

Appendix D: Public Comments

The following document lists the public comments the SEC received at the Citizen Workshops as categorized by topic area and town.

The comments are organized into the following topic areas:

1. SEC Membership/Structure/Process
2. Public Engagement
3. Noise & Visual Impacts
4. Alternative Sites/Routes
5. State Energy Policy/Determination of Project Need
6. Consideration of Local Views/Resources for Municipalities
7. Other
8. Cumulative Impacts

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Groveton	There should be a meeting/hearing where interveners are allowed to cross-examine the applicant	262
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Groveton	Let SEC members consult with their staff experts to come up with their position	246
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Groveton	Independent commission may have been better understood with expanded discussions/explanation; focused members, staff dedicated to its work, accessing agencies for expertise as well as other sources for analysis & evaluation	249
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Groveton	Pre-application meetings—Publish specifics of project before meeting, e.g. designs and intended locations.	261
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Groveton	SEC make up should include a person from DRED to determine “Is it economically viable? What is the economic impact?” Should also include an ‘adverse effects’ person and 2 public members chosen through transparent process. 5000	302
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Groveton	SEC needs to have funding for their own staffing needs and SEC members need to be able to consult with the experts in their own agencies!! They are NOT often the expert	257
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Groveton	SEC should have ability to gather info from staff.	303
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Keene	The SEC membership should maybe be different for different types of energy facilities.	322
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Keene	SEC should be an independent commission with the option of having some agency representation or consolidation... does not have to be either/or.	365
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Keene	Potentially, limit the number of applicants and projects heard before the SEC each year, or maybe limit how many are heard at one time.	325
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Keene	SEC should be an independent commission with staff support, with 3-4 permanent members plus 3-4 public members chosen from region being impacted. Chosen by town selectmen or planning board.	358
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Keene	Whatever SEC structure is ultimately in place, they need a paid staff	324
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Keene	We spent dozens upon dozens of hours in front of the SEC; I learned a lot. I thought the SEC was extremely receptive to us as interveners and listened well, better than I expected. I would hate to see that get lost in any process change.	314
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Keene	Should the SEC consider a limit on the number of applications they can handle in a year?	337

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Keene	The SEC needs more staff	336
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Keene	State needs to pay for at least one new staff person to support the work of the SEC	356
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	The ‘goldrush’ of energy projects is a term often heard these days regarding NH and energy policy. With our state currently being targeted by the energy industry as a potential corridor, this discussion around the SEC and its role/functionality is especially important. I feel that now, more than ever, the SEC should be fully funded, staffed, and specifically focused on the task of reviewing and deciding on the viability of the various project before it now and in the future. Most importantly, I feel that members of the public -- particularly those who can demonstrate standing-- must have a place on the SEC, perhaps specific to each project based on locality and impact.	21
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	When an application is submitted, what kind of “scientific studies” are done? Who develops/evaluates the effectiveness of those studies? i.e., impact on wildlife, impact on quality of life to resident & abutters, economic projections, etc.	18
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	Regarding SEC Structure, Membership, & Process; You should ask the SEC members if they think they should have smaller numbers. I think they should be smaller in number, but it would be interesting to hear what they think. Public input would be helpful, but I don’t think it should supersede those w/ the expertise applicable to what’s being discussed.	5
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	On process: Does the AG’s office, as counsel to the public, lean toward state/governor priorities, rather than those of the general public?	8
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	An objective SEC is key.	16
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	There should be fees for application; this is a big stumbling block for SEC. MA, NY, CT all have hefty fees	7
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	The SEC should have a formal office with 1 to 2 staff	4
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	Require specific disciplines to be on SEC—geologist, environmentalist, etc.	49
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	SEC needs adequate staffing & funding for that staff	55
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	SEC Committee members should be paid separately from their regular duties.	59

