New Hampshire Energy Facilities Siting Process

The following summary of key aspects of the New Hampshire Energy Facilities Siting Process administered by the Site Evaluation Committee (SEC) was compiled through research of primary and secondary resources, and interviews with a range of stakeholders, including state officials, representatives of project developers, environmental organizations, legislators, regional planning agency officials, and business associations. It should be noted that the scope of this research (consistent with the requirements in SB99) is primarily focused on documenting the current process and identifying areas for potential improvement. While many of those we interviewed identified a number of areas for potential improvement, others maintained that the current structure, process and decisionmaking criteria works reasonably well in meeting the SEC's general statutory purpose and obligations.

General Description

The New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee has jurisdiction over proposed energy facilities exceeding 30 megawatts (MW) in capacity, as well as other types of projects related to the storage, delivery or production of energy (see RSA 162-H:2). Certain parties may also request that the SEC take jurisdiction of other projects under certain circumstances. As a result, the SEC may review generation plants, for example, that are smaller than 30 MW but at least 5 MW.

The SEC statute requires that eight state agencies sit on the SEC. The Legislature created the SEC, recognizing that the state requires an adequate and reliable supply of electricity and the effect that the siting and construction of energy facilities has on the public welfare, economic growth, the environment and the use of natural resources. In doing so the legislature found that the public interest requires:

1) a balance between the environment and the need for new energy facilities;
2) elimination of delay in the construction of new facilities;
3) full and timely consideration of environmental consequences;
4) transparency and complete disclosure of plans;
5) sound land use planning where all environmental, economic and technical issues are resolved on an integrated basis.

Each agency that has permitting authority over a particular issue (e.g., Department of Environmental Services for wetlands) conducts its usual review process and submits permit conditions to the SEC for consideration for inclusion in the SEC-issued Certificate of Site and Facility should the SEC approve the project.[1]

If the SEC votes to approve a facility, it grants a Certificate of Site and Facility, often with conditions. A party proposing a project must demonstrate that it has adequate financial, technical and managerial capability, that the project will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region, and that the project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air and water quality, the natural environment and public health and safety. (See more detail below).

[1] With the exception of certain air emissions permits that must be issued within timeframes specified under

I. STRUCTURE & AUTHORITY

A. SEC Membership includes 15 members from 8 state agencies:

- Dept. of Environmental Services (DES), Commissioner
- DES, Director of Water Division
- DES, Director of Air Division
- Public Utility Commission (PUC), 3 Commissioners and a staff engineer designated by the PUC Commissioners.
- Department of Resources and Economic Development (DRED), Commissioner
- DRED, Director of Parks and Recreation
- DRED, Director of Division of Forests and Lands
- Dept. of Health and Human Services, Commissioner
- Fish and Game Dept., Executive Director
- Office of Energy and Planning, Director
- Dept. of Transportation, Commissioner
- Department of Cultural Resources, Commissioner

Some members may designate a deputy or other high level official in their agency to sit in their place. The designee assumes the full authority of the official.[2]

For energy facility applications, the chairperson *may* designate a subcommittee of no fewer than seven members to consider the application (NH RSA Chapter 162-H:4,V). For renewable applications, the chairman *shall* designate a subcommittee. This subcommittee has full authority to make decisions and issue certificates.[3]

Challenges[4]: 1) While the participation of high-level officials as the decision makers in facility siting proceedings provides direct involvement of state decision makers, the resulting size of the SEC is viewed as unnecessarily large and cumbersome. 2) In addition, the time commitment required is both unpredictable (triggered by an application as decided by the applicant) and intensive. 3) None of the agencies receive funding for its SEC duties other than permit fees for reviewing permits that are part of the process. 4) The complexity and resource demands of siting

---

[2] RSA 162-H:3 permits certain members of the Committee to designate a different official from that agency to sit on the Committee. The Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Services may designate the Assistant Commissioner. The Commissioner of the Department of Resources and Economic Development may designate the Director of the Division of Economic Development. The Commissioner of the Department of Transportation may designate the Assistant Commissioner. The Commissioner of the Department of Health and Human Services may designate one of the two most senior administrators responsible for the management of public health services. The Commissioner of the Department of Cultural resources may designate the Director of the Division of Historical Resources. The Director of the Office of Energy and planning may designate the Deputy Director.

[3] Once a subcommittee is appointed by the chair, subcommittee members may, with the exception of the chairperson or vice-chairperson, designate an employee from his or her agency to assume his or her responsibilities as a subcommittee member provided that such designee shall be a senior administrator within the agency, department, or division that the member represents under RSA 162-H: 3. See, RSA 162-H: 4, V.

[4] Challenges in this paper are culled from our research and discussion with the Coordinating Committee, its members individually, and others recommended by the CC members.

cases have been increasing and the number of smaller-scale, but contentious siting cases may continue to increase. 5) Serving on the SEC and meeting the other responsibilities of Commissioners and Directors of state agencies could become increasingly challenging in the face of budget constraints. 6) When responsibilities are delegated to non-SEC members, the delegation is not always consistent to ensure consistent results. 7) The current structure of the SEC prevents SEC members from talking with their staff about the application once it is filed. For example, a number of the agencies, such as the Department of Environmental Services, have responsibility for reviewing the applications for air and water permits, and the staff is also responsible for bringing forward any concerns they have with the applicant's filing. Yet they are not allowed to communicate this to the DES Commissioner (Chair of the SEC) outside of the formal adjudicatory hearings in order to avoid ex parte communications.

B. Staffing: The SEC has no dedicated staff; staff are hired on an ad hoc basis to deal with individual applications. Some staff costs are only covered when there is an applicant, and the applicant is then required by statute to cover the costs of legal counsel hired by the Committee to advise the Committee, an Administrative Assistant who handles docketing and other clerical tasks, and stenographer for all public portions of the proceedings.

***Challenges*:** 1) Without dedicated staff, the SEC members must review all materials personally, attend all adjudicatory proceedings in person (except under circumstances in which a designee is appointed when allowed), and must deliberate and render opinions without the aid of independent staff analyses. This places a very large burden on individual SEC members who, as noted above, already have extensive other responsibilities. 2) The lack of dedicated staffing also places unpredictable and sometimes substantial burdens on the staff of various agencies, such as DES, to answer general questions received by phone or email about how the SEC works, to present overviews of the SEC process at public meetings, and to receive and store comments on potential projects prior to the filing of applications.

C. Funding: The SEC does not have its own budget. Applicants bear the cost of undertaking special studies and hiring necessary experts and counsel. Applicants must also pay for all other incidental costs of the proceedings, such as rental fees for rooms for public hearings conducted by the Committee. (NH RSA Chapter 162-H:10,V; http://nhrsa.org/law/chapter/162-h/). While the applicant is responsible for paying the invoices rendered by the Legal Counsel to the Committee, the Administrative Assistant and the stenographer for all filed matters, all other staff time must be covered by participating agencies' budgets.

Challenges: 1) Agency budgets must absorb the cost of staff time and other resources needed to review applications (unless there is a permit, such as a wetlands permit, which may offset some costs through a permit fee), present evidence through the adjudicatory proceedings, conduct analyses, and for the head of the agency (or a designee when permitted) to sit as a member of the Committee on a case. 2) Costs can only be billed to an "applicant" as specifically defined in the law and the rules. In the case of Merrimack Station Electric Generating Plant, for instance, a petition brought to the SEC by petitioners rather than the facility owner, the NH Supreme Court found that the law only authorized billing an "applicant" for committee expense. Because the SEC had a specific rule that defined "applicant" in a manner that did not include the petitioners, they could not be required to pay the legal counsel and other staff costs. (http://www.nhsec.nh.gov/2009-01/index.htm).

D. Jurisdiction: The SEC has jurisdiction over all electric generating stations greater than 30 MW as well as certain renewable energy facilities between 5 and 30 MW; certain electric transmission lines greater than 100 kilovolts (kV); transmission lines greater than 100 kV and 10 miles long

within an existing right of way (ROW) and 200 kV in other instances; energy transmission pipelines that are not considered part of a local distribution network and refineries, storage and loading facilities. The definition of renewable energy facilities includes projects between 5 and 30 MW, which the SEC may oversee on its own motion, or in response to certain petitions (RSA 162-H:2, XII). The SEC may choose to review such a project if it finds that the project requires a certificate, consistent with the findings and purposes set forth in the purpose clause of the statute. Those purposes and findings include:

- Maintaining a balance between the environment and the need for new energy facilities in New Hampshire;
- Avoiding undue delay in the construction of needed facilities and provide full and timely consideration of environmental consequences;
- Ensuring that all entities planning to construct facilities in the state be required to provide full and complete disclosure to the public of such plans; and,
- Ensuring that the construction and operation of energy facilities are treated as a significant aspect of land use planning in which all environmental, economic, and technical issues are resolved in an integrated fashion.

See also Jericho Wind Project http://www.nhsec.nh.gov/2012-03/documents/130318order.pdf

Conditions for Exemptions: The statute allows for the SEC to exempt facilities from its review under certain conditions, which means such facility would no longer fall under the jurisdiction of the SEC and the SEC would have no further role in reviewing that project or proposal. After a public hearing in the county where the facility is proposed, the SEC may exempt a facility from its jurisdiction if it finds that:
(a) Existing state or federal statutes, state or federal agency rules or municipal ordinances provide adequate protection of the objectives of RSA 162-H:1;
(b) A review of the application or request for exemption reveals that consideration of the proposal by only selected agencies represented on the committee is required and that the objectives of RSA 162-H:1 can be met by those agencies without exercising the provisions of RSA 162-H;
(c) Response to the application or request for exemption from the general public indicates that the objectives of RSA 162-H:1 are met through the individual review processes of the participating agencies; and
(d) All environmental impacts or effects are adequately regulated by other federal, state, or local statutes, rules, or ordinances. (RSA 162-H:4, IV)

In such cases the siting, construction and operation of the facility remains subject to existing local and state laws, ordinances and regulations.

Example: University of NH Landfill gas project, 2007 (http://www.nhsec.nh.gov/2007-01/documents/decision_order.8.8.07.pdf)

Opt –In: The SEC may review on its own motion facilities outside the jurisdictional size and scope, if it finds that the certificate is needed to meet purposes in RSA 162-H:1. This "opt-in" provides broad authority to the SEC, making virtually every energy facility potentially subject to review. The request for review may also come from the applicant or two of the following types of petitioners:
(a) A petition endorsed by 100 or more registered voters in the host community or host communities;
(b) A petition endorsed by 100 or more registered voters from abutting communities;

(c) A petition endorsed by the governing body of the host community or 2 or more governing bodies of abutting communities;
(d) A petition filed by the potential applicant.
(RSA 162-H:2, XI)

If accepted, SEC review preempts local jurisdiction. See, RSA 162-H:16, VI. *See generally, Public Service Company v. Town of Hampton*, 120 NH 68 (1980)

Example: See Timbertop wind case for an example of a denial of an opt-in request. The municipality objected to the applicant's petition.
(http://www.nhsec.nh.gov/minutes/documents/130603minutes201204.pdf)

Example: In the case of Lempster (24 MW wind farm), 100 voters petitioned for inclusion.
(http://www.nhsec.nh.gov/2006-01/index.htm)

Challenges: 1) While the statute is clear about which facilities must file for a certificate or request an exemption, the statute also provides a number of ways that projects outside the SEC's jurisdiction may come under review by the SEC and preempt local jurisdiction, though this has typically only taken place when there is support from the local governing body. Communities that do not have the resources to conduct an evaluation, but think a facility may have a significant impact, may request SEC to exercise jurisdiction. The applicant may also ask for review to by-pass local jurisdiction. The standard for accepting such a request from a community or applicant is subject to some interpretation and has been controversial in the past. 2) State agencies play a key role in reviewing the applications, making recommendations for conditions, and providing draft permit language. The SEC must incorporate terms and conditions specified by state agencies that would otherwise have statutory regulatory authority under federal or state law.[5] However, there are some state agencies that may have an interest in an application but would not otherwise have regulatory authority over the project. For instance, although the Fish and Game Department is required to comment on wetlands applications filed with DES they do not have separate permitting authority. The roles of such non-permitting agencies and their appellate rights are not clearly defined in the statute.

E. Role of the Counsel for the Public: The counsel is charged with representing the public in seeking to protect the quality of the environment and to assure an adequate supply of energy. The counsel is accorded all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of an attorney representing a party in the applicant's case. The NH Attorney General appoints an Assistant Attorney General to serve as the Counsel for the Public (RSA 162-H:9).

Challenges: 1) Like other staff, the Assistant Attorney General appointed as Counsel for the Public must integrate this responsibility with other non-SEC work assignments. 2) No other staff are currently assigned to assist, and the workload can be both unpredictable and intensive at times. 3) In addition, the limited role of the Counsel has been questioned by some members of the public who would like the Counsel to represent their interests as private landowners.

II. PROCESS

A. Filing Requirements: Each application shall:

- Describe in reasonable detail the type and size of each major part of the proposed facility.

[5] If a state agency with state or federal statutory permitting authority denies authorization, then the application must be denied. See, RSA 162-H:16, I.

- Identify both the preferred choice and any other choices for the site of each major part of the proposed facility.
- Describe in reasonable detail the impact of each major part of the proposed facility on the environment for each site proposed.
- Describe in reasonable detail the applicant's proposals for studying and solving environmental problems.
- Describe in reasonable detail the applicant's financial, technical, and managerial capability for construction and operation of the proposed facility.
- Document that written notification of the proposed project, including appropriate copies of the application, has been given to the appropriate governing body of each community in which the facility is proposed to be located.
- Provide such additional information as the committee may require to carry out the purposes of this chapter. (RSA 162-H:7,V).

More specific filing requirements are outlined in Chapter Site 301.02, adopted in 2008 (http://www.nhsec.nh.gov/rules/documents/chapter200_procedural_rules_adopted.pdf).

Challenges: While a filing may include alternatives for the site of the facility in addition to a preferred choice, and the SEC has authority to review "available alternatives," it does not typically require the applicant to put forth and analyze additional alternatives once the application is considered complete.

B. Deadlines: A certificate decision is required within 9 months of acceptance of an application, or an exemption decision within 60 days. Renewable energy projects have an expedited deadline for decision within 240 days, or 8 months (RSA 162-H:7 and H:4).

Other deadlines: The SEC has 60 days to determine if an application is complete (and 30 days to make such a determination for a renewable facility). A progress report is required within 5 months that includes draft conditions and additional information needed. The SEC may suspend the time frame if it finds doing so is in the public interest. (RSA 162-H:6, H:7 and H:14)

Challenges: The deadlines are not always met, and although the SEC is authorized to extend them, this may create greater uncertainty for the applicant and interested parties.

C. Process for Decision Making:
All proceedings and deliberations of the SEC members are open to the public. They comply with and are conducted according to the rules and procedures governing adjudicatory hearings. The SEC, in consultation with Counsel for the Public, may request any information or studies it considers necessary to develop the record needed to support its findings, and may require the applicant to pay the reasonable costs of conducting such studies. Decisions are made by majority vote of the full SEC, its designees or subcommittee where allowed, and must be supported by the record. Decisions are subject to judicial review by the state Supreme Court.

> **Use of Conditions in Certificate Approval Process:** A certificate of site and facility may contain reasonable terms and conditions the committee deems necessary. The committee may condition the certificate based upon the results of required federal and state agency studies that exceed the application period or based on evidence offered during the course of the proceeding. Conditions are recommended to the SEC by the state agencies (RSA 162-H:16, I, VI-VII).

Challenges: 1) While the accessibility and transparency of the adjudicatory process is important and valued, the formality of the process (pre-filed testimony, cross-examination of witnesses) requires a significant level of expertise and time by intervenors, which not all intervenors possess.

D. Public Engagement: The SEC must hold at least one informational public hearing in the county or counties where the facility is located, and may at its discretion hold additional informational hearings. The SEC must consider and weigh all evidence presented at public hearings and all written information and reports submitted to it by members of the public before, during, and subsequent to public hearings. Any member of the public may, at the discretion of the SEC, also become a formal intervenor in the adjudicatory proceedings. (RSA 162-H:10)

Challenges: 1) The informational meetings are held as close to the project site as possible, though sometimes are at some distance from the actual site and are typically evening hearings. 2) The adjudicatory process is viewed as complex and costly for small organizations and abutters, and participation can be daunting. 3) The fact that most applicants' requests for a certificate have been approved in the past, has led to the perception that the process favors the applicant. 4) Since opinion can be diverse and in conflict among members of the public, it is difficult for the SEC to weigh such views in total and on balance. 4) There is lack of clarity on how public input informed decision including any balancing of local and statewide.

E. Role of Municipalities: The SEC must give "due consideration" to the views of municipal and regional planning commissions and municipal governing bodies. Municipalities affected by a proposed facility must be notified. (RSA 162-H:16, IV, b)

Challenges: 1) It is very challenging for municipalities, especially smaller ones, to deal with the expense and complexity of participating in an SEC proceeding. 2), Under the current process designed to facilitate one-stop shopping and balance state and local interests, the SEC has authority to preempt municipal jurisdiction if needed. Municipalities may intervene, but they have no decision-making power in the process for projects within their boundaries. For instance, municipalities can recommend conditions they can not impose conditions, require alternatives analysis, nor can they veto or block projects that they do not support or that they believe are inconsistent with local land use priorities.

F. Monitoring and Enforcement: A certificate of site and facility may provide for reasonable monitoring procedures seen necessary by the SEC. The committee may delegate the authority to monitor the construction or operation of any energy facility granted in a certificate (162-H:4).

Whenever the committee determines that any term or condition of any certificate issued under this chapter is being violated, it shall, in writing, notify the person holding the certificate of the specific violation and order the person to immediately terminate the violation. If, 15 days after receipt of the order, the person has failed or neglected to terminate the violation, the committee may suspend the person's certificate. Except for emergencies, prior to any suspension the committee shall give written notice of its consideration of suspension and of its reasons and shall provide opportunity for a prompt hearing (162-H:12).

> **Penalties:** The superior court may enjoin any construction or operation of energy facilities in violation of the statute or in material violation of the terms and conditions of a certificate issued. A violation may result in an assessment by the superior court of civil damages not to exceed $10,000 for each day in violation (162-H:19).

Challenges: 1) While the statute provides the SEC with clear authority to oversee the implementation of the certificate throughout the construction and operation, the SEC does not have staff resources to monitor the implementation of projects for which approval has been granted. The SEC relies on state agency personnel to assist with monitoring. Thus, the SEC typically only responds to violations brought to its attention by others. 2) Furthermore, if that violation is outside the jurisdiction of any one SEC member agency's authority, the SEC must take action without any or sufficient staff to do so. This effectively triggers the need for the Committee to again engage Legal Counsel, administrative support, and a stenographer (for public proceedings) in order to conduct enforcement proceedings.

G. ADR: Alternative dispute resolution exists only informally; settlements can and have occurred in the past but are not explicitly provided for in the statute.

III. FINDINGS AND CRITERIA

A. Findings necessary for approval of a certificate: The SEC must find based on the record that:

- The applicant has adequate financial, technical, and managerial capability to assure construction and operation of the facility in continuing compliance with the terms and conditions of the certificate.
- The site and facility will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region with due consideration having been given to the views of municipal and regional planning commissions and municipal governing bodies.
- The site and facility will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air and water quality, the natural environment, and public health and safety.

Criteria: No additional criteria exist beyond the three general findings required in the statute (RSA 162-H:16, IV). A fourth finding, that the SEC should take into consideration the state's least cost energy policy, was deleted in 1998. However, SB99 requires that the SEC adopt rules establishing criteria no later than January 1, 2015, particularly criteria designed to address the second and third findings above. (RSA Chapter 162-H:16)

Challenges: 1) While the decisions of the SEC are based on the record developed during the adjudicatory proceeding, the lack of more specific criteria in the SEC's governing statute has led to the perception that the decision-making process can be inconsistent. 2) Furthermore, since the restructuring of the electricity sector in New Hampshire, the SEC does not have any way to anchor its findings to the overall state policy or the state energy plan. This leads to the perception that the SEC cannot or does not consider the project in a broader context. In practice, it should be noted, that the SEC refers to state policies such as the Renewable Portfolio Standard and the Governor's executive order implementing the "25 x 25" renewable energy goal, to support the need for renewable energy projects. (See Jericho Wind Case). 3) If the SEC were to create more extensive regulation, policy, or guidance, for decision-making, the rulemaking effort would be time consuming for agency staff (who would not be compensated for their time by the SEC), require the approval of the legislature, and be difficult, in many cases, to develop sufficiently. 4) The consideration of substantive siting criteria is a matter of extensive public dispute, especially in the context of transmission lines and wind turbines and whether such criteria should be determined in the first instance by the legislature or through the rulemaking process.

B. Orderly Development: The SEC must consider undue interference with orderly development of the region. Linkages between energy facilities development and economic development are also recognized in the purpose of RSA 162-H. Applicants submit and the SEC reviews economic impacts predictions. Filing requirements include: "information regarding the effects of the facility on the

orderly development of the region, including the applicant's estimate of the impacts of the construction and operation of the facility on:
(1) Local land use;
(2) Local economy; and
(3) Local employment."

***Challenges*: 1)** The criteria is not clear for what studies, analysis, and data the applicant or others need to bring to the SEC to determine undue interference with orderly development, including economic impacts. For instance, are land use and community impacts analyses also appropriate? 2) Regional Planning Councils have the authority to evaluate the economic development impacts of development projects within their region, but have not typically used the authority to look at energy facilities.

C. Noise of wind facilities: The state does not currently have criteria governing noise levels of wind or other energy facilities, but address noise on a case by case basis. Some municipalities may have or be considering adopting noise ordinances, but the SEC has the authority to override local ordinances if it finds reason to in its review of an accepted application.

An ad hoc group of stakeholder group convened to develop guidelines on wind siting did not reach consensus as to whether noise levels or distance from source should be the basis for developing assessment guidelines or evaluating the relative level of concern. The group concluded that it did not have sufficient expertise to resolve this issue. [6]

Challenges: Noise is becoming an increasing concern in siting cases. Some members of the public are concerned that it is a serious public health issue

D. Visual impacts of wind facilities: SEC addresses visual impacts on case-by-case basis. However, no consistent, formalized visual impacts standards for energy facilities exist. Recommendations for addressing visual impacts of wind facilities were proposed as part of the Wind Siting Guidelines, recommendation of an ad hoc stakeholder group that were not adopted.

E. Transmission Lines: No criteria beyond the general findings apply, but the applicant must provide the following information:
(1) Location shown on U.S. Geological Survey Map;
(2) Corridor width for:
    a. New route; or
    b. Widening along existing route;
(3) Length of line;
(4) Distance along new route;
(5) Distance along existing route;
(6) Voltage (design rating);
(7) Any associated new generating unit or units;
(8) Type of construction (described in detail);
(9) Construction schedule, including start date and scheduled completion date; and
(10) Impact on system stability and reliability.
(Chapter Site 301.03- Contents of Application)

---

[6] http://www.nhsec.nh.gov/documents/siting_guidelines.pdf.

The applicant does not have to provide alternative routes.

Challenges: 1) The wind guidelines developed by a group of stakeholders in 2007 are informational only, and are rarely if at all used in SEC proceedings. 2) For visual impacts and noise, the SEC lacks a clear methodology for analyzing and weighing impacts, and must rely on expert analysis and the particular conditions and circumstances in each case. 3) For transmission, the SEC has not had to review a major application for many years, but the Northern Pass expected application will place an enormous burden on the SEC for a project that crosses through a number of local jurisdictions and will likely be contentious. There is no specific, consistent criteria required for alternative routes, undergrounding, or use of existing developed transmission rights-of-way/corridors as part of filing or during proceeding. 4) The SEC may consider "available alternatives," but an in-depth analysis of alternatives would not typically be undertaken unless it is raised during the proceedings.

G. Eminent Domain: A law recently passed that prohibits the use of eminent domain for private projects, such as merchant generation or transmission projects. http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/li/498-a/498-a-mrg.htm. Nothing in RSA 162-H has ever granted the SEC the authority to approve the exercise of eminent domain for any purpose whatsoever or to authorize other parties to exercise eminent domain powers at the direction of the SEC. Eminent domain authority can only be utilized by public utilities subject to approval by the PUC.

REFERENCES:

- RSA Chapter 162-H "Energy Facility Evaluation, Siting, Construction and Operation," http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/nhtoc/nhtoc-xii-162-h.htm
- Chapter Site 301.02 - Site and Facility Certificate filing requirements, rules adopted 2008 (http://www.nhsec.nh.gov/rules/documents/chapter200_procedural_rules_adopted.pdf)
- 2002 NH State Energy Plan (http://www.nh.gov/oep/resource-library/energy/publications.htm#state_energy_plan)
- 2007 proposed Wind Siting Guidelines (http://www.nhsec.nh.gov/documents/siting_guidelines.pdf)
- SB 99 (http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/legislation/2013/SB0099.html)
- Energy Facility Siting, Operations and Licensing Study Committee Report of the NH General Court, Aug. 1990 (scanned copy)
- Richard D'Amato and Michael Sanchez (Dartmouth College students), "Policy Options for Siting Energy Facilities: A Cross-State Analysis of Energy Facility Siting Board Strategies," PRS Policy Brief 1213-18, June 26, 2013
- Interviews with Coordinating Committee Members and others (confidential)