14 MS. BERWICK: It's up to you.

15 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Okay. What
16 I'll do is, since I did grant you intervenor
17 status, I will, if you want to speak, I'm going
18 to put you last, though, because you have that
19 special status. This will give you an
20 opportunity still to speak, but I'm going to
21 put you last, so that people who haven't been
22 granted status, get to talk.

23 MR. BUCO: But I do have to work at
24 2:15, in Concord, today. So, I don't know what

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 time I'd be able to make it in.

2 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: I truly hope
3 we'd be done long before that.

4 MR. BUCO: Okay. All right. Thank
5 you.

6 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Okay. I'm
7 going to move on to Mary Wells, followed by
8 Susan [Sarah?] VanderWende.

9 MS. WELLES: Good morning. It is
10 still morning. My name is Mary Welles. I'm
11 here today in support of the Antrim Wind
12 Project. I grew up in Antrim. I've lived in
13 town for over 20 years. My family still lives
14 in Antrim and owns almost 200 acres of land
15 there, most of it prime river bottom farmland.

16 I support this project, because I am
17 in favor of the implementation of renewable
18 alternative energy sources, not only for my
19 generation, but for future generations, which
20 includes my two young sons. I hope to return
21 to Antrim with my family, and I'd proud to live
22 in a town with this kind of progressive energy
23 project.

24 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Sarah VanderWende, followed by Michael Ott,
2 please.

3 MS. VANDERWENDE: Good morning.
4 Thank you for this opportunity. My name is
5 Sarah VanderWende. I'm a resident of Antrim.
6 I live on Old Pound Road, in the historic
7 Antrim Center. I'm about two miles from the
8 proposed site.

9 I hope you'll take the time to read
10 the submission of my former statement to the
11 Committee on the same application, which was
12 made in 2012. I still believe exactly as I did
13 four years ago. The historic significance of
14 these hills is unchanged; the comfort they
15 provide to those that visit them yet persists.
16 The people of this town have already done what
17 they can to preserve them. I still struggle
18 with the uncertainty of having a safe and happy
19 home or where I will go if its integrity is
20 destroyed. And, yes, I still believe the
21 Applicants are untrustworthy. I ask you to
22 uphold the wishes of the Town and preserve this
23 special place from this insane proposal and any
24 other which may be drummed up and brought

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 before you.

2 In the years since I last appeared
3 before you, I have had much need and many
4 different times to seek solace in these hills.
5 Watching my husband lose his life to cancer,
6 and seeking ways and reasons to carry on alone
7 brought me back to my quiet place in the pines
8 again and again. It is an axiom that no matter
9 how much one may suffer, they can always look
10 out and see someone else who is suffering more.
11 In the long hours that I spent with Paul and
12 other survivors watching as liters of poisons
13 were pumped into their veins, and in the days
14 after his surgery when radiation burned from
15 the inside out to singe the beard from his
16 face, I came to understand how vital it is that
17 we all have some special place we can go to and
18 be relieved of the burdens of our hearts.

19 Modern medicine now understands how
20 tightly joined our mental, emotional and
21 physical health truly are. Our own stress,
22 fear and anxiety are killing us with epidemics
23 of heart disease, cancer, and diabetes, and our
24 best cures and defense against them is

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 lifestyle change that reduces our stress
2 chemistry. Already we see post treatment
3 prescriptions (based on evidential studies) for
4 people to take long walks in nature, to go
5 fishing, meditate, and to get away from the
6 trappings of our industrial society.

7 I worked for a month this summer as a
8 fly fishing guide up north in Pittsburg. Yes,
9 I'm a licensed guide, too. One of my
10 housemates there is a young veteran taking part
11 in a program for others like himself who suffer
12 from the traumas of their experiences and work
13 toward the transition back into civilian life.
14 His arms and legs are covered in the scars of
15 searing shrapnel, in his ears is a constant
16 ringing that will never stop; like the man in
17 the recently nominated short film "The Last
18 Time I Heard True Silence", it is to the hills
19 and trees and waters he has come to find refuge
20 and healing. I imagine that is exactly why
21 Colonel Willard spent so much time camping and
22 fishing here in Antrim that the pond and
23 mountain were named in honor of his sacrifices.

24 Even as these dear souls have done

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 all they can to save our world, it has been
2 vital that there was a place for them to come
3 home, where troubles and pains can be
4 forgotten. We all need such places. We all
5 need to look upon some peaceful scene and know
6 that we are not alone in our suffering, and
7 that those who have stood in the same place
8 knew how important it would be to those who
9 would come after. To be strengthened by the
10 knowledge that we, too, can persevere in the
11 face of our challenges. We need spaces and
12 time to walk among the trees as they murmur the
13 comfort to us in the quiet; to hike in nature's
14 surrounds to vistas that put us back in
15 perspective, seeing how very small we are in
16 this great creation; to scramble the banks of
17 chuckling streams or glide upon quiet waters
18 and contemplate what good we can honestly do
19 for our neighbor. I think on Judge Tuttle and
20 his very many services to his neighbor, his
21 towns, his wisdom shared with the Governor, his
22 many contributions that have allowed us to
23 flourish, and I wonder if I can follow even a
24 small part of his example.

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 As we strive in our many ways to save
2 the world, to protect our earth, I cannot help
3 but wonder why we have come to the theory that
4 destruction of our peaceful places will somehow
5 be "worth the sacrifice". Whether it is
6 medicine or science, we are little more than
7 frogs at the bottom of a well. We are grossly
8 limited in our understanding by our own short
9 history and the size of our microscopes. Time
10 and again both have shown us our
11 shortsightedness and we have suffered from our
12 prideful assumptions of superiority. We are
13 here before this Committee yet again on the
14 unfinished business of resolving this conflict
15 in understanding how best to preserve our
16 existence here in this small arena.

17 Since this proposal to place an
18 industrial wind generation facility on the
19 Tuttle Hill-Willard Mountain ridge came to the
20 public eye, the voters of Antrim have supported
21 our original designation of the area as worthy
22 of conservation on four separate ballots.
23 Unlike opinion polls, and, no, they didn't go
24 to all residents in town, closed balloting gets

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 the true answers.

2 This Committee must support the
3 people of Antrim and their desire to preserve
4 the beauty and history of this site. I ask you
5 please, declare this site inappropriate for
6 development of large wind facilities. I ask
7 you not to allow this process to continue and
8 draw us back again and again. And, I ask you,
9 please --

10 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: I will need
11 you to wrap it up.

12 MS. VANDERWENDE: -- let me remain
13 peaceful in the home where my life and love
14 have dwelled.

15 These comments are on file.

16 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

17 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: If you're
18 able to, it would help the transcriptionist to
19 get a copy, if you're willing to do that?

20 Oh, she already gave it to Pam.

21 Okay. Thank you.

22 All right. Mr. Ott, followed by
23 Dennis Cashman, please.

24 MR. OTT: Chairman Scott, Committee,

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 it's nice to see you again. I'll defer to most
2 of my testimony in February, or my statement in
3 February. I don't have anything written, but I
4 wanted to just say a couple things. I've been
5 reading with intent the transcription. I'm
6 really impressed, Mr. Patnaude. This is
7 impressive stuff.

8 It's a busy season right now in power
9 generation. I was literally inside of a
10 nuclear steam turbine on Friday. I'll be at
11 our large gas turbine facility tomorrow. I got
12 time off of work to be here. There's a lot of
13 people I know who are in major support of the
14 project, but they can't get time off. So, I
15 want to speak for them a little bit as well.