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	Money must be available to the SEC for experts, etc.	60
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	Conflicts of interest need to be accounted for when assembling the SEC committee.	35
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	Staff and money: The time availability and assignment of technical staff to support SEC needs to be better defined, as well as how these resources are assigned. A well-defined fee structure could help support the financing of this effort.	61
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	SEC membership: Consider having regional planner and possibly even municipal planners sit as non-voting members on SEC.	62
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Manchester	Provide a “stepped” application process that recognizes ‘different’ --Rural, Suburban, city-- locations and should have control cost for all parties.	45
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Newington	As a former counsel for the public, I’m not sure how to answer the question about how it could be made more effective. It is already effective, and works well even if some do not like it.	382
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Newington	Clarify whether SEC members can communicate with agency staff regarding the state permits before the Committee	380

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Newington	One of the key dates that is missed in almost every project is the Completeness determination. The project's barely understood, yet it's accepted as complete, we get right into the Discovery phase and people are asking questions—it's impossible to get the committee together to get people to make decisions because there are so many of them with demanding schedules. They say all politics is local, but so are all impacts. Towns generally know what those are, and when you look at what happens on the back end when there's problems, I think the reason that it happens is that it's expensive for towns to participate, and I think that some of the powers that Counsels for the Public has could be addressed very effectively if towns could also request those studies be done during the application acceptance process. For example, on Portland, it was going right through the town's location for a new library. Town had to come in and present testimony. Also the issue of safety and capability of local responders. Tourism and economic impacts. If you allowed towns a greater role in the acceptance process, those issues would get flagged earlier and the whole process would go more smoothly. State officials, often, have no reason to be aware of these types of issues, but that is what the towns are for. 162:h-1 talks about balancing the needs for facilities and the impact; should come back in the form of a benefits test. Not necessarily a high impact, but the committee needs to be able to look at what does this project bring to the state and what is the benchmark for measuring impacts	367
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	SEC – Accountability for enforcing conditions of application. Collect fines for non-compliance.	91
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	The SEC timeline should be longer, it's almost impossible for a community to react to the thousands of pages in the application in 3-4 months.	73
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	SEC – More transparent.	90
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	On SEC Membership: Independent commission should have the statewide and local representation or at least local rep.	85
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Many tables did not understand what SEC filing requirements - Adopt visual impacts – specific filings, etc. meant. It was not clear.	235
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	One of the things that wasn't addressed in this evening's choices is the possibility of the applicant paying a fee that would cover the costs to towns for being an intervener. That fee could also help to fund a paid staff for the SEC—they are currently very overwhelmed.	285

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	SEC should have citizen representation consisting of at least 2 residents from the region in which project is to be sited.	186
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	I personally do not think the PUC represents the people in the state, it represents industry, its credibility is nill, and it should have one 1 rep on SEC, not 3.	290
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Structure: have designated staff/legal counsel for consistent analysis of applications.	232
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	The SEC has to be more responsible for compliance. A facility comes in, they get their certificate, and they're free to go. The public watchdogs can't be expected to keep an eye on a major corporation. The SEC must have a compliance arm.	69
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Either all 15 members should vote, or selective voting should be random. If the members can pre-decide who gets to vote, there could be collusion.	293
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	I think it is important to fund the SEC—or whatever approval process we choose—giving it adequate funds for support staff, and not stealing resources from the agencies.	287
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	SEC membership – no elected officials or members of public. Why is NH need for power not evaluated?	204
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	SEC needs to be more active in compliance aspect.	155
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	SEC members should be hired.	157
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	The permitting process requires regulatory agencies approval anyway so get them off the SEC where their hands/tongues are tied from working with their staffs.	163
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Applicant answers questions from the public on the record transparency.	147
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Independent Commissions should be staffed by professionals in each of the impact areas – econ, environ, water, transpo, housing, jobs	144
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Comments. Pre Application Process: May have advantage to organize for small group. May have advantage for applicant with \$ to sway opinion.	174
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	SEC members should be hired, not appointed. It should be a standing committee.	185
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Public member from community affected.	142

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Not enough details – BAD question. If there was an Independent Commission as a replacement for the SEC, how can we make sure unbiased, & with citizens part of it?	234
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Subject – SEC Structure, Membership & Process: Proposal – select public members by allowing each RPC involved to have a member.	128
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	What is an independent commission? What does independent mean?	233
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	The SEC needs more transparency, a seat @ the table for public in areas directly involved, a general pause for projects.	112
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	For the independent commission the appointments should not be political.	105
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Covered Facilities – Do not opt-in petitions by applicant.	211
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	SEC Membership – local member of public for application review – locally selected such as in NY as mentioned in overview.	212
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Require multiple pre-filing meetings.	215
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Require Local Representation as a part of the independent commission, possibly local selectboard chairs.	222
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	SEC Structure & Membership: Preventing SEC pre-emption of local zoning would let the people have powerful input without paying \$.	231
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	SEC should have a safety/fire official to protect the public.	154
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	In favor of an independent commission with chairs of local selectboards appointed to subcommittee on a case-by-case basis.	131
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	Members of the SEC are both too many and not enough. Too many from state agencies, none from the general public. The SEC should have it's own funding and not rely on the state agencies their members represent.	388
1 - SEC Membership/ Structure/ Process	Plymouth	The committee members should attend all major hearings about a proposed project. If the guidelines are well-written, there will be less of a need for hearings - any contractor will be able to determine if they can meet the criteria and are willing to do so.	389
2 - Public Engagement	Groveton	Land-owner protection: Developers may not approach more than 10% of the land owners until after a certain step in the process – e.g. after pre-application meeting.	260

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
2 - Public Engagement	Groveton	Additional option to consider regarding public engagement: Require SEC to respond, in a public forum, in writing, to every public comment received, and to demonstrate how each comment was taken into consideration in its decision-making	294
2 - Public Engagement	Groveton	The public receives no feedback on its input other than final decision, especially written input—were we even heard?	266
2 - Public Engagement	Groveton	A public engagement coordinator should also disseminate info/existence of projects	263
2 - Public Engagement	Keene	Pre-application as a part of the process is one of the best options we considered in this exercise. Requiring the applicant to conduct an open dialogue with the host communities allows for the flow & exchange of information about what’s important to the community, what areas should be avoided, etc. The applicant could also share the realities they face, and this helps promote the ability to build a partnership and avoid/limit an us vs them mentality from developing.	351
2 - Public Engagement	Keene	Variation on public engagement coordinator—make them county-based, not state-based to reduce the appearance of political/bureaucratic pressure and increase regional representation.	347
2 - Public Engagement	Keene	Consider having a member of the community or county where the project is going to be built as a member of the SEC for that project.	355
2 - Public Engagement	Keene	Suggest new option for SEC public membership—at least one regional county rep and a local rep.	364
2 - Public Engagement	Manchester	Require applicants to pay for informing the public using a multi-media approach	51
2 - Public Engagement	Manchester	Public engagement: Provide sufficient funding from the state budget to strengthen the process	47
2 - Public Engagement	Manchester	“Meaningful” Public engagement Means education & having a comprehensive energy plan for the state; Information about a project should not come in the form of a developer advertisement & propaganda. The proposed project should be considered in light of our energy plan for NH.	19

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
2 - Public Engagement	Manchester	Another question that I also think deserves a little more attention is the one regarding the Public Advocate for the SEC. I've seen the SEC in action and was really unimpressed with that person—not because that person wasn't doing the best they could, but because of the constraints placed on them. It seems to be a conflict of interest for the PA to have to balance public interest and power needs.	278
2 - Public Engagement	Manchester	Structure/membership: Should be discussing how the public members might be selected; what criteria should be used to choose that private person?	44
2 - Public Engagement	Manchester	Use technology to inform & gain feedback from the people.	48
2 - Public Engagement	Manchester	Abutter notification needs to be improved. Landowners should be notified by certified letter from project owner BEFORE filing @ SEC.	53
2 - Public Engagement	Manchester	Reduce need for public engagement by improving siting process to better represent the majority's interests	52
2 - Public Engagement	Manchester	On public engagement, need quantitative criteria written into statute/rules that gives weight to public opinion in affected towns. Applicant must notify affected towns of planned project before—or at least at time of—contacting affected property owners. SEC should defer to municipal preferences. Applicant must find independent study/assessment of projects effect on property values.	28
2 - Public Engagement	Manchester	Public engagement MUST include vote of IMPACTED townspeople with vote being significant criteria of SEC decision	22
2 - Public Engagement	Manchester	For the question about how the SEC can balance local concerns, they should inundate local newspaper with large informative articles	3
2 - Public Engagement	Newington	I've been selectman, chair of ZBA, chair of planning board, and I've seen the expectation of the ordinary person in being able to participate in decisions that affect them directly. This whole process exists because sense that there isn't enough public involvement now. We need to look for meaningful ways for public to have more direct impact into what is a very complex and difficult process that ends up favoring applicants.	369
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Counsel of Public should be independent and not appointed by AG.	93
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Pre-Application Process should include town select boards & county reps.	220

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Public Engagement: Allow towns to veto projects. Deny ability of SEC to pre-empt local zoning.	214
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	SEC Structure: Public member from affected community elected by the town.	113
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Most people don't find the current process transparent; on each case, the SEC should issue a report which itemizes the various categories of pro and con arguments it has considered, and how it has dealt with each of those.	288
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Publicize time and place of final voting so public can intend.	96
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Would it work to have two public counsels – one who would represent public in favor of project and one who would represent public against the project? These counsels could bundle concerns of public & represent their interests in adjudicatory process.	99
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Towns w/in 10 mi VIA area need to be invited to community meetings and have role in process.	100
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Public input – Why so late in process?	203
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Public Engagement: Feel there are significant barriers to citizens not familiar with the SEC process, or don't have ability to attend	129
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	How do citizens get notified of public hearings, pending applications, etc.	191
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Perhaps it would be useful to have two advocates for the public—one for projects supporters and one for opponents.	289
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	The idea of increasing public engagement is great but worthless if it provides no input in decision making that permits siting, or sets the rules, regulations, or guidance to the SEC.	101
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Publicly address each concern of public so public knows listened and reasoning.	97
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Public Engagement: Applicant pays for commercials newspaper/radio to inform the public about meeting.	146
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	More Media to encourage EMAIL/Electronic input FACEBOOK Feedback/input.	175
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	It's important that there is funding available for the public to engage experts.	74
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Engagement: Add statutory requirement that applicant has duty consider local, regional & public comment.	148
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Community Surveys were felt to be underutilized.	176
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Topic 4: Local rep. – voted by town for particular project.	181

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Public engagement HAS to include polling of the effected towns – more advertising needed. Need vs. greed & the pro v. con issues need to be made public.	160
2 - Public Engagement	Plymouth	Public Engagement: It needs to be clear that the Public Engagement Coordinator position has a vote to be meaningful.	132
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Groveton	Options for addressing visual impacts: Mitigation guidance is not effective because it is not strong enough. The option of having SEC attach mitigation conditionality to every certificate issued should be included.	269
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Groveton	Variances should be listed in the standards—e.g., distance from people or impact would change allowable noise. So a noise requirement could be relaxed for a remote plant, but more restrictive in an area that would impact people/wildlife.	297
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Groveton	Noise standards should be relative to ambient background, and there should be a comprehensive list relating to all energy projects. Applicant should be required to file anticipate noise expectations and address paying the fine as a cost of doing business. However, state should also take local ordinances into accounts if a local area wants to invite industry.	300
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Groveton	Health necessary consideration	243
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Groveton	If local standards exist for noise and visual, the SEC should use and abide by them. The SEC should not override or overrule local control.	296
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Groveton	Visual or noise impacts question: The statement “If not statewide noise standard, should the SEC defer to local noise standards” should be reversed to “The statewide noise standard should be minimal and then should defer to the local standards if they are higher.”	295
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Groveton	Noise: If the state standard were relative to background, then over time background decibel would always increase so standard is always increasing decibels. Thought a standard would be constant. A moving # isn’t really a standard	267
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Groveton	Aesthetics necessary consideration	242
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Groveton	SEC should establish requirements to mitigate potential adverse visual disruptions	298
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	In terms of noise, the word health also wasn’t mentioned at all tonight or in SEC proceedings. That should be an important consideration.	318

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	Noise & visual impacts should have guidelines so that SEC doesn't have to reinvent the wheel each time, but shouldn't be hard and fast standards. Should have regional forums to discuss & decide these guidelines	348
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	The bottom line—this is an aesthetics issue. Hard to define, but in a state like NH where a major part of our economy is based on tourism, aesthetics --including wildlife, natural spaces, etc.-- should be the NUMBER ONE issue that the SEC is mandated to deal with.	320
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	Jean Vissering, working with the Clean Energy States Alliance, has developed a process for evaluating visual impacts, "A Visual Impact Assessment Process for Wind Energy Projects." SEC should be using it.	323
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	I'd like to see either statewide noise guidelines—to give towns an idea where to start—or state standards that have an option to modify them on a case by case basis if given good cause. Should not be one hard and fast rule for all. At a minimum, the guidelines are needed so that towns don't set the standards so high that there would be no place in NH to put a new project.	352
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	There should be a state standard for noise based on region. Standard should include measurement of infrasound	344
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	Intervener funding is a greater idea; there is currently a huge burden on interveners	329
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	There is a need for funding for public engagement coordinator to provide info & resources at meetings, to towns, etc.	328
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	Visual should be done on a case by case basis	345
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	Good idea to have two meetings—one with developer and another w/ SEC—but requirements need to be put in place—should have SEC representatives present to explain questions & offer clarifications	330
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	I like the idea of statewide noise "guidelines" --e.g. best management practices-- rather than absolute standards. The problem with having local noise standards is that communities may tend to adopt restrictive noise standards that essentially eliminate themselves from consideration for energy facilities, in which case the state could end up with a limited number of options for siting any facilities.	350
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	Caution: Having public seat on SEC might be controversial or contentious	331
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	Sound guidelines are badly needed	338

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	1974 EPA study known as the Levels document quantified community noise reaction. The model has been applied to the wind farms in Maine, and it correctly predicted the citizen response to the wind farms there. FAA uses that model, it is a definitive work in the field that has never been challenged, and NH should incorporate it in decisions.	310
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	I'm a member of a planning board that spent 7 months developing a comprehensive ordinance for wind farms; the experience in front of the SEC was frustrating and maddening. While I am not an expert on any of the topics, I'm well acquainted with many of them and I felt like we never had an opportunity to talk about what we knew and understood. I think that one of the least understood issues on wind is noise. I couldn't even poll on the noise questions, because there was no answer that I think is the right way to handle it. There is so much misinformation about the unique characteristics of noise generated by windfarms that you don't want to leave it to individual towns, necessarily, because they may not have the requisite knowledge. However, at the moment, NEITHER DOES THE SEC. I believe there is a lot of study that needs to be done, and a state standard may be appropriate if it were an INFORMED standard.	308
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	Type of noise—e.g. impulse vs modulation -- should be considered.	362
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	Need to allow noise standards to change as we become more knowledgeable	357
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	SEC should use town LWES ordinance standards for visual impact. Affected towns' ordinances should be applied as well as the host town. If affected towns do not have LWES, the SEC should use the EPA "Levels" document.	359
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	Public notice needs to be expanded beyond legal notice of hearing in paper and in terms understandable for lay person.	327
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Keene	Aesthetics must be important in a state that depends on tourism, even though it is very hard to regulate aesthetics & dictate how to judge them. Noise needs more research.	334
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Manchester	Regarding noise, the decibels are often much higher than the applicants' experts quote, and violations occur. We need enforcement and oversight.	36
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Manchester	A statewide standard for noise needs to address distance from homes as well as decibel level. For wind towers, it relates to the height and output of the towers.	40
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Manchester	On noise & visual impacts, SEC should evaluate impