1	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE		
2	SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE		
3	Tonue 15 2020 6.00 pm (Float repided live		
4	January 15, 2020 - 6:00 p.m. (Electronically filed on 01-30-20) 13 Templeton Turnpike		
5	Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire		
6			
7	IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2019-02 SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:		
8	Application of Chinook Solar,		
9	LLC, for a Certificate of Site and Facility. (Public Information Session)		
10	(Tubite intermedian beables)		
11	PRESENT:		
12	Michael J. Iacopino, Esq., SEC Counsel (Brennan) (Presiding as Presiding Officer)		
13	Pamela G. Monroe, SEC Administrator		
14	ramera o. nomeocy blo naminibolacor		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23	COURT REPORTER: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52		
24			

1		
2	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Chinook Solar, LLC: Douglas L. Patch, Esq. (Orr & Reno)
3		Heath Barefoot, Project Director Joseph Persechino (Tighe & Bond)
4		Paul Callahan (NextEra) Dana Valleau (TRC)
5		Marc Wallace (Tech Environmental) Matthew Magnusson (Seacoast Econ.)
6		Michael Buscher (TJ Boyle)
7		Reptg. Counsel for the Public: Heather Neville, Esq.
8		Assistant Attorney General N.H. Department of Justice
9		Deparement of odderec
10		
11		
12		
13		
1 4		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
2 4		

1		
2	INDEX	
3		PAGE NO.
4	SUMMARY OF THE PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION	
5	AGENDA BY ADMINISTRATOR MONROE	4
6	SUMMARY OF THE SEC PROCESS BY PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO	5
7		
8	PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT BY:	
9	Mr. Barefoot	25
10	Mr. Wallace	30
11		
12	Q&A SESSION	35
13		
14	PUBLIC COMMENT BY:	
15	Dana Pinney	50
16	Suzanne Fournier	51
17	Patricia Martin	5 9
18	Stephanie Scherr	61
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

PROCEEDING

ADMIN. MONROE: Thank you, everyone.

My name is Pam Monroe. I'm the Administrator

for the Site Evaluation Committee. And with me

tonight is Mike Iacopino, he serves as Counsel

to the Committee.

I have a few things up here. If people don't have them, I will give you a few minutes to come up. I have a copy of the agenda for the meeting tonight. I have the presentation that Mike and I are going to do.

And then, I also have the -- ask if you have questions, after you hear the presentations, if you could please write them down. We'll collect them, and then we'll have them answered in an orderly fashion.

And if you're interested, after we finish with all that, there's a yellow form, if you want to speak about the project, what you think about the project, there's a public comment session, and we'll just open it up for people to come up.

So, if you raise your hand, I'll bring you all that stuff. Anybody need

1 anything?

2 [Asking for show of hands.]

ADMIN. MONROE: Okay. Well, without further adieu, I will turn it over to Attorney Iacopino.

PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Good evening.

Good evening, everybody. My name is Mike

Iacopino. I'm a lawyer from Manchester, New

Hampshire, where I practice with the law firm

of Brennan Lenehan. I have had the privilege

since approximately 1998 of acting as outside

counsel to the New Hampshire Site Evaluation

Committee.

We're here tonight for a public information hearing, which is one of the first public steps that the Committee takes in bringing a project that is before the Committee to the public.

First thing that you need to know is that all of your questions should go to Pam Monroe. She is our Administrator, her email, the website, and her telephone number are up there on the screen right now. She is very cooperative and very helpful. So, if you have

questions or concerns, she should be your first point of contact. She may refer your question to me, if it's something legal, or she may refer you to a state agency, if it has something to do with state agency involvement.

But our purpose tonight, from the Site Evaluation Committee's view, is to tell you about what the Site Evaluation Committee is and how it operates. After we're done with that, you'll hear the specifics of the proposed project from those folks who are here to represent Chinook Solar.

So, let's start off with the purposes of the statute. This is really a balancing statute. And the number of the statute is RSA 162-H. As lawyers, we call that an "enabling statute". That's the legislation that gives the Site Evaluation Committee its authority to act.

And the first part of the statute deals with the purpose, why it is there. It's designed to balance benefits and impacts, to balance the benefits and impacts of the selection of sites for energy facilities, such

as this solar facility, considering the welfare of the population, private property, the location and growth of industry, the economic growth of the state, historic sites, aesthetics, air and water quality, the natural resources, and public health and safety. Quite a few things, as you can see, to balance.

Also, part of the purpose of the Site Evaluation Committee is to avoid undue delay in construction of new facilities. Also, and very important, to provide full and timely consideration of all environmental consequences. And, finally -- oh, and to provide, as we're starting to do here tonight, full and complete public disclosure. And, then, finally, to make sure that the selection of sites, construction, and operation of energy facilities, such as the solar facility that is proposed for this town, are treated as a significant aspect of land use planning.

So, the Site Evaluation Committee really has a big job. There's a lot of things to balance. Basically, it's like a planning board for energy facilities in the state. It's

designed to integrate all of the various

permitting processes. If you think of, if

someone came to Fitzwilliam and wanted to put

in a Walmart or a shopping mall, you can think

of all the permits that they would have to

apply for in order to do that. The Site

Evaluation Committee process for energy

projects sort of becomes a big funnel. All

those state agencies are involved, but all the

permitting comes down to the Site Evaluation

Committee.

We do preempt the local authority, that's your zoning board, building inspector, planning board may have. And, basically, we provide a one-stop shopping experience, if you will, for energy facilities, but also for folks who are involved and want to have a say in where and how those energy facilities are or are not constructed. So, that's basically what the Site Evaluation Committee is.

Who makes up the Site Evaluation

Committee? Those folks up on the screen are
the regular Committee members. Dianne Martin,
who is the Chair of the Public Utilities

```
1
         Commission, serves as the Chair of the Site
         Evaluation Committee. And the Commissioner of
 2
 3
         the Department of Environmental Services,
         Robert Scott, serves as the Vice Chair of the
 4
 5
         Committee. The Committee consists of the two
 6
         other Public Utilities Commissioners; Mike
 7
         Giaimo and Kathryn Bailey currently hold those
         positions. The Committee also consists of our
 8
 9
         Commissioner of the Department of
10
         Transportation, Victoria Sheehan.
                                             The
11
         Committee also consists of the Commissioner of
12
         the Bureau of Economic Affairs, this is a new
13
         one, they split up a state agency. I believe
14
         it's called the Department, is it --
15
                   ADMIN. MONROE: Business and Economic
16
         Affairs.
17
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: The Department
18
         of Business and Economic Affairs. And that's
19
         Taylor Caswell, who's the Commissioner for that
20
         department. And then, the other department,
21
         these two used to be combined, is the
22
         Department of Natural and Cultural Resources.
23
         And Sarah Stewart is the Commissioner of that
24
         particular agency, also sits on the Committee.
```

We have two members of the public.

These are folks who are not state employees,
they're not commissioners, who sit as our
regular public members, or what we sometimes
call "full public members". There are other
public members as well. But the two who are
the full public members are Susan Duprey and

8 George Kassas.

Now, this is what I meant when we talked about "full public members" and "other public members". Susan and George are regular members of the Committee. However, we have three additional members who are there so that, when we have a number of these projects going on at one time, we have the manpower to consider them. And the three other public members are Robert Baines, Thomas Eaton, and Lisa Noe.

And each time that a subcommittee is created for an energy project, such as has been done in this case, the public members are drawn out of a Boston Red Sox hat in a random draw method.

So, for this particular

Subcommittee -- for this particular project,
the Subcommittee consists of Dianne Martin, she
will be the Presiding Officer. If there are
procedural issues to be determined, the
Presiding Officer is the person on the
Committee who will decide those issues. So,
things like "when are we going to have
hearings?", you know, "what will be the order
of presentation?", if there are some objections
to evidence, the Presiding Officer is the
person who deals with those things.

Also sitting on this particular case is Rene Pelletier. Now, he's been designated by Bob Scott, the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Services, to sit in his place. Some of our state agencies have the ability under the statute to designate a senior administrator in their department or a staff attorney from their department to sit in their place. So, Mr. Pelletier will sit in the place of Bob Scott. And Bill Oldenburg, from the Department of Transportation, will sit in place of the Commissioner of Transportation.

Wildolfo Arvelo will sit in the place of Taylor

1 Caswell from Business and Economic Affairs.

2 Benjamin Wilson is actually a member of the

3 Committee. And the statute actually says

4 either "the Commissioner of the Department of

5 Natural and Cultural Resources or the Director

of the Division of Historical Resources" can

7 sit. And, in this particular case, Mr. Wilson

8 will sit on this particular Committee. And our

9 two public members are Susan Duprey and Thomas

10 Eaton.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, those are the folks that are going to come here on February 20th for the public hearing and listen to anything you all have to say. They're the folks who are going to sit on this case through -- until there's a decision on it. And that includes holding trial-like hearings, likely to be held in Concord, but to actually hold what we -- the lawyers have fancy words for, they're called "adjudicative hearings". But it's like a trial, like you see on TV, where there will be witnesses and cross-examination.

And the public is represented by Counsel for the Public. The Counsel for the

Public is an Assistant Attorney General in most cases, sometimes a Senior Assistant Attorney General. And her purpose is to represent the public in seeking to protect the quality of the environment and to assure an adequate supply of energy.

Counsel for the Public is treated
like a party in any case. If you think of a
criminal case, there's a prosecutor and a
defense lawyer, they have certain rights before
the court, the same thing here. Counsel for
the Public has all the same rights as any other
party would have in a proceeding.

In fact, Counsel for the Public can engage consultants. She can engage her own legal counsel, if she thinks she needs it. And that's all at the cost of the applicant.

In this particular case, Heather

Newell is our -- Heather Neville, I'm sorry, is

our Counsel for the Public. If you could stand

up and introduce yourself please.

MS. NEVILLE: I'm Heather Neville.

I've been appointed. My contact information is on the slide. If any of you wants a word with

```
1
         me after the discussion ends, I would be
 2
         happy to --
 3
                         [Court reporter interruption.]
                   ADMIN. MONROE: She'd "be happy to
 4
 5
         talk with you as well."
 6
                   MR. PATNAUDE: Okay.
 7
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: That's another
         thing about Site Evaluation Committee hearings,
 8
9
         everything is recorded verbatim by our
10
         excellent court reporter over here
11
         [indicating]. So, if you do speak tonight, or
12
         at any time at one of our hearings, you should
13
         make sure that you speak in a manner that is
14
         not too fast, that is loud enough to be heard,
15
         although you have great microphones here, and
16
         make sure you enunciate your words, so that we
17
         can get all of everything that everybody has to
18
         say down into the record.
19
                    The next thing I want to talk about
20
         is, and we just said that you can call Pam or
         you can talk to Heather about your questions or
21
22
         concerns about projects like this, but people
23
         that you can't talk to, okay? You can't talk
```

 $\{SEC\ 2019-02\}\ [Public\ Information\ Session]\ \{01-15-20\}$

to the members of the Site -- of the

24

```
1
         Subcommittee themselves. The reason being is
 2
         because they sit as judges. This is a
 3
         quasi-judicial proceeding. So, there is a rule
 4
         against what lawyers call "ex parte
 5
         communications". What that means is, they're
 6
         not supposed to talk to people unless all of
 7
         the parties to the action are present.
         Oftentimes we have people -- we'll have, for
 8
 9
         instance, if we had the Committee here, they
10
         would be lined up at a table. Many times we
11
         have people come up and you just want to be
12
         friendly and talk to them. Pam or I are going
13
         to probably shoo you away. We'll try to do it
14
         politely, because we want to avoid any
15
         situation where the members of the Subcommittee
16
         can be accused of having heard some piece of
17
         evidence that wasn't available to all of the
18
         parties. And they are actually required by
19
         statute not to communicate directly or
20
         indirectly with any person or party in
21
         connection with any matter pending before the
22
         Site Evaluation Committee.
23
                   And that's why the first thing that I
24
         told you today is any questions that you have
```

or any concerns that you have, in the first instance should be brought to Pam, and, in the event that there is a better person to deal with your concern, she will direct you to that person.

But, again, please, if our Committee members, if it seems as though they're being rude or whatnot, they're not. They're just —they're governed by this law, and they're not permitted to have ex parte communications.

How long does this all take? Well,

I'm going to go through the timeline. And it's
a fairly long timeline, but it ends at 365 days
from the date that the Application was
accepted. So, let me take you through it.

Okay. Some of this has already occurred. At some time before the Chinook

Application was filed, at least 30 days before the filing, the Applicant, I believe they came here, Doug, was it in this billing? Came here, and they had what they call a "Pre-Application Public Information Session". And I understand that that took place on July 18th. That's not something that the Committee itself was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

involved in. But that's sort of the first public event in our timeline.

Once the Application is filed, and in this case it was filed on October 18th, the Administrator sends it out to all of the agencies, state agencies, who might have jurisdiction or other regulatory authority over any aspect of the proposal.

We also designated a Subcommittee on November 8th. And the word "expeditiously" is there is because that's what the statute says we're supposed to do, we're supposed to do things expeditiously. And the state agencies who we sent the Application out are required to review that Application in an expeditious fashion, and get back to us within 60 days to tell us "is this Application complete for their purposes?" And, in this particular case, all of the relevant state agencies did get back to us and determined that the Application was complete for their purposes. And the Subcommittee held a hearing on the Application, after having reviewed it, and said the Application is complete, and they accepted the

Application -- was it December 17th? -- was the date that we accepted the Application. And that's the date that most of our other timelines run from, the date of acceptance of the Application.

Now, mind you, "acceptance" doesn't mean that they're going to grant the certificate. It just means that there was sufficient information in the Application for the case to proceed. Okay?

The next step in our timeline is what we're doing tonight, is to hold a Public

Information Session, so that the public can learn about the project and learn about the Site Evaluation Committee process.

Our next step, you'll actually meet our Subcommittee, and that will be at a Joint Public Hearing, right here, in Fitzwilliam.

And it will occur on February 20. We're required to do it within 90 days from acceptance of the Application. And that's called a "Joint Public Hearing", because preferably there will also be representatives from the various state agencies here. So, the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Subcommittee of the Site Evaluation Committee will be here, as will, hopefully, representatives from the various state agencies.

And then, we go into our sort of pre-adjudicative process. The agencies will do a deeper dive into the Application, and especially those aspects that, for instance, DES will deal with environmental issues, the Division of Historic Resources will take a deeper dive into historic resources and archeological resources are affected by this project. And they will give preliminary reports to the Site Evaluation Committee by May 15th, 150 days after the acceptance of the Application. And those preliminary reports, once filed, will be available on our website. This is all a public hearing, and these reports are all public, unless there is something secret in them. And I will tell you, there are statutes in New Hampshire which require confidential treatment of things like where there might be archeological resources. So, in some cases, you will see what's called a

"Motion for Protective Order" filed on things like that.

The agencies, after giving their preliminary reports, give us their final reports, in this case, by August 13th, and which is 240 days after the acceptance of the Application.

And then, we begin our adjudicative process, the trial process, if you will. And that's going to start no earlier than August 13th, this coming summer. And then, that proceeds just like you see on TV. There will be witnesses and cross-examination. There will be memos of law filed.

And, ultimately, the Site Evaluation

Committee Subcommittee will sit in front of you all and deliberate. And they're actually required to deliberate in public. And they'll vote the project up or down. They will vote to either grant the certificate or deny the certificate. And then, a written order will come out.

Seems like a long timeline, but you'd be surprised how fast it goes. But, during the

course of that time, we have lots of opportunities for public participation. It began before even the Site Evaluation Committee was involved. One of the things that the Applicant is required to file with their Application is the transcript of the Pre-Application Information Session. So, that's already been filed along with the Application. So, there's been public there.

There is tonight, anybody who wishes to give input or ask questions tonight, that will all become part of the record of our proceeding. There will be the public hearing that's on February 20th in front of the Subcommittee. And the Site Evaluation

Committee accepts written comments from the public all the way through until the evidence is closed in the adjudicative process. So, literally, up to the day that they vote on whether to grant or deny a certificate, they will consider any written comments.

There are also, on occasions, times when we will, during the trial process, set aside an hour or two for public comment at that

time. To learn if we're going to do that, you have to follow the scheduling notices that will come from our Chairperson.

There's another way to intervene. If you believe that the project affects you individually, or affects a group that you might belong to, you can also file a petition to intervene. Those are due tomorrow -- day after tomorrow.

ADMIN. MONROE: By Friday.

PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: By Friday.

And, in order to have a motion to intervene granted, you've got to show that you have a demonstrable interest in the outcome of the proceeding. If you wish to intervene as a party, you will be requested to act like a party, to come to the hearings, to act in accordance with the Site Evaluation Committee rules, if you were granted intervention status, and, you know, you have to -- you have to play by the rules.

Of course, everybody who has an interest in the proceeding has a right to counsel at your own expense. And if you were

to intervene in the proceeding, you could hire a lawyer to represent you, if your intervention was granted, or you could hire a lawyer to move for your intervention as well. So, those are the areas where the public can be involved in our cases.

What does the Site Evaluation

Committee have to find? What is it that they actually do? There are certain criterias -
criteria and findings that the statute, our enabling statute, as I said before, the statute that gives authority to the Site Evaluation

Committee, requires that the Site Evaluation

Committee consider certain things.

The first is whether the Applicant has adequate financial, technical, and managerial capabilities to site, construct, and operate the project, in a manner that would be consistent with the certificate and any conditions that are in the certificate.

The second consideration that the Site Evaluation Committee must determine is whether the project will unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region, giving

due consideration to the views of municipal agencies, regional planning agencies, and municipal governing bodies. So, the Site Evaluation Committee will consider the views of the board of selectmen, the planning board, any of these agencies that come forward and present their views, those will be considered. Now, as I said before, the Site Evaluation Committee does not have to follow them, nor does the Applicant have to go through your local procedures. But the Site Evaluation Committee by law must consider those views.

And the Site Evaluation Committee, in order to grant a certificate, must find that the project, the siting, construction or operation of the project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air and water quality, the natural environment, public — and the public health and safety. And, finally, the Committee must determine whether or not the project will serve the public interest.

All of those things are considered by the Site Evaluation Committee. And if you've

ever gone to one of our deliberative sessions, where the Site Evaluation Committee is determining whether to grant a certificate or not, you will see that they go through each and every one of those things, just like chapters in a book. And they consider each one of them before they get to a final decision as to whether or not to grant the certificate.

Again, our contact information:

First, your first point of contact should be

Ms. Monroe, and her information is up there.

So, I guess we'll move on to the next part of our agenda, which is the presentation by the Applicant. But, just so you know, you're going to have the ability to ask questions. And, if you have questions on anything that I've spoken about, I'm here to answer them. But we'll do that in the question portion of the agenda.

Thank you.

MR. BAREFOOT: Hello. Good evening, everyone. My name is Heath Barefoot. And I'm a Project Director with NextEra Energy. And I'm here to talk to you tonight about Chinook

Solar. This is the second opportunity that
I've had to visit and share information about
this facility here in Fitzwilliam. And, once
again, I thank all of you, members of the
public and representatives of the Town, and, of
course, the Committee, for allowing the project
team and myself tonight to be here.

So, Chinook Solar is a facility being proposed by NextEra Energy. NextEra Energy is the world's leading generator of energy from the wind and the Sun. We have 90 solar projects operating in 36 states. And, since 2004, we deployed more than \$85 billion worth of energy infrastructure. And we think that this demonstrates our commitment to the communities in which we work, to successfully design, build, construct, operate renewable energy generating facilities.

Chinook Solar is a 30-megawatt photovoltaic solar generation facility proposed here in the Town of Fitzwilliam. It's located east of Town, south of Route 119, and east of Route 12. And it will lie on land that historically has been logged for timber. And

its footprint will be 110 acres.

We have filed an Application for Site and Facility with the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. That was done back in October. And, of course, tonight is a continuation of that process.

If we successfully secure a permit, we anticipate beginning construction in the Winter of 2020 into 2021. And we would target a commercial operation date of October 2021.

We've heard a pretty good amount of detail on the SEC process already tonight. I won't go into that in further detail in my presentation. But, of course, if we have specific questions afterwards, we'd be happy to address any of those.

We've engaged in a lot of work. Our panel of experts and engineers have been busy surveying, analyzing, investigating various aspects of the project, as it relates to the environment, as it relates to aesthetics, the overall design of the facility. And we're very proud of the results. We achieved a design, a structure that we think fits very well with the

proposed location. And many of these reports are all available as part of our Application, which may be found both at the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee's website, and hard copies also have been made available here to the Town as well for the public to review.

None of this has happened in a vacuum. We have continuously consulted with various agencies in -- here in New Hampshire.

We've investigated or sought advice on any area of interest. That feedback has along the way been incorporated into our design plans. And we have demonstrated a consistent effort in trying to communicate with the agencies, to ensure that we have a successful project.

Notably, you know, Fish & Game consults with any species of interest; for example,

Alteration of Terrain, of course, for storm water management.

In parallel, we've also shared information here in the Town, with the Planning Board and the Selectboard, and tried to -- we've consistently followed up to share that information with the public.

Throughout this process, this has led us to ultimately achieve a design which we feel very confident works with the location, and one which we think the community can also be proud of. It is optimized in a variety of ways. The site makes use of, to the fullest extent possible, of existing logging roads. Given the history of tree — logging on the site, we've minimized potential for tree-clearing. We've avoided any direct impact to wetlands.

There are certain design features that are incorporated that allow mobility of wildlife. There are gaps in the fence line that allow that to occur. There are also gaps in the bottom of the fences that, for example, allow turtles to migrate from wetlands during breeding season, up to the highlands, and as well as small mammals and other wildlife to move throughout the facility.

Also, notably, there are two high-voltage transmission corridors that run adjunct to where the project is located. The first of which is a 345 kV transmission line, and then, in addition, there is a two-circuit

115-kilovolt transmission line.

So, the benefits are clear. This project will deliver clean, reliable energy that helps the region achieve carbon reduction goals. It will also provide construction jobs locally, once construction begins. And while being a passive land use, once it is finished, it will continue to pay stable property tax revenue to the Town over the life of the project.

So, for all those reasons, we feel that we've designed a great facility, and one that we're very optimistic in moving forward with. Thank you.

We brought Marc Wallace with us. He is our sound -- our sound expert. And we know last time when we were here there were a lot of questions about sound. And it's very difficult to kind of discuss sounds in abstract terms. So, we thought a little demonstration here might be helpful.

MR. WALLACE: My name is Marc
Wallace. I am with Tech Environmental. And
I'm a vice president at the firm. I'm also the

Project Manager for the Chinook Solar Sound Study.

I was asked to give a demonstration tonight of what the sound would be from the project, versus what we might measure in this room. So, I'm going to give an overview of the sound study that we did. And then, I'll do a brief demonstration of the sound that we're measuring in the room.

But, first, I'd like to talk about how sound is measured. It's measured with a sound meter, it's measured in decibels, or dB, that's the abbreviation for it, and, typically, it's measured in A-weighted scale, because it's frequencies that people tend to hear. So, the numbers that you see are on a dBA level.

What we did, as part of our sound study, was performed an ambient survey, where we took measurements of sound from the project site area. We set up a long-term sound meter in the center of the site. And we collected measurements over a 24-hour period. The quietest hours that we had, and that occurred in the daytime and the nighttime, the sound

level was 23 decibels, or dBA, during the daytime, and 20 decibels at night.

We then performed an acoustic modeling analysis, which was done with a three-dimensional sound model. We included receptor points that represented 51 homes surrounding the site. We took into account terrain and atmospheric conditions. And we also put in the sound sources, the inverters and the transformer and their predicted sound levels.

The model then predicted the sound levels at each of the homes. And those sound levels range from 5 decibels to 26 decibels, which is shown on the chart over to the right over there. And that also shows what the sound levels would be from other types of sources.

Those sound levels were then added to the background sound levels. So, the sound levels that we collected establish a baseline condition. The total sound was then compared to the ambient conditions. And that incremental change is what we compared to the state and the Fitzwilliam noise ordinance,

which is based on a 10-decibel, or dBA, level above ambient.

For most of the homes, the sound levels were reading zero to 3 decibels, which are imperceptible by people. And at a few homes that were closest to the project, we did have sound levels that were above 4 to 6 decibels above the ambient condition. But, keep in mind, those were based on when the facility is running at max power and when -- at the quietest conditions.

So, what I'm going to do now is talk a little bit about this demonstration. So, what I have here is a iPad, that has its own microphone, but we've attached one of our microphones, which is a laboratory-calibrated microphone, which is sensitive to plus or minus 1 decibel. So, it's much more sensitive than the one that's with the iPad itself.

The iPad is now communicating with the computer, which is then showing you what it's measuring for sound in the room. And it's primarily myself, you know, conversing with you folks.

So, what I'd like to do is, I'll just stop talking and we can measure the sound within the room, so that we can compare that to what the project sound level is.

[Short pause.]

MR. WALLACE: So, it's registering about 39 decibels. Which is about 15 decibels higher than what we would be expecting from the project from its maximum sound level.

To give that some kind of perspective, you know, for every doubling of sound, you get -- for every 10-decibel increase, I'm sorry, there's a doubling of sound. So, with a 15-decibel increase, it's about three times as loud in this room than what the project is going to be doing.

So, for example, if you were at home, and you had your television, and say you set it at 20, and then you raised it to, say, 60, that would be about a 15-decibel increase in sound, or about three times as loud. So, at least it gives you a better perspective of what the sound is in this room, compared to what the project is going to be emitting.

```
1
                    So, that's my brief demonstration of
         the sound. And I'd be willing to take any
 2
 3
         questions during the Q&A portion of the
         meeting.
                   Thank you.
 4
 5
                   ADMIN. MONROE: Okay. That ends the
 6
         presentation portion of the meeting.
 7
                    So, does anybody have a green form or
         would like to fill one out? Do you have
 8
9
         questions that we can take?
10
                   Because we have a few up here that we
11
         can go through, but I'll hand these to anybody
12
         who want them?
13
                   Okay, let me come get that.
14
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: I'll start
15
         with the first two questions that we have, and
16
         they both appear to be for the Applicant.
17
                   The first one is, goes as follows:
18
         "As a property owner, my taxes are excessive.
19
         Will this solar development cause our real
20
         estate taxes to decrease? Please quantify."
                   Whoever from your team you want to
21
22
         address that, that is fine.
23
                   MR. BAREFOOT: I'll just say that the
24
         project is negotiating with the Town on a
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Payment in Lieu of Taxes Agreement, which would provide tax stabilization, in terms of the revenues the Town would receive and the tax exposure that the project will face. I think there's a mutual benefit to both parties in having an agreement such as that in place.

With respect to what that would do to the Town's tax roll, I don't have any information available on that.

PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Okay. The next question is a lengthy one, and I will read it as it was written: "When you were here last you stated that your sound study showed that only four residences would be impacted by the noise from the solar arrays transformers. term "impacted" is a industry euphemism used to soften the real issue. The real issue is that these households will be harmed by the noise. What changes have you made to the design since your last visit to mitigate the harm that will be inflicted on these residents? Have you designed a sound wall, integrated isolation strategies, considered encapsulation or other reasonable accommodations? You said that you

want to be a good partner in our community. I look forward to hearing your response regarding the measures that you have built into your new design to alleviate this concern."

I figured you would take it.

MR. WALLACE: So, we haven't changed anything in our sound study from what was presented during the pre-application meeting back this summer. I will say that, you know, we have taken into account a lot of different things within our model to address the potential sound from the transformers.

The size of the transformer is pretty small. The other portion to it is that, you know, it's for a solar project. It's not for a large substation or a typical type of substation.

And, when we did our sound study, I know there were concerns about tonal issues, and we addressed that in our current study. We looked at different tones from the transformers, as well as from the inverters.

We compared that to the Fitzwilliam tonal noise ordinance portion of that. And there were no

tonal sounds that would be impacted at any of those homes. The sound levels being 4 to 6 decibels at a few of those homes are on the level, again, where we're assuming maximum operation of the facility, and comparing that to the quietest hour, which is generally not going to be case.

And I would also like to point out
the fact that, when we did our ambient sound
survey, we captured very ideal conditions for
the lowest ambient sound conditions. So, when
we are looking at that incremental change, it's
very conservative from the standpoint of we're
looking at maximum sound level conditions from
the project and comparing it to a very low
background sound level. So, in those cases,
where we're seeing a 4 to 6 decibel increase,
it's slightly noticeable for those people.
But, again, it would be under those extreme
conditions.

PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: The next question appears to be for the Committee.

There are two questions on the sheet. I'll read the first one first, then I'll answer it:

"Has the Town of Fitzwilliam filed to intervene?"

And the answer to that is "Yes." The Town of Fitzwilliam has filed a timely Motion to Intervene, and the Applicant has indicated that it does not object to the Town of Fitzwilliam intervening in the proceeding.

The second question on the sheet is -- oh, by the way, that motion is on our website. If you need the website again, you can look at it up here at the table. But the motion from the Town is available to the public. As will all the motions or anything that's filed in this that is not subject to a protective order for some statutory reason. We try to post everything in the case on our website, so that the public is fully informed of all aspects of the operation of the Committee and any project.

ADMIN. MONROE: And I'll just add
that if -- I have the service list for the
project. If you would like to be on the
service list, what that means is that your
email address would be added to it. And when

1 people, parties to the proceeding, file 2 documents, you would get it as simultaneously 3 as it's filed with the Committee. Sometimes 4 there's a lag of a day or two to get the 5 documents up on the website, that's just because of staff, I have staff, staff at the 6 7 PUC to help with things. But we try to get them up there as timely as possible. 8 9 So, if you are interested in 10 receiving them real-time as everybody else 11 does, send me an email and I will add you to 12 the service list. PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Your email box 13 14 can get full very quickly. 15 The next question is, I'm going to 16 read it as it was written, but I noticed this, 17 too: "Benefits? What was that about meeting 18 renewable goals?" 19 MR. BAREFOOT: There are Renewable 20 Portfolio Standards established in each of the 21 states in New England. And facilities, such as 22 this, help the utilities achieve those goals. 23 And what those goals seek to establish is a

 $\{SEC\ 2019-02\}\ [Public\ Information\ Session]\ \{01-15-20\}$

certain amount of the energy consumed

24

regionally has to be comprised of renewable sources.

PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Next question is: "Can you describe how the site plan shown on the easel has changed since the public meeting this past summer?"

And make sure you tell us your name, sir.

MR. PERSECHINO: Good evening. Joe Persechino, Tighe & Bond. I'm the site civil engineer for the project.

We essentially formed the layout of the facility, including the access drive and solar PV array. The largest change, there were some small changes throughout regarding slight relocation of access drives due to further considerations of the overall layout of the site, with some new resource areas being identified that we were, again, maintaining a commitment to avoid those resource areas. So, the old — the largest, you know, difference really is the old plan had a access drive that kind of went through this area [indicating], which was then found to be a wetland area. So,

```
1
         we relocated the drive, the access road, up and
 2
         along more towards the northern portion of the
 3
         site, and that required an additional crossing,
 4
         an open span crossing, so that would avoid any
 5
         direct wetland impacts. That's a very large
 6
         change to the plan.
 7
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Okay.
         question has to do with wildlife. It's
 8
9
         actually several questions, but they're all in
10
         the same category. So, mostly about the fence:
11
         First, "How tall is the fence? How far apart
         are the gaps in the fencing for the wildlife?
12
13
         How many gaps are there? And what sizes --
14
         what size wildlife does it restrict?" Or, I
15
         guess the flip-side of that would be, what size
16
         wildlife does it allow to go under the fence?
17
                   MR. VALLEAU: Dana Valleau, and I'm
18
         from TRC. And, so, the first question is "how
19
         tall is the fence?"
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: "How tall is
20
21
         the fence?"
22
                   MR. VALLEAU: Seven feet, I think is
23
         standard for the height of the fence. "Gaps
```

 $\{SEC\ 2019-02\}\ [Public\ Information\ Session]\ \{01-15-20\}$

between the fence" is the next one?

24

```
"How far
 1
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Yes.
 2
         apart are the gaps in the fencing for
         wildlife?"
 3
 4
                   MR. VALLEAU: So, around, yes.
 5
         underneath, it's a 6-inch gap for small
         wildlife to be able to traverse underneath the
 6
 7
         fence, and also, you know, cross under where
         the panels are. But each panel array has gaps
 8
9
         in between it as well. So -- and those vary.
10
         And that would be for the larger mammals that
11
         can't squeeze under the fence. There are
12
         spaces in between each set of arrays.
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: And what's the
13
14
         size of those?
15
                   MR. VALLEAU:
                                  They vary. Some are
16
         probably 500 feet, some are 100 feet. So, it
17
         varies, depending on the layout. So, you can
18
         take a closer look at the site plan and see the
19
         gaps between each of the array sets.
20
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: And I guess
21
         the questioner is also concerned about "what
22
         size wildlife is restricted", or not
23
         restricted, I guess.
24
                                  Yes.
                   MR. VALLEAU:
                                        So, within the
```

arrays where the panels are located, large wildlife would be restricted. And then, in between the array areas, any size wildlife could fit in between.

PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: And could you tell me what you consider to be "large wildlife" as opposed to --

MR. VALLEAU: Large wildlife? Larger than a snowshoe hare. So, you know, 6-inch gap under the fence, anything that could fit under that 6-inch gap could traverse the array areas. Between the arrays, anything larger, you know, up to a moose, could easily walk between the arrays.

PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

The next question has to do with wetlands:

"You said there would be no direct impact on wetlands. What are the indirect impacts?"

MR. VALLEAU: So, any indirect impacts are probably related to any stormwater runoff that's coming from the site. So, in order to avoid that, stormwater runoff has been designed to go out off the site in a sheet flow for the most part. So, it's able to infiltrate

1 into the ground.

And, also, we're trying to maintain a 75-foot setback at least from all wetland areas. Some cases it's more. And there are a few areas where we do encroach in the 75 feet, and it's primarily where we cross with open spans. So, there's two locations where we cross wetland area with spans that are not impacting the wetland directly. They're abutments that are set back from the wetland boundary and the access span will cross.

PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Along those lines, the next question is: "What are the impacts (direct and indirect) to Scott Brook?"

I think it's "Scott Brook". Is that --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

MR. VALLEAU: Scott Brook, yes.

We're in the Scott Brook watershed for most of the project area. And there's no direct impact to Scott Brook. It's pretty distant from the project.

PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: The question is "direct or indirect".

MR. VALLEAU: And, so, indirect,

```
1
         again, it could be something related to
 2
         stormwater runoff, which we're, you know,
 3
         managing, based on DES standards and
 4
         requirements.
 5
                         [Multiple cellphone alerts
 6
                         sounding off for an Amber
 7
                        Alert.1
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Okay. Let's
 8
9
         take a moment. Everybody check their alarms.
10
                         [Short pause.]
11
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Okay. I think
12
         I'm reading this next question correct, but
13
         there's a word I can't quite make out: "What
14
         is a new resource area? The man in the blue
15
         suit jacket spoke too quickly. Please explain
16
         in more detail."
17
                   MR. PERSECHINO: The best dressed,
18
         right.
19
                   So, we did delineations initially in
20
         2016, which was a very dry year. And, so, in
21
         2019, we went out to check all the boundaries
22
         from the -- based on that original delineation.
23
         And we identified some areas that weren't
24
         identified. 2019 was a much wetter year.
                                                     So,
```

then, you know, we identified new areas that hadn't been identified initially. So, then, the project design shifted to avoid those new areas.

PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Okay. Next question, we may need a different person to answer it. It says this is a "Follow-up to Renewable Portfolio Standard response. Since Connecticut and Rhode Island are buying the power don't the RECs accrue to those states rather than New Hampshire?"

MR. BAREFOOT: Yes, they do. That's correct. There are two benefits, though, that remain local. First of which is the power does feed into the local transmission grid here and New England. New Hampshire is part of the regional grid. And, so, here in New Hampshire you benefit that way.

And the other benefit is the property tax payments stay local.

PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: And just to those, I should have said, instead of using the term "RECs, "renewable energy credits" is what the acronym "RECs" stand for. In our business,

1 we use lots of acronyms unfortunately. There is a comment that follows this 2 3 question. It says: "I support this and I am 4 happy and proud to have it in the Monadnock 5 Region, but I don't think it helps New 6 Hampshire meet RPS goals." 7 I don't know if you want to respond to that or not? It's not a question. It's 8 9 just a statement. So, --10 MR. BAREFOOT: Yes. 11 PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Are there any 12 other questions? Any other written questions 13 from the audience? 14 There's one in the back there. Well, 15 it's more than one. Okay. "Eversource said that there would be no noise from the Route 12 16 17 substation. There was. They said that a wall 18 would not fix it. It did. What is your commitment to helping homeowners if your sound 19 20 modeling is wrong and the noise at their home 21 is unacceptable?" 22 MR. WALLACE: Can you repeat it? 23 PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: I certainly 24 Obviously, this questioner is referring can.

```
1
         to the Route 12 substation by Eversource,
 2
         apparently owned by Eversource.
                    "Eversource said there would be no
 3
         noise from the Route 12 substation. There was.
 4
         They said that a wall would not fix it.
 6
               What is your commitment to helping
 7
         homeowners if your sound modeling is wrong and
         the noise at their homes is unacceptable?"
 8
                   MR. BAREFOOT: Our commitment is that
 9
10
         this facility will be designed and constructed
11
         subject to our permitting conditions. And to
12
         the extent we are not within those conditions,
13
         obviously, we will remain under the
14
         jurisdiction of the Site Evaluation Committee,
15
         and we will have to address those.
16
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Are there any
         other questions, written questions from the
17
18
         audience?
19
                         [No indication given.]
20
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Okay. Hand it
21
         over to you.
22
                   ADMIN. MONROE: Okay. So, that
23
         closes the question part of it. I see yellow,
24
         I have two, two people here. I guess we've got
```

```
1
         a couple more. So, if you could come up to the
 2
         mike when I call your name, and succinctly
 3
         state your comments for the record. And,
 4
         again, please speak into the microphone, speak
 5
         slowly, as we have the court reporter here.
 6
                   So, Dana Pinney is the first one who
 7
         signed up to speak.
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Have him come
 8
9
         right up to the microphone.
10
                   ADMIN. MONROE: Yes. Right there.
11
                   MR. PINNEY: Thank you. You already
12
         read my questions. And I do have a comment.
                    I'm in favor of solar. I have solar
13
14
         on my house. And it works. I also live near
15
         the substation, and know what can happen, what
16
         can go wrong, when a large company comes in,
17
         with good intentions, and their project doesn't
18
         work to their expectations.
                   And I would hope that the people
19
20
         around this project, which, if done right, I
21
         feel is a good thing, aren't harmed.
22
                   ADMIN. MONROE:
                                    Thank you,
23
         Mr. Pinney. Suzanne Fournier is our next
24
         commenter.
```

1 MS. FOURNIER: Good evening. Suzanne Fournier, Milford, New Hampshire, 9 Woodward 2 3 Drive. So, I am also the coordinator for a 4 local grass roots environmental group. It's 5 called "Brox Environmental Citizens". 6 So, I oppose the locations of Chinook 7 Solar, because the impacts to the environment are too great. So, in order for New Hampshire 8 9 to reap the most benefits from solar, it 10 needs -- the solar needs to be in the right 11 places. This place is a bad site for the 12 following reasons, I think. 13 Number one: We will lose forests. 14 Now, I understand it had been logged. Forest 15 is still there. So, loss of forest. And the 16 forest gives many benefits, they provide many,

many benefits.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Number two: There will be impacts on the wildlife functions of the special wetlands known as "vernal pools". They're scattered throughout the site. And, if they're turned into islands, you know, unreachable islands or inhospitable islands, that's a problem.

Number three: Effect on the already

1 imperiled Blanding's turtle and the wood Without studying them at this site, 2 turtle. 3 how can anyone, meaning the Applicant, how can anyone know what the effects of the project 4 5 would be? There's a recent New Hampshire 6 Supreme Court decision on this issue that I'll 7 discuss later in my comments. 8 Number four: I also oppose this 9 project because it is sprawling into green 10 This is known as "energy sprawl". I space. 11 picked up that term when I was doing my 12 research around New England and New Jersey. 13 New Hampshire has hardly begun to put solar on

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

research around New England and New Jersey.

New Hampshire has hardly begun to put solar on existing structures and developed and degraded lands. It's not well thought out to be rolling out solar into current use conservation land and other green spaces. In fact, New Hampshire's 10 year energy plan that the Governor puts out has sounded the alarm that, if we try to meet our renewable energy goals by ground-mounted solar and wind, the repercussions for land use would be staggering.

Number five: I've done research recently and wrote a white paper that I'm

providing as part of these comments. In it you will see that Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Jersey are ahead of us, us people of New Hampshire, in that they have already learned that by sprawl and the loss of farmland and forest and other green spaces exchanged for solar, they are now steering developers to brownfields and other degraded and already developed places and structures. And they're using incentives and disincentives to steer in the right direction.

So, in the white paper, I briefly mention that there's a project in Hopkinton and Webster, on the town lines there, that was going to be 17 megawatts on their landfill.

Sounded great. But, now, the project has increased to 35 megawatts, and will be almost entirely moved onto private land that appears to have much forested green space. So, this is the kind of sprawl that is occurring right now in New Hampshire. I expect you'll be seeing that 35-megawatt paperwork soon.

So, sprawl, and I'm talking about sprawl here in Fitzwilliam, sprawl into current

use green space could defeat the goals of the current use program that is to encourage the preservation of undeveloped farm and forest land.

So, if I have a couple more minutes,
I would like to continue by circling back just
to two of the points I mentioned at the
beginning in opposition. If that's okay?

Number one: Forests provide much more than carbon sequestration, you know, carbon -- CO2. They provide cooling, climate resilience, clean water, and habitat for rare turtles, like the Blanding's and wood turtles that are at this site. They have been noted for this project.

So, the question I have: Should we be trading -- Should we be trading these environmental benefits of forests for the benefits of solar? I say we don't have to.

What we have to do is look somewhere else to put the solar.

So, number two: This site has many vernal pools, and I think I remember the number being 45, you know, and the Applicant divided

them up between natural and man-made, perhaps.

To wildlife, they don't know the difference.

They just go to them.

And, so, the vernal pools are so special. And why are they so special? They're so special, because they are necessary for wildlife species that live in the forest that the project would cut down. They don't stay in the pools. The forest and the vernal pools go together, called the "wetland complex", they go together for the survival of the species, like the Blanding's turtles and the amphibians that they eat. The amphibians live in the forest, as do the Blanding's turtles, but they also use the vernal pools.

The Applicant has stated in its paperwork that the known information about the Blanding's turtles and the wood turtles are that they live off-site. Fact is, that without a survey on this site, their actual presence on the site is just not known. That's information that is lacking. The Applicant relies on the Natural Heritage Bureau report, which has a huge disclaimer that says "most of the this

land has not been surveyed", and I saw no information about the Fish & Game Department saying that there had been any sort of surveys on this land, other than the bats. The bat survey has been done.

So, I want to tell you also that the New Hampshire Supreme Court recently decided a case, it was November of 2019. It involved New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, its Alteration of Terrain Program, and endangered wildlife. And I provided a copy of that decision. But it's also available for anybody online at the Supreme Court's Decision page. The court said that prior studies need to be done in order to know how to design properly a project, so that the correct standard of protection of endangered wildlife is utilized. It's going by — they want them to use the correct standard.

The regulation at issue is DES's, it's Env-Wq 1503.19(h). The related rule, it's kind of parallel what the Site Evaluation

Committee has, you have Site 301.07(c)(4), that requires, and I'll quote, "assessment of

potential impacts of construction and operation of the proposed facility on significant wildlife species." So, the Blanding's turtles and wood turtles, and any other that might be found if the survey was correctly done.

So, again, we're talking, how does the Applicant provide an assessment without first surveying for endangered wildlife? And then, second, without a long-term study of how the endangered animals are actually using the site prior to designing the project? And I'll note that, when the Applicant told us tonight, when they discovered there were wetlands that showed up, because of the climate, they saw the wetlands, they made a change. So, similarly, with respect to the endangered wildlife, how they are using the property, it would be very important to make adjustments to a design.

So, I say, without such information or a survey or a study of significant, you know, a year or two study, you end up with what the Applicant says they will do, and that is surround the entire construction area with silt fence. Now, maybe they will do that in

1 sections, and it will be broken up, it's mentioned that there would be some 100 feet, 2 3 maybe 500 feet between sections. But, nevertheless, I think it would add up to miles 4 5 of silt fence that would be put up. And silt fence blocks everybody. So, this is what the 6 7 Applicant said. They would put up silt fence around the entire construction area, and they 8 9 said it may be in sections at a time, but there 10 still would be miles of length of silt fence 11 that would prevent Blanding's turtles to get 12 into their vernal pools to feed, and rest, and 13 other activities they do in the pools, they 14 find mates, and that would be in the spring and 15 summer. 16 So, I, unfortunately, have the 17 unpleasant experience seeing turtles, 18 Blanding's and others, turtles following a silt 19 fence that has blocked their access to vernal 20 pools in the Town of Milford. 21 So, I hope you will review the

So, I hope you will review the Supreme Court decision and decide to require a study, a survey, a long-term study.

In closing, I want to stress that the

 $\{SEC\ 2019-02\}\ [Public\ Information\ Session]\ \{01-15-20\}$

22

23

24

```
1
         environmental impacts on the endangered and
         rare wildlife are unknown at this time, but
 2
 3
         expected, I believe, to be severe for the loss
 4
         of the forests that would be cut down, you
 5
         know, and the vernal pools would be impacted,
 6
         because the forest is gone, and that's part of
 7
         the wetland complex.
 8
                   So, the last point is that New
9
         Hampshire needs to wake up and stop energy
10
         sprawl, as the other states are working to do,
11
         before we lose hundreds and then thousands of
12
         acres that have been wisely saved in current
13
         use.
14
                    So, thank you for hearing my
15
         comments.
16
                   PRES. OFCR. IACOPINO: Thank you.
17
                   ADMIN. MONROE:
                                    Thank you,
18
         Ms. Fournier. Patricia Martin is the next
19
         speaker.
20
                   MS. MARTIN: Thank you for taking my
21
         comment. I live in the next town over, in
22
         Rindge. And, first, I want to express my
23
         gratitude to the people of Fitzwilliam for
24
         entertaining this project.
```

As we know, every energy project has a price. There's a cost associated no matter what you do. My understanding is that the land that this project is going on has been previously logged. And I wanted to give people a little perspective that the Burgess biomass plant, up in Berlin, burns through one acre of woodland per hour when it's operating to generate 75 megawatts of electricity. And, so, it would burn through an area of the proposed solar project in six days.

You know, as I said, every project has its cost. The use of fossil fuels, Professor Webler, Dr. Webler, at Keene State College, did an analysis. And it turns out that fossil fuel projects, because we don't see all of it, actually requires about three times the amount of land. You know, it may be in Pennsylvania, it may not be in your backyard, but it requires three times as much land as a solar project.

So, I really encourage NextEra to be very good to the people of Fitzwilliam, to be very careful about their wildlife and their

```
1
         species, and to reward them well for hosting
         this project. And that the project overall
 2
 3
         will be very successful, so that it can be a
         model for making these projects available to be
 4
 5
         sited in other areas of New Hampshire.
                   We have a lot of land, and we don't
 6
 7
         have a lot of people. And, so, the land can be
         a resource for us. It can help with carbon
 8
9
         sequestration. And having solar does not
10
         diminish the ability to do plantings underneath
11
         the solar panels that will help sequester
12
         carbon. It's a total solution. And we have to
13
         be realistic about, if not fossil fuels, then
14
         what is it that we want?
15
                   So, thank you very much.
16
                   ADMIN. MONROE:
                                    Thank you,
17
         Ms. Martin. And our last speaker, unless
18
         somebody else wants to fill one out, is
19
         Stephanie Scherr.
20
                   MS. SCHERR: Yes. Stephanie Scherr.
21
         I live in Fitzwilliam.
22
                   The first thing I'd like to do is
23
         just thank all of the Fitzwilliam residents who
24
         came out tonight.
                            This is a weeknight, and
```

folks are tired, and we put these things aside, but it's important to our town.

In 2014, Kinder Morgan tried to put the Northeast Energy Direct directly through this town. And I won't soon forget that, and I won't let you forget it either. They wanted to take out some of the houses of our residents, and they wanted to put it through our wetlands and through a pristine aquifer. They wanted to put it through our neighbors' towns and through a lot of southern New Hampshire. We were angry, upset, hurt, frightened, stressed out, and worried about what is going to happen to our town. And, at that time, we would have been super thankful for this project.

That doesn't mean this project is perfect. It means that we need to be just as cautious and thoughtful in the things that we ask about this and hope that it is well sited. And I'm thinking that some excellent questions have been brought up tonight.

Those of you that have questions when you go home, or you learn something else, please ask for resources on how you can still

send those questions in, because those questions are really important, and they will be documented.

After that NED pipeline was withdrawn, and that was Kinder Morgan, along with Liberty Utilities, this town learned a great deal about what was going on around it. And we put money into surveying our wetlands, and we designated prime wetlands. And we have a list of more wetlands that we can potentially designate prime, because we have the entire town survey and found out what amazing resource we have. That's something that NextEra should know we care about and we want to preserve. And, so, we are going to be watching carefully. We want you to be very protective of that, we care about those things.

The Granite Bridge pipeline is now being pushed by Liberty Utilities, who learned a lot from Kinder Morgan. And, so, the pipeline threat is not gone. And, in this project coming to Fitzwilliam, it's helpful to us, and we need to be supportive of solar projects and other renewable energy projects,

because of the fact that that pipeline threat is still very real. It's not in our town today, but it could be tomorrow.

And we have senators, state senators, from both parties, who are in full support of fossil fuel expansion in our state. I'm not sure if you're aware of that, but now you know. And I would suggest that you talk to them about your support for renewable energy projects such as this.

I get a lot of questions about this project. Even when I don't know the answer, I try to find them. But the most frequent question that I personally receive is "Hey, you know, I'll support it, but is the energy for our town? Because, if it's not for our town, I'm not interested." But it's for all of us. It goes into the grid, and, therefore, we all share it.

So, even if it doesn't seem like it's just for Fitzwilliam, it is for Fitzwilliam, because that's where our energy comes from. It goes into shared resources. So, yes, we do benefit from that.

In terms of our neighbor from

Milford, I'd just like to say just a few
things. I grew up in New Jersey. And my
biggest concern was that we were losing
farmland, and still are, in an alarming rate,
and it's through development. And, so, in New
Jersey, absolutely, we thought solar should be
pushed as quickly as possible, not for the loss
of green space, but it's still happening at an
alarming rate.

But that's a problem here in New
Hampshire as well. When I moved here in 1993,
there was a lot less development than there is
now. When you live here, you don't see that
happening, because it happens a little at a
time. But I can tell you that it has changed a
great deal.

So, yes. When we have those services, when we have parking lots or malls, we should be thinking about "Hey, is the parking lot porous? And can we cover that parking lot and those buildings with solar panels?" And it should absolutely be our first preference.

1 However, we do need to make room for 2 it as quickly as possible. We need to make 3 sure that we're getting on this, because the 4 climate emergency is real, it's here. We all 5 know that it's happening. Deny it or not, it's in our face. It's on TV, in the videos. 6 7 There's no denying it. And New real. Hampshire is facing some extreme consequences 8 9 already. We have wildlife that are in 10 detrimental situations. We're losing our 11 moose, whales, cod, shrimp. Those are our 12 livelihoods in many ways. They're not just 13 things that we eat and hunt, but they're things 14 that bring tourists to our city, to our towns, to our homes. This is important to us. 15 16 the only way to protect that is to think about the future, right now, every day. It's an 17 18 emergency. 19 I also just want to say, I ask that 20 our Conservation Commission please consider 21 doing what you can to find out about the impact 22 to wetland services, because Scott Brook is a

And, lastly, just to say that, if you

 $\{SEC\ 2019-02\}\ [Public\ Information\ Session]\ \{01-15-20\}$

really important resource for us.

23

24

```
didn't know it already, that Fitzwilliam is one
 1
 2
         of the towns, and so is Rindge, that
 3
         participated in Solarize Monadnock this past
         summer. We had a great detail of interest in
 4
 5
         residential solar. And, so, people are
 6
         interested here, and they are learning more.
 7
         It's something we need to embrace. But I thank
         you for your support.
 8
                    I do support this project. But, as I
 9
10
         said, I also want to make sure that it's well
11
         sited. And I ask you to continue asking
12
         questions and to attend these things and speak
13
         with your neighbors. Thank you.
14
                   ADMIN. MONROE:
                                    Thank you,
15
         Ms. Scherr.
16
                    Is there anybody else who would like
17
         to make a public comment?
18
                         [No indication given.]
19
                   ADMIN. MONROE: Hearing none, I guess
20
         we will adjourn the hearing. Thank you all for
21
         coming out tonight. And look forward to seeing
22
         you on February 20th, at 6 p.m., back here.
23
                (Whereupon the Public Information
24
               Session was adjourned at 7:23 p.m.)
```


CERTIFICATE

,

I further certify that I am neither attorney or counsel for, nor related to or employed by any of the parties to the action; and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed in this case, nor am I financially interested in this action.

I, Steven. E. Patnaude, a Licensed Shorthand

Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing

is a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic

notes of these proceedings taken at the place and on

the date hereinbefore set forth, to the best of my

skill and ability under the conditions present at

Steven E. Patnaude, LCR

Steven E. Patnaude, LCR Licensed Court Reporter N.H. LCR No. 52 (RSA 310-A:173)