16 According to ISO, right now, at this
17 minute, we're at 14 gigawatts demand on the ISO
18 grid. Fifty-four (54) percent of our fuel mix
19 is natural gas, and 33 percent nuclear, good
20 ol' Seabrook, we like Seabrook, and renewables
21 is 6 percent, and that includes Schiller
22 Station with wood chips, right? So, let's take
23 wood chips out for a minute and look at real
24 renewables.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

2 MR. OTT: Sorry. I get excited about
3 power.

4 So, if we take out Schiller Station,
5 and all the wood chips in that big building
6 there, and we look just at solar and wind,
7 we're down at about 200 megawatts right now.
8 We need to build that up. You know, one of the
9 other gentlemen spoke about spinning reserves,
10 that we need to have ready for -- if wind power
11 dies down. We love that. We love spinning
12 reserves. To have capacity that you're not
13 using makes it easier to have a power plant run
14 and be more efficient. Yes, they can spin up
15 as they need to, but that's a really good
16 thing. We like that in power generation.

17 We're talking about the property.
18 These turbines are going to be built on all
19 this acreage, 600 acres of private property. I
20 own part of that property. I think of it as my
21 home. I'll be an Antrim resident for ten years
22 coming up in March. And it's my home. My
23 homes will be closest to any of the turbines
24 that are going to be built.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 In terms of sound, anybody who lives
2 in North Branch knows, the biggest sound
3 pollutant we got now are those darn rumble
4 strips. They just, you know, dug rumble strips
5 all through the center lane. And I don't care
6 what time a day it is, when that 18-wheeler
7 hits those rumble strips, we're talking
8 multiple times an hour, you can hear it
9 reverberate off the hills, like that's going to
10 eclipse any sound from a wind turbine.

11 But it's private property. And the
12 view is everybody's, sure. I mean, your view
13 is what you see, right? That's yours. But the
14 property you're looking at is somebody else's.
15 I have a lot of heartburn when we talk about
16 the conservation, I didn't want to give the
17 conservation easement at first. I want to
18 protect my rights as a landowner. I know Paul
19 Whittemore, I speak for him. I talked to him
20 via text last night. He is not in favor of any
21 kind of conservation on his property, but he
22 did it for the wind project. Me, too.

23 I gave Jack, you know, a few acres
24 for conservation when we first talked about it.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 He asked for more, I gave more. He asked for
2 more, I gave him some more. So, we've got
3 acreage now on the top that will be conserved,
4 but only with this project. If it wasn't for
5 those guys, I want no part of that.

6 My property was for sale for a little
7 over a year, and nobody else wanted it. The
8 parcel next to me, which is almost 50 percent
9 bigger than mine, was for sale for two years,
10 nobody wanted that.

11 But, if all these people want to, you
12 know, control what we do with our land, why
13 don't they buy it? You know? It's my land. I
14 mean, if the project doesn't go through,
15 according to Rural Conservation District rules,
16 I could put in a ski slope, you know? As long
17 as I don't exceed 30 feet above the top of the
18 trees, I wouldn't need a variance. We wouldn't
19 have to come to you guys.

20 But, I mean, that's hyperbole. I, of
21 course, wouldn't do that. But, at the same
22 time, it's private property, you know? And I
23 value that, those rights that I can retain for
24 that property myself.

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 So, those are some of the things that
2 I think is important. That like, you know, DOT
3 didn't ask for permission when they were going
4 to drill those rumble strips in. It's their
5 property, they can do it. And that had a lot
6 of sound impact for everybody right on the
7 street, but, you know, it's the right-of-way.

8 Eversource, right now, they have got
9 track vehicles all along the right-of-way,
10 they're replacing poles all along, and guy
11 wires. They have destroyed my yard pretty
12 well, but I know they're going to come back and
13 fix it. That's what Antrim Wind is going to
14 do. Granted, the timeframe is a little longer.
15 But, with the track vehicles, that have flags
16 and there's boards all over my creeks, they're
17 all there now temporarily, but they're all
18 going to pull them back out when Eversource is
19 done. It's for the better of the whole of the
20 community.

21 That's all. Thank you very much.

22 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

23 Mr. Cashman, followed by Richard LaRoche.

24 MR. CASHMAN: My name is Dennis

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Cashman. I live in Bridgewater. I'm a Ph.D
2 degreed management consultant and college
3 professor, teaching leadership and management
4 programs. I presented testimony to the SEC
5 during the siting criteria process. I
6 testified in support of clear photo simulations
7 of wind turbines depicted face-on with the full
8 dimension of rotating blades against an
9 unobstructed blue sky background. I was
10 pleased that you agreed with my assessment, and
11 that of others, as representing a fair
12 depiction of a proposed industrial wind turbine
13 facility.

14 Today, I want to share and comment on
15 a few observations regarding the visual impact
16 testimony provided by Antrim Wind.

17 Within Criteria Number 8, it is
18 stated that photo simulations should include
19 the "view that closely matches human visual
20 perception, under clear weather conditions and
21 at a time of day that provides optimal clarity
22 and contrast". In support of this, it further
23 states "Turbines shall be placed with full
24 frontal views and no haze or fog effect

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 applied." The photos clearly indicate the
2 Applicant has failed to follow these criteria.
3 Note the Applicant's submission of a hazy view
4 of Gregg Lake. Notice how difficult it is to
5 see some very prominent wind turbines against a
6 hazy background.

7 Now, in the next picture, on the
8 following page, it becomes clear why the
9 Applicant submitted a hazy view of Gregg Lake
10 in 2016, when compared to the Gregg Lake photo
11 simulation back in 2012. Here, the turbines
12 clearly appear in Antrim Wind's earlier photo
13 when the hazy is removed.

14 Another quick comparison quickly
15 indicates how difficult it is to count the
16 number of turbines in a hazy background, as
17 depicted in this Franklin Pierce Lake photo
18 simulation. Compare this to the clarity of a
19 comparable photo simulation provided in Kellie
20 Connelly's testimony.

21 Further nighttime -- Further,
22 nighttime photo simulations and the assessment
23 from key observation points were not submitted.
24 Photo simulations should also include nighttime

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 conditions, since the FAA requires flashing red
2 strobe lights. Wind developers have claimed
3 that new systems will not need these strobe
4 lights, but, until Antrim Wind actually
5 receives FAA approval and can ensure the radar
6 detection will be in place during all times
7 during the night, the Applicant should be
8 required to follow the SEC criteria. A
9 nighttime photo simulation clearly indicates
10 the distraction that red strobing lights create
11 in a lake setting such as that proposed by
12 Antrim Wind.

13 Within SEC Criteria Number 7, it is
14 stated that photo simulations should include "a
15 sample of private property observation points".
16 It's interesting to note that LandWorks
17 dismissed the inclusion of White Birch Point
18 and Black Pond in the evaluation because they
19 are privately owned. The photo simulation by
20 Kellie Connelly clearly shows the dominance of
21 the turbines in the landscape. Additionally,
22 note the clarity provided by a blue sky
23 background.

24 LandWorks should only present the

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 data with an objective analysis. The visual
2 impact has been minimized by placing them in a
3 hazy background, which is clearly in violation
4 of the SEC criteria. Some locations have been
5 removed from the evaluation, though it was
6 clearly stated that a sample of private
7 property should be included in the analysis.
8 Further, nighttime photo simulations were
9 deleted due to a hope that the FAA would relax
10 the rules. The consultant indicated a
11 significant level of subjectivity by making
12 statements that go beyond the scope and role of
13 an objective consultant. The consultant stated
14 that turbines greater than 6 miles away really
15 are not visible. A field visit to Groton Wind
16 proves those turbines to be clearly visible
17 from Cardigan Mountain or the southern end of
18 Newfound Lake, which are well beyond 6 miles
19 away. The consultant further stated that how
20 you view turbines is related to how you view
21 wind energy and climate change. Subjectivity
22 appears confirmed through the high number of
23 low visual impact ratings throughout the
24 report. The inclusion of the term "reasonable

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 viewer" as interchangeable with the required
2 impact on the "typical viewer" further sounds
3 dismissive of anyone who might disagree.

4 I appreciate your time and
5 consideration and hope that you've found it to
6 be both valid and helpful preserving the
7 integrity of the application of the SEC siting
8 criteria.

9 Thank you.

10 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

11 Mr. LaRochelle, followed by Mr. Quinchia.

12 MR. LaROCHELLE: Good afternoon. My
13 name is Richard LaRochelle. And I own a camp
14 on White Birch Point. I have the oldest camp
15 that was built in 1910. And I've lived there
16 for 21 years. And I also own 20 contiguous
17 acres going around it.

18 And I've just got to say that, you
19 know, I've worked very hard to restore this
20 camp back to a camp from when I first purchased
21 it. And the camp is about halfway up Patton
22 Hill, which is the other side of Gregg Lake.
23 So, we basically will be looking at all of
24 these wind turbines. We were never contacted

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 by the Selectmen of Antrim. We've never been
2 contacted by Antrim Wind. And I think, you
3 know, we have the biggest impact on this
4 project. But, because most of the people that
5 have camps there are not residents of Antrim,
6 so we have taxation without representation,
7 basically, is what it comes down to.

8 And I just feel that, you know, when
9 I bought this property 21 years ago, how
10 beautiful it was, and that was the main reason,
11 you know, attending hikes at the Harris Center,
12 and, you know, other things through this area,
13 and how beautiful it was, made me buy this
14 camp. And, you know, I've put a lot of time.

15 So, my concerns are, you know, the
16 noise level, being directly across from this,
17 is it going to be a 24/7 hum all the time? The
18 light flicker at sunset, because, you know,
19 some of these turbines are facing us, and the
20 Sun sets behind them.

21 The night lights and, you know, on
22 the towers themselves, you know, that kind of
23 pollutes, you know, the night sky that we have
24 now.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 And, you know, the mitigation that of
2 them putting a sign up, you know, it's kind of
3 insulting. You know, you're going to destroy,
4 you know, this beautiful spot that I have, and
5 you're going to put up a little sign, you know,
6 which we could do if we wanted to.

7 We just celebrated our 100th
8 anniversary in 2013 as a group. Some of the
9 people that are there have been coming there
10 for 90 years, you know, since they were born.
11 And, you know, the fragmentation of the
12 wildlife corridor. I went to a meeting six or
13 seven years ago at the Harris Center, and this
14 was supposed to be a Super Sanctuary. This was
15 part of that corridor. And, now, you're going
16 to fragment it with these large commercial wind
17 towers in a rural conservation district, and
18 they will be some of the highest towers in the
19 area. And, you know, we'll set precedent in
20 the State of New Hampshire that you could put a
21 commercial development into a rural
22 conservation easement. And I just think that
23 just sets precedent because of that. And the
24 Town has, you know, voted against, to keep that

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 rural conservation.

2 And, I mean, what will the town --
3 the Town of Antrim actually gains, you know,
4 some tax dollars. I've lived there for 21
5 years and I've paid a premium to live there
6 part-time. My taxes are a lot higher than the
7 regular people that live in town. And, then, I
8 look at what my property value could decline
9 because of this, and, you know, what actually
10 is gained from this?

11 And, also, you know, I think it's
12 shortsighted of the town, you know, not to look
13 at Stoddard and, you know, the other
14 surrounding towns that get absolutely nothing
15 from this. All they get is the -- you know,
16 the unsightly look of the towers, and now on
17 their properties, with no -- there's no value.
18 You'll see it from Deering, you'll see it from,
19 you know, Stoddard, Hancock, and all the other
20 towns around there.

21 And I just think it's just, you know,
22 it's a shortsighted attempt at clean energy
23 that really is going to affect a pristine area.
24 And there's really not a lot of gain for the

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 state, and especially for the towns that
2 surround us.

3 And that's all I really have to say.
4 Thank you.

5 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
6 Mr. Quinchia. I apologize, I couldn't read the
7 "a" at the end earlier, and followed by
8 Mr. Jolly.

9 MR. QUINCHIA: SEC Subcommittee for
10 Antrim Wind, Robert Scott, Committee Chair,
11 thank you for allowing me the time to speak
12 here before you.

13 My name is Ivan Quinchia. And I'm a
14 resident of Hebron, New Hampshire, and we live
15 under the shadows of Groton Wind.

16 As an active participant in the SEC
17 rulemaking process, I am deeply disturbed by
18 the arrogance displayed by the Applicants for
19 the Antrim Wind Project and ignoring the
20 process and the rules.

21 Arrogance, because, in the process of
22 ignoring the rules, they are sticking their
23 thumbs in the noses of the SEC members,
24 organizations and the public that participated

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 through countless hours of testimony, review
2 and promulgation.

3 The following are my comments
4 relative to wildlife studies and
5 decommissioning.

6 Natural resources and wildlife: Only
7 avian, vernal pools and wetland studies were
8 done. This project is within a high value
9 wildlife habitat and fragmentation will have an
10 irrevocable effect on the natural environment.
11 Site 102.57, which is the definition of
12 "wildlife", means "wildlife" as defined in RSA
13 207:1, namely, "all species of mammals, birds,
14 fish, mollusks, crustaceans, amphibians,
15 invertebrates, reptiles or their progeny or
16 eggs which, whether raised in captivity or not,
17 are normally found in a wild state."

18 Site 301.07, the "Effects on the
19 Environment": "Information regarding the
20 natural environment, including the following:
21 Description of how the applicant identified
22 significant wildlife species, rare plants, rare
23 natural communities, and other exemplary
24 natural communities potentially affected by

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 construction and operation of the proposed
2 facility, including communications with and
3 documentation received from the New Hampshire
4 Department of Fish & Game, the New Hampshire
5 Natural Heritage Bureau, the United States Fish
6 & Wildlife Service, and any other federal or
7 state agencies having permitting or other
8 regulatory authority over fish, wildlife, and
9 other natural resources." And that was in
10 quotes.

11 Antrim Wind's bird/bat expert stated
12 that no studies were done for wildlife. No
13 waivers have been presented, only the mention
14 of phone conversations or acknowledgement of
15 documents received on specific subjects.
16 Antrim Wind says New Hampshire Fish & Game has
17 not requested any of the studies, however
18 Antrim Wind is required to provide studies
19 based on the application requirements in the
20 statute.

21 It was stated in testimony by Antrim
22 Wind consultants that they had emailed Fish &
23 Game and received no response. The consultants
24 did not provide the communication, so it's not

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 possible to determine what the nature of the
2 e-mail may have done. This is irrelevant as
3 the statute is very clear.

4 And the quotes: "Site 301.08
5 Effects on Public Health and Safety". Number
6 "(8) The decommissioning plan required under
7 (7) above shall include each of the following:
8 (a) A description of sufficient and secure
9 funding to implement the plan, which shall not
10 account for the anticipated salvage value of
11 facility components or materials; (b) The
12 provision of financial assurance in the form of
13 an irrevocable standby letter of credit,
14 performance bond, surety bond, or unconditional
15 payment guaranty executed by a parent company
16 of the facility owner maintaining at all times
17 an investment grade credit rating; (c) All
18 turbines, including the blades, nacelles and
19 towers, shall be disassembled and transported
20 off-site; (d) All transformers should be
21 transported off-site; (e) Overhead power
22 collection conductors and the power poles
23 should be removed from the site; (f) All
24 underground infrastructure at depths less than

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 4 feet below grade shall be removed from the
2 site and all underground infrastructure at
3 depths greater than four feet below finished
4 grade should be abandoned in place; and (g)
5 Areas with subsurface components are removed
6 should be filled, graded to match adjacent
7 contours, reseeded, stabilized with an
8 appropriate seed and allowed to re-vegetate
9 naturally."

10 This is from the decommissioning
11 document prepared by TRC, 14 Gabriel Drive, in
12 Augusta, Maine. "The removal of the
13 foundations will require the use of a hydraulic
14 excavator and a hoe-ram, an additional
15 excavator with a bucket, dozers, loaders, and
16 transport vehicles. Foundation removal will
17 start with the excavation of an approximately
18 8-foot deep trench around the perimeter of the
19 foundation adjacent to each foundation to
20 accept concrete rubble. The excavated material
21 will be stockpiled adjacent to the trench for
22 use in re-grading. An excavator equipped with
23 a hydraulic ram/impact hammer or comparable
24 equipment will then remove the top 24 inches of

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 the foundation. All the metal and cable should
2 be cut off at the new lower elevation of the
3 foundation so that there is nothing left
4 exposed above the concrete. The metal that is
5 cut off will be separated and recycled. The
6 concrete that is removed from the foundation
7 will be placed into the trench and topped with
8 the stockpiled excavated material. The site
9 then will be re-graded and seeded.

10 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: I'm going to
11 need you to finish up here.

12 MR. QUINCHIA: I'm almost done.

13 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: You're well
14 past five and a half minutes.

15 MR. QUINCHIA: The decommissioning,
16 as stated in the rules, fall under the SEC --

17 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

18 MR. QUINCHIA: The decommissioning,
19 as stated in the rules, falls under the SEC
20 jurisdiction as having sufficient funds to
21 un-assemble, recycle, and return the site to
22 its original condition. Although it is
23 customary practice to take existing
24 foundations, demolish and reclaim any

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 recyclables and use the rubble as backfill in
2 the process of building a new facility, road,
3 etcetera, there is no new facility being built
4 and the concrete additives and materials are
5 not indigenous to the ridge.

6 Also, the additional trenching for
7 the burial of construction debris at
8 decommissioning does not fall under the
9 original permit scope. Since this will be 50
10 years into the future, environmental
11 regulations may change the condition on
12 trenching and burial of construction debris on
13 a ridge line.

14 The turbine pads, as stated by the
15 Siemens engineer on this job, will be about
16 four feet thick and mostly above ground as they
17 will be anchored to bedrock. The site has to
18 be restored to original grade and all
19 infrastructure removed to 4 feet below grade,
20 not the 24 inches as stated in the
21 decommissioning document prepared by TRC.

22 Funding, as described in the
23 decommissioning document, "Antrim Wind, LLC,
24 has obtained a decommissioning estimate from

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Reed & Reed (see Attachment A) for the complete
2 decommissioning of the Project in accordance
3 with the plan set forth herein. The estimate
4 is \$2,775,000 pursuant to AWE's agreement with
5 the Town of Antrim.

6 An irrevocable letter of credit with
7 no inflation escalators like CPI would be
8 worthless in 50 years. The estimate of
9 \$2,775,000 has to be questioned as the Town of
10 Antrim is not an expert in the decommissioning
11 of wind farms.

12 Thank you to the SEC, Subcommittee
13 members and Subcommittee Chair Robert Scott for
14 continuing the process of inclusion and
15 fairness.

16 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
17 Mr. Jolly is next, followed by Mr. Gary
18 Lambert. What's the will of the Committee?
19 It's what, 12:30, we have probably 45 minutes
20 to an hour more of testimony. I'd prefer not
21 to have people waiting on us. What do you
22 think? Does everybody want to keep pressing
23 on?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Muscle on.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Okay.

2 DR. BOISVERT: Just a five-minute
3 break.

4 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Okay. So,
5 we'll take a five-minute break, and then we'll
6 start back with you. Thank you.

7 *(Recess taken at 12:28 p.m. and*
8 *the public comment hearing*
9 *resumed at 12:37 p.m.)*

10 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Okay. Thanks
11 for being patience, Mr. Jolly.

12 Again, Mr. Jolly, followed by Gary
13 Lambert, please.

14 MR. JOLLY: Are you ready, sir?

15 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Ready.

16 MR. JOLLY: Good afternoon. I had
17 prepared to say "good morning", but that isn't
18 working out.

19 My name is William Jolly. And I live
20 at 184 Orange Road, in the Town of Groton New
21 Hampshire. I've been involved intermittently
22 with these projects, observing and testifying
23 against them since the word "go".

24 The first one to come in my

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 neighborhood, as you all know, is Tenney
2 Mountain. And I was more involved with the one
3 that was supposed to go on Cardigan, the
4 Cardigan-Highland Range, because I'm a physical
5 abutter to the proposed project there, but that
6 seems to have lapsed.

7 With regard to Tenney Mountain, what
8 I'm going to speak about today, and I'll keep
9 it under four minutes I think, is specifically
10 the aftermath of what's happened in the Town of
11 Groton and the region around that.
12 Representative Brown spoke to it a little bit.
13 But I want to make sure that, as a resident of
14 Groton, you get some feedback as to what
15 happens.

16 You folks are inundated with new
17 projects. And, so, I assume, and I shouldn't
18 do that, but I assume that the aftermath is
19 something that you don't get to view very
20 often. I encourage you to come on up, take a
21 look at Tenney, if you haven't recently. We've
22 had a quality-of-life impact that is probably
23 irreversible, until we dig down the four feet,
24 bury it, and do something with the concrete.

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Specifically, what I'm going to speak
2 to, under quality of life, would be noise,
3 safety, real estate values, and other economic
4 interests or issues, and then viewscape.

5 I live on the Cardigan-Highland
6 Range, about a mile from the pavement, set way
7 back, because I moved up from Boston about 20
8 years ago to have peace and quiet. At a range
9 of about seven miles from the nearest turbine
10 that exists now in Groton, I can hear the
11 turbines. I can hear them at night. It is not
12 always ceiling-dependent. Although, when
13 there's a low ceiling, in other words, low
14 cloud cover, the sound will travel and bounce
15 along underneath; this morning it was
16 noticeable. At night, my viewscape is
17 impacted, because I can see blinking lights
18 where there were none.

19 So, the idea that the footprint of
20 this is isolated, perhaps it is isolated
21 physically to a certain point on the ground,
22 the impact, just if you used my place, is a
23 14-foot radius -- or, a seven mile radius, a
24 significant radius in all directions.

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 You can go to the Town of Ashland, by
2 Exit 24 on I-93, and, if you're fortunate
3 enough to have to change a tire there some
4 evening, you'll notice that you can hear and
5 observe the wind turbines from there as well.

6 So, one of the disadvantages that any
7 particular town has, and this happened to
8 Groton, is that we're speaking for ourselves,
9 but the issue spreads to communities that don't
10 have a say in the matter, and that's where you
11 step in, obviously.

12 With regard to safety, I would be
13 most concerned about ice. The ice that is
14 thrown on the Tenney Project is significant.
15 I've never run out there with a tape measure, I
16 don't know if I'm even allow up there. But I
17 would hope that any project that is allowed,
18 the setback requirements are such that ice
19 cannot be -- that ice would not reasonably be
20 expected to hit the property of an abutter, not
21 just the residence of an abutter. And I think
22 you should stick to that vehemently. And the
23 reason is that, by ice -- by allowing anything
24 like that to happen, where we look at the

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 residence or the building as being the issue,
2 that precludes the property owner, that didn't
3 ask for this wind turbine to come in, from
4 expanding and using the highest and best use of
5 his property. That diminishes his value.

6 And I'll speak to that directly. I
7 own 174 acres in the Cardigan-Highland Range.
8 It's two lots. And, at one point, in order to
9 raise capital, I attempted to sell my 86-acre
10 lot. I listed it for under \$500 an acre.
11 There aren't many 86-acre lots for sale in New
12 Hampshire anymore.

13 My realtor called me and asked,
14 because he was getting a lot of phone calls,
15 "whether or not you can see the turbines from
16 that lot?" And I had to tell him "of course,
17 you can. You can see the turbines."

18 We had, out of 100 and some odd phone
19 calls, we had five showings of that lot. Five.
20 No offers. Two of those offers were not -- or,
21 two people backed out specifically because of
22 the view of the turbines. So, for those who
23 say that it's "statistically insignificant",
24 this is the UNH study that says "the impacts on

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 real estate is statistically insignificant on
2 real estate values." I'd love for you to be
3 part of my outlier. Okay?

4 This is a significant issue for the
5 people in the area. Maybe statistically,
6 depending on the geographic range that you're
7 looking at, it's not significant. But
8 statistics are malleable, and Mark Twain has a
9 better quote than I can ever come up with on
10 that.

11 With regard -- so, that touches on
12 the values. I want to talk about --

13 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: And I do need
14 you to wrap up here.

15 MR. JOLLY: Yes. The only other
16 thing I would talk about is economic. And we
17 hear about jobs, I don't see any green shirts
18 here today, but we hear a lot about jobs. In
19 my area, I can think of, and I'm pretty
20 studious of it, three people that have jobs
21 because of the Groton Wind Project. One of
22 them lived in Groton already, the other two had
23 to be brought in, because, to work on turbines,
24 there's a special skill. And, so, there really

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 are no jobs created, people are being brought
2 in from other states.

3 I have about seven hours' worth of
4 other stuff to do. But what I'm going to do,
5 if it's all right, is just send that to, and I
6 hope that you review my notes, if I e-mail them
7 in.

8 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Yes. We'll
9 take written comment.

10 MR. JOLLY: Thank you.

11 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
12 Mr. Lambert, please.

13 *[No verbal response.]*

14 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Okay.
15 Mr. Gross, please, followed by Graham Enman.

16 MR. GROSS: Thank you. Resident of
17 Antrim 36 years. I supported the project
18 originally. I've supported it through its
19 manifestations and its modifications. I
20 support it now. Please let the project
21 continue.

22 Thank you.

23 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Short, but
24 sweet.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Okay. Next, Mr. Graham Enman again,
2 followed by Justin Lindholm.

3 MR. ENMAN: Graham Enman, 16 Pierce
4 Lake Road. I'm a lifelong resident of Antrim.
5 I am still in support of this project. And, as
6 everyone else who support it, I urge you to
7 accept this Application.

8 Thank you.

9 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
10 Mr. Lindholm, followed by Betsy Chatman.

11 MR. LINDHOLM: My name is Justin
12 Lindholm. I'm a property owner in Lempster,
13 New Hampshire, where my family lived for many
14 years. I've had property interests in Lempster
15 for more than 50 years myself. Iberdrola
16 approached me to put wind turbines on my land
17 in Lempster and I declined.

18 On one of my regular visits to
19 Lempster in early 2012, I noticed a tremendous
20 number of "For Sale" signs around the Iberdrola
21 Wind Project. I photographed every single "For
22 Sale" sign that I could find in the entire
23 town, to see if there was a pattern that would
24 show up on a map, after taking photos with a

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 GPS camera. Each photo is geo-tracked --
2 geo-tagged with the location, and the entire
3 photo set is here on the Internet site.

4 A professional photographer friend
5 created this map below to show the locations
6 using Google Earth and pushpins identifying the
7 locations of all the properties for sale. The
8 one area that did not have "For Sale" signs is
9 to the east, where there were hardly any
10 houses. There's also, down on Long Pond and
11 Sand Pond, over 100 part-time residents and
12 some full-time residences, not a single "For
13 Sale" sign was down there, which is over
14 two miles away.

15 Sometime later, I learned that a
16 study by Matthew Magnusson, a witness in this
17 Antrim Wind case, on the "Impact of the
18 Lempster Wind Power Project on Local
19 Residential Property Values" was released in
20 January 2012, the same month I noticed all the
21 "For Sale" signs clustered around the wind
22 project. I was amazed to read in the report
23 that "this study has found no evidence that the
24 Project has had a consistent statistically-

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 significant impact on property values within
2 the Lempster region." The geniuses on the
3 research team looked at property sales and
4 parcel records. Apparently, they never got out
5 of their offices to ride around the area and
6 see what was happening all around the wind
7 project.

8 The study does say, on Page 28,
9 "There were very few transactions within a very
10 close distance of the turbines, and also very
11 limited sales of properties with views of
12 turbines, so some caution must be used in
13 interpreting these results."

14 What is the most amazing is this
15 purported study of impacts to property values
16 in Lempster never once mentioned all the
17 properties for sale around the wind project.
18 Could the "very few transactions" that they
19 talked about be because nobody could sell their
20 properties near the wind turbines?

21 Incredibly, the study ends with a
22 claim "there is no evidence to suggest that the
23 Lempster Wind Power Project has had any
24 consistent, observable, statistically-

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 significant impact on property values in
2 Lempster or the communities surrounding the
3 Project." There is no evidence when the
4 researchers do not ask the right questions or
5 go out in the real world and look. Instead,
6 Matthew Magnusson seems to have designed a
7 study to reach a predetermined conclusion that
8 benefits his client. Any study of impacts to
9 property values in Lempster that does not
10 discuss all the properties for sale around the
11 wind project has no credibility as far as I'm
12 concerned.

13 Thank you.

14 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

15 Betsy Chatman, followed by Michael Behrmann.

16 MS. CHATMAN: Thank you. My name is
17 Betsy Chatman and I live in the Town of Antrim.

18 In 1999, my husband and I purchased
19 land on Salmon Brook Road, in Antrim, to build
20 our retirement home. Having spent our careers
21 in the public service sector, we were seeking
22 the peace and tranquility of living in nature,
23 free from noise and development, able to enjoy
24 the nighttime sky without the interference of

1 ambient light.

2 We looked at quite a few properties
3 during our search. When we found 42 acres at
4 the end of Salmon Brook Road, we knew that we
5 had found the perfect place. Located in the
6 "no man's land" at the edge of town, and in a
7 conservation district, we felt confident that
8 our tranquility was assured.

9 The advent of Antrim Wind has changed
10 all that. Our first experience with Antrim
11 Wind was finding a 10-foot white cross on our
12 property, presumably used as part of an aerial
13 survey. No one knocked on our door, sent us a
14 letter, or called on the phone to ask
15 permission to erect such a structure. A pretty
16 clear indication of the attitude of this
17 company. Now, I do understand that the Company
18 has changed hands. But, from the testimony
19 I've heard today, the attitude has not changed
20 even a little bit.

21 Now, while most people would find
22 discovering a white cross on their property
23 annoying, for my husband and myself, an
24 interracial couple, the connotation can be more

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 ominous. We made a police report, took
2 pictures, removed the cross, and posted "No
3 Trespassing" signs.

4 I've heard testimony here about all
5 the residents of Antrim receiving surveys in
6 the mail. Funny thing. Those of us who are on
7 Salem Brook Road, who are not abutters, never
8 received such surveys, whether from Antrim Wind
9 or from the Town. I heard about them, but we
10 personally never received one.

11 Both the voters of Antrim and this
12 Committee have rejected this project on more
13 than one occasion. Indeed, the only supporters
14 seem to be the Antrim Selectmen, and many of us
15 who will be the most seriously affected feel
16 like sacrificial lambs. The average property
17 owner in Antrim will suffer higher taxes. Some
18 of us will suffer much more.

19 The taking of a portion of our
20 property, the peace and quiet, the lack of
21 ambient light, that were the reasons that we
22 purchased this property in the first place, and
23 not for public use, but for the profit of a
24 private company, is unconscionable.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Thank you for your consideration.

2 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

3 Michael Behrmann, followed by Lori Lerner.

4 MR. BEHRMANN: Good afternoon. My
5 name is Michael Behrmann. I am here today on
6 behalf of New Hampshire Clean Tech Council,
7 which I'm the Director of, and the New
8 Hampshire Sustainable Energy Association, to
9 provide our support to the Antrim Wind Energy
10 Project, and to urge you to approve its
11 Application. For your reference, we did
12 previously submit written comments dated
13 February 19th, 2016, further detailing my
14 comments today.

15 The New Hampshire Sustainable
16 Association and New Hampshire Clean Tech
17 Council urge you to carefully consider the
18 breadth and depth of statutory support for
19 renewable energy sources evidenced in existing
20 statutes as you decide the future of this
21 project specifically, and wind siting
22 generally.

23 As the members are already fully
24 aware, the Legislature has previously deemed

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 renewable energy projects to be in the public
2 interest, a finding that must not be ignored
3 nor discounted in the SEC process. This
4 project has met, for all intents and purposes,
5 the required statutory standards for this type
6 of power generation and to submit it to
7 additional, unpredictable requirements severely
8 impacts the project, but also greatly
9 challenges wind development in New Hampshire
10 altogether; and at a time when we need more
11 clean energy development.

12 We also wish to stress the
13 significant economic development benefits and
14 opportunities this project will provide to the
15 Town of Antrim, the state, and our environment
16 and economic future. It provides New Hampshire
17 with a meaningful example of economic
18 opportunity and development, estimated at over
19 53 million for the Hillsborough County area
20 alone. This economic impact will reverberate
21 throughout those communities, and indeed the
22 state and region as a whole.

23 The matter before you will establish
24 a lasting precedent for all other wind

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 development in New Hampshire, and that economic
2 potential, along with environmental protection
3 it brings with it, must be accounted for when
4 weighing other factors.

5 For the reasons -- for those reasons
6 and those provided in our prior letter, we
7 strongly urge you to approve this Application.

8 Thank you.

9 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

10 Ms. Lerner, followed by mark Zankel.

11 MS. LERNER: Thank you, Chairman
12 Scott and Subcommittee members for allowing me
13 to speak today on the Antrim Wind docket.

14 The Antrim Wind project is the first
15 project to be reviewed under the new SEC rules.

16 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

17 MS. LERNER: I need to read your
18 sign.

19 The SEC rules were reformulated in
20 response to public outcry back in 2012, when
21 the public raised concerns with the ambiguous
22 and subjective language of the statute. There
23 was little trust by the citizens of New
24 Hampshire that projects were being evaluated in

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 a consistent, transparent manner. As a result,
2 there were a number of legislative bills
3 passed, I won't go through those, all serve to
4 require the statute and corresponding rules to
5 be rewritten to achieve the following goals:
6 Address the duration of the SEC review process;
7 better quantify the data presented by the
8 applicant; reduce subjectivity; provide greater
9 transparency and lead to more informed and
10 consistent decisions.

11 I attended every SEC rulemaking
12 meeting, and I actively participated in the
13 process. My direct and continued involvement
14 provided me the opportunity to observe the
15 Committee's deliberations and its intent as the
16 rules were being formulated.

17 I am here today to express my
18 concerns that both the letter and the spirit of
19 the rules, as adopted, are not being followed
20 in this docket, particularly in the area of the
21 SEC Subcommittee's ability to make an informed
22 decision, while also reassuring the public the
23 process has been completed in a transparent
24 manner. The information from the Antrim Wind

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Application, which has been further expanded
2 through prefiled testimony and the
3 cross-examination of the Applicant and its
4 witnesses, has made it abundantly clear, the
5 Applicant has not complied with the SEC rules
6 in many areas.

7 Thank you for the opportunity to
8 share the areas where I believe the Application
9 has not met the requirements of the rules.

10 Right out of the gate, on Site
11 202.19(b) -- or, actually, I'm sorry. As we go
12 through my testimony, I'd like you to bear in
13 mind 202.19(b), which states "An applicant for
14 a certificate of site and facility shall bear
15 the burden of proving facts".

16 Site 301.03 defines the required
17 "Contents of the Application". And Site 301.02
18 states "All information furnished shall appear
19 in the same order as the requirements to
20 provide that information appear in Site 301.03
21 through 09." Lack of compliance with these
22 rules is obvious in at least many of the
23 following significant areas: The first one,
24 which is the general, I just characterize as

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 "general", 301.03(c)(3) states that "The
2 location, shown on a map, of property lines,
3 residences," and so forth, you have it in front
4 of you. The map provided by Antrim Wind, which
5 I got from the Application, contains only the
6 property line of the project parcels, not that
7 of the abutters.

8 Next one: Visual impact. A lot of
9 this was covered, so I'm not going to repeat
10 it. I will say, though, that the failure for
11 them to have nighttime lighting is a pretty
12 significant impact, I would say. Nighttime
13 lighting for a wind project, for anyone that
14 lives nearby them, it looks like an airport
15 landing strip. So, to not have the residents
16 and the people living nearby understand what
17 that impact may be, as well as for the
18 Committee who is making the decision, I think
19 that's a huge lack of compliance on the part of
20 Antrim Wind.

21 Wildlife, that's been discussed.
22 There's no record of any studies beyond the
23 avian and bat studies.

24 For noise, the noise study from

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 February 2016 shows sound receptors with
2 circles showing the sound contours. Although,
3 if you look at the rule, it shows that
4 "Measurements shall be conducted at the nearest
5 properties from the proposed wind turbines at
6 all residential properties within two miles".
7 And, within that, it clearly states a "Layout
8 of the project area, including topography,
9 project boundary lines;" and also the "location
10 of all sensitive receptors, including schools,
11 daycare centers, health care facilities,
12 residences, residential neighborhoods" and so
13 forth.

14 This is -- is another example of
15 where the information may be contained in
16 another area of the Application, as was the
17 suggestion that we heard last week in
18 cross-examination on setbacks? Although, I
19 have been unsuccessful in locating it. The map
20 does not show property lines nor does the
21 location of the -- nor does it show the
22 location of the receptors. It only provides
23 the GPS coordinates for each receptor. Is it
24 the responsibility of the Parties to this

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 docket to determine the location of the GPS
2 coordinates? Their sound study fails to meet
3 the intent of the rules, which were intended to
4 ensure all parties impacted by this project
5 would have a good understanding of direct --
6 direct impact on them. People have to guess
7 what is their property and what is someone
8 else's?

9 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Ms. Lerner,
10 you're at five minutes now, and you're only
11 halfway through. So, if you could summarize,
12 we do have the written document.

13 MS. LERNER: Sure. In terms of
14 shadow flicker, if you look and you compare the
15 two, what's probably most telling is the rules
16 call for it to be out to one mile -- I'm sorry,
17 the rules call for the study to be done at
18 least from -- of at least one mile. And, also,
19 they're -- if you look at the Application, they
20 have changed that to out to one mile or within
21 one mile. But, in looking at the table that I
22 have on the next page, what's pretty clear is,
23 when you look at the change in the distance
24 from the old study done back in October, versus

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 the current study, the number of shadow flicker
2 hours has considered -- considerably increased.
3 As well, you have no idea what property they're
4 referring to, they only give the GPS
5 coordinates. So, unless someone is technically
6 savvy, it's really difficult to understand
7 where this property is that's receiving the
8 shadow flicker.

9 It also proves that there seems to be
10 a direct correlation between distance and
11 these -- and the amount of shadow flicker. If
12 the distance had been increased, instead of
13 being within one mile, if they had followed the
14 rules and considered going beyond one mile,
15 what would those results have been?

16 Within the setbacks, just to go
17 through that quickly, Antrim Wind may argue
18 that they met the letter of the rule. However,
19 providing the elements -- I'm sorry. Let me go
20 back, to the top of Page 5.

21 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Again, we do
22 have the written statement here. If you want
23 to just sum it up, because you're going on
24 seven minutes now.

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 MS. LERNER: Okay. So, bottom line,
2 the intent of this, the rules and what was
3 filed for the Application, are not connected.
4 I have gone through this Application very
5 closely. I understand the intent of the rules.
6 In this document here, I've quoted many of the
7 intents based on the Committee member
8 deliberations. And you can see, by reading my
9 document, that the rules were not followed.

10 The people here in this room today,
11 they have no idea what the noise level at their
12 home may be, what the shadow flicker is. For
13 shadow flicker, I'd recommend a zero hours,
14 because how is a person living in his home
15 going to determine how much shadow flicker they
16 are having so they can report that to you? The
17 only way to solve that problem is to have zero
18 shadow flicker hours. Otherwise, we're taking
19 a guess at that.

20 I'm sorry. I had a lot of material
21 here, and I wish I could have gotten through
22 it. But, hopefully, you'll read it very
23 carefully.

24 Thank you for this opportunity to be

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 part of this docket.

2 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

3 And thanks for the written comment.

4 MS. LERNER: Thank you.

5 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Mr. Zankel,
6 followed by Mr. Chris Condon, please.

7 MR. ZANKEL: Good afternoon, Mr.
8 Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Mark
9 Zankel. And I'm the State Director for the
10 Nature Conservancy in New Hampshire. Thank you
11 for this opportunity to comment on the Antrim
12 Wind facility proposal.

13 The Nature Conservancy's mission is
14 to conserve the lands and waters on which all
15 life depends. We've got a long history of
16 conserving land in this part of New Hampshire,
17 including in Antrim and Stoddard. Our
18 1,200-acre Loverens Mill Cedar Swamp Preserve
19 contains a globally rare Atlantic white cedar
20 swamp and is located a very short distance
21 north from the proposed project. And our
22 1,300-acre Otter Brook preserve lies due west
23 of the project area.

24 In addition to our efforts to

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 directly conserve lands and waters, the Nature
2 Conservancy has worked to advance clean and
3 renewable energy policies in New Hampshire and
4 across the nation as a way to meet greater
5 demand, while reducing carbon emissions and
6 ensuring the long-term health of our lands,
7 waters, and the biodiversity they support.

8 In our detailed comment letter of
9 April 8th, 2016, we addressed two of the
10 criteria that the SEC must consider when
11 evaluating a project: First, whether the
12 project will have an unreasonable adverse
13 effect on the natural investment. And, second,
14 will the project serve the public interest?

15 Our analysis focused on topics where
16 the Nature Conservancy has expertise. We're
17 not passing judgment on the project as a whole,
18 as we recognize that there are other factors
19 that the SEC must consider.

20 With regards to environmental and
21 natural resource impacts, we specifically
22 considered air quality, water quality, and the
23 natural environment. We focused on significant
24 wildlife habitat, forest fragmentation,

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 landscape connectivity, species of concern, and
2 exemplary natural communities.

3 Our analysis indicates that, while
4 the project will have impacts on the natural
5 and physical environment, including habitat
6 fragmentation and direct mortality of birds and
7 bats, the overall environmental impact is not
8 unreasonably adverse, and the Application
9 offers a reasonable package to help mitigate or
10 offset these impacts.

11 We do suggest that, if the SEC were
12 to approve the Project, it include the
13 following additional conditions: First, to
14 require post-construction invasive species
15 monitoring and control. And, second, to
16 require post-construction monitoring of bird
17 and bat mortality, consistent with the American
18 Bird Conservancy's principles for bird-smart
19 wind energy development.

20 The second area we explored was in
21 regards to the new criteria that energy
22 projects need to meet the public interest.
23 While all energy development will have impacts
24 and costs, there are unique and well-defined

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 public policy goals associated with renewable
2 energy. How a project balances impacts and
3 furthers these policy goals should be
4 considered by the SEC when examining if a
5 project meets the public interest test.

6 After reviewing this project in the
7 context of the state and region's energy
8 planning, the Nature Conservancy believes that
9 the proposed project meets the public interest
10 finding as put forward in RSA 162-H:16 and
11 further defined by the SEC rules.

12 The Legislature has determined that
13 investment in renewable energy is in the public
14 interest because of the potential economic and
15 clean air benefits these projects can provide.
16 This project responds to goals outlined in the
17 New Hampshire Climate Change Action Plan, meets
18 the requirements of the New Hampshire Renewable
19 Energy Standard, and meets the standards of the
20 New Hampshire Energy Policy as defined by RSA
21 378:37. And the project helps to address
22 climate and energy -- and clean energy
23 commitments made by the New England governors
24 and Eastern Canadian Premiers.

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 Thank you again for your time today.
2 Evaluating the benefits and impacts of energy
3 projects is rarely black-and-white. Our
4 conclusion is that the Antrim Wind Project will
5 have impacts on the natural and physical
6 environment, however, we believe the overall
7 impacts are not unreasonably adverse and the
8 project meets the public interest finding.

9 Thank you.

10 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
11 Mr. Condon, followed by Susan Duley.

12 MR. CONDON: Thank you for the
13 opportunity to speak today. My name is Chris
14 Condon. I'm a resident of Antrim. And I'm
15 here to speak in favor of the project.

16 In small towns, like Antrim, it's
17 always a struggle to balance development with
18 maintaining the rural character of our towns.
19 That's what it says in a lot of our master
20 plans all throughout New Hampshire. We want to
21 maintain the rural character of our town. We
22 want to protect our small businesses in town,
23 and we don't want big-box stores.

24 So, to me, very briefly, this sort of

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 project kind of fits that criteria. It doesn't
2 impact traffic. It doesn't add a lot of people
3 coming in and out of town. And, yet, it
4 supports our tax base and maintains the rural
5 character of our town.

6 Thank you very much for the
7 opportunity.

8 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
9 Ms. Duly, please, followed by Timothy Perry.

10 MS. DULEY: Hello. My name is Susan
11 Duley. I'm a resident of Concord, New
12 Hampshire. My sister is a resident of Antrim
13 and lives on Salmon Brook Road. I haven't had
14 much time to prepare comments. I've been out
15 of the country. But I've been to many of these
16 hearings.

17 And my bottom-line sentiment is that,
18 as a third attempt to get this project approved
19 by the SEC, it really does not represent much
20 that's been changed or different from the first
21 two projects. And, if the first two projects
22 were rejected by the SEC, it's curious to me
23 why this would merit any further favorable
24 review.

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 I believe this project is of a scale
2 that belongs in another area. It is way
3 out-of-scale for the Antrim -- for Tuttle Hill,
4 for Gregg Lake, for Willard Pond, I support
5 many of the comments that have been made
6 earlier about the environmental impacts, about
7 the flyway area that is affected by this, by
8 the conservation land.

9 It is notable that the voters of the
10 Town of Antrim twice decided not to change the
11 conservation easement for this area, which
12 indicates that they do not want that natural
13 conservation land to be altered or the use of
14 it changed.

15 There have been a number of specific
16 citations, some of them rather technical, that
17 indicate that the Application has ignored
18 specific SEC rules in a number of areas. I
19 would urge you to look at those very closely.

20 And I also believe that this has not
21 been a transparent project. It seems to me
22 that there's been a vested interest in the
23 leadership positions in the Town of Antrim to
24 engage this project and to negotiate a

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 go-forward agreement without full transparency
2 and without the full support of the town.
3 Again, comments have been made about that, and
4 I would encourage you to look more deeply into
5 those.

6 I don't believe the State of New
7 Hampshire needs a project of this nature. I
8 don't believe that the energy needs in this
9 state require the contribution, the fairly
10 minimum contribution of energy that this
11 project will generate. And it is small for the
12 State of New Hampshire; it is huge, it is a
13 devastating project, when you look at it for a
14 town of Antrim, a small town like Antrim. And,
15 so, to me, it is very out-of-balance,
16 out-of-scale.

17 The Tuttle Hill and Willard ridge
18 damage would be extensive, would be permanent.
19 You have heard many comments to that effect.
20 And I think, in effect, would have a very
21 negative impact on essential wildlife habitats,
22 on migration corridors, and in the long-term --
23 even in the long-term restoration of the land,
24 it will never really be fully restored to its

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 present condition.

2 More specifically, the noise, the
3 shadow flicker of this project bothers me and
4 affects me, because I know it will have an
5 effect on people who live in the immediate
6 area. The visibility of the turbines, living
7 with noise that has very negative effect on
8 people's health, mental health, physical
9 health, and living with the light, the
10 interruption of a peaceful and tranquil
11 environment with the light, is a very
12 significant effect for abutters. My sister is
13 an abutter. But also for other people in the
14 area. And you have heard again comments about
15 how this can travel out seven miles.

16 And, finally, Antrim Wind has gone
17 through many iterations, and now has other
18 supporters in the project. But has no
19 documented prior experience really to prepare
20 them for erecting the largest turbines in the
21 state. Why Antrim Wind? Why the largest
22 turbines? Why in this fairly low-level ridge?
23 And why, when the state really does not need
24 this contribution to its energy pool?

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 I urge you to continue your critical
2 assessment and reject this proposal. Thank
3 you.

4 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
5 Timothy Perry, followed by Mr. Buco.

6 MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, folks.
7 How you doing? As you know, I'm a resident of
8 Antrim. I live one mile from Gregg Lake. I
9 live on the corner of Gregg Lake Road.
10 Professionally, I am a network administrator at
11 a private school for special needs kids. That
12 means that I spend pretty much every day
13 surrounded by computers, routers, switches,
14 technology. What I do after work, virtually
15 every day and every weekend, is either hike
16 through New Hampshire or get in my kayak and
17 paddle through New Hampshire.

18 Gregg Lake, obviously, being just a
19 mile up the road from my house, is one of my
20 most frequent places that I kayak. Willard
21 Pond, being in town, even though you have to go
22 through Hancock to get there from heya [sic],
23 is probably the most beautiful piece of
24 property I know of in New England. Pillsbury

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 State Park, up in Washington, is also one of my
2 favorite places to paddle.

3 And I think that's the best
4 illustration of what we're looking at here. I
5 have frequently paddled on the different ponds
6 at Pillsbury State Park, and gotten to the far
7 end of the pond before I even remembered that
8 the wind farm in Lempster is actually there. I
9 have a video of myself sitting in that lake
10 with a loon and her babies, and you can hear
11 the babies peeping to mom, but you can't hear
12 those towers.

13 As I said, professionally, I'm a
14 network administrator. My wife, however, is a
15 climate researcher at UNH. So, I don't get the
16 day-to-day media version of climate change.
17 What I get is the day-to-day, in-the-trenches
18 details of what climate research is today.
19 Climate research today is not about whether or
20 not global warming is man-made. That's
21 accepted science amongst anybody in the field.
22 What they are dealing with now is looking at
23 how we can mitigate this and how big of a
24 problem we actually have.

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 As already been mentioned, we just
2 recently passed 400 parts per million of
3 atmospheric CO2; this is significant.
4 Historically, for the past million plus years,
5 we have had CO2 levels that were approximately
6 240 parts per million. The question of global
7 warming is not one of rising sea levels. It is
8 not one of a slight change, like perhaps what
9 we've been dealing with this summer, with the
10 worst drought that I've seen in New Hampshire
11 in my life. The problem is actually runaway
12 global warming, and this something that doesn't
13 get covered in the media. Right now, we're
14 looking at 400 parts per million. We are on
15 track to see 600 parts per million by the end
16 the century.

17 If we don't make significant changes
18 now, these changes will not be stoppable. If
19 we're worried about what the appearance, the
20 aesthetics at Gregg Lake or Willard Pond is
21 going to be because of a few wind turbines,
22 what is the appearance going to be with 800
23 parts per million of atmospheric CO2?

24 I'm already watching the maple trees

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 this year turn red one day and drop all their
2 leaves the next. That's not normal.

3 We have had numerous ballots in
4 Antrim. And every one that has directly
5 addressed "do we or do we not want the wind
6 turbines?" has been 70 plus percent in
7 agreement. The citizens of Antrim want this
8 project.

9 There's been a lot of talk about
10 taking a property. Abutters who may lose some
11 minimal value of their property, which all of
12 them claim they want to spend the rest of their
13 life on anyhow. So, resale is not really an
14 issue. As far as I'm concerned, that is pretty
15 much negated by the interests of the people
16 that own this property. If we do not allow
17 this, then we are taking their rights as
18 property owners.

19 I'm going to close real simply: I
20 urge you to approve this plan. Antrim Wind,
21 contrary -- again, I'm sure you folks have had
22 some interaction with Jack and John. There is
23 nothing arrogant about these people. They have
24 been as accommodating as any organization can

{SEC 2015-02} [Day 8/Morning Session ONLY] {10-03-16}

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 be to the concerns of the town, the abutters,
2 the state. We, as a state, need this, we
3 have -- the Legislature has passed legislation
4 asking for us to increase our renewable
5 resources.

6 Please think globally and act locally
7 and approve this project.

8 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.
9 Mr. Buco, now is your time.

10 While he's walking up, I had called
11 Mr. Gary Lambert, he didn't respond. Has he
12 showed up?

13 *[No verbal response.]*

14 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Don't see
15 that. Okay.

16 Mr. Buco.

17 MR. BUCO: My name is Josh Buco. And
18 I live at 80 Reed Carr Road, in Antrim. Me and
19 my wife decided to choose Antrim as our place
20 to live about two years ago. We loved it for
21 its peace, it's quiet. It's just all natural
22 beauty. And we wanted to raise our kids here.

23 So, in putting these windmills, if
24 it's approved, that's something that would be

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 ripped away from us and our kids. And, you
2 know, we urge you to please consider striking
3 it down and denying this Application.

4 You know, this is somewhere we did
5 want to spend, you know, our entire life
6 because of how beautiful it is. And, with this
7 going in, we would seriously consider moving
8 elsewhere. And that could be extremely tough
9 for us, as, you know, she is a stay-at-home
10 mom, and we have three children. We really
11 can't afford to do that. But it is something
12 that we would work hard at at doing. And I
13 don't think that's right for us.

14 So, that's really all I have. I do
15 thank you for this opportunity to just speak.

16 And thank you.

17 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: Thank you.

18 And thank you for your patience, too.

19 Okay. Seeing no others, that seems
20 to be all the questions [comments?] we have.
21 What we'll do is we'll take a 45-minute, and I
22 do mean 45-minute, not 50 or 60-minute, break
23 for lunch. And, then, we will start --
24 Mr. Enman, I warned you that I may not be able

[Hearing to receive public comment]

1 to go right to you, because I'm a little bit
2 worried about time and getting the Audubon
3 Society panel. So, I'm going to start with the
4 Audubon Society panel when we come back.

5 So, that was scheduled for three
6 hours. So, I don't know what that will do to
7 Mr. Enman. So -- there he is. In worst case,
8 if that bleeds over to the next day, I know we
9 keep -- you're like a ball we keep pushing down
10 the road here.

11 MR. ENMAN: I'll take financial
12 compensation.

13 [Laughter.]

14 PRESIDING OFCR. SCOTT: All right.
15 All right, thank you. So, we'll take a break.
16 Thank you.

17 (Lunch recess taken at 1:21 p.m.
18 and concludes the **Day 8 Morning**
19 **Session**. The hearing continues
20 under separate cover in the
21 transcript noted as **Day 8**
22 **Afternoon Session ONLY**.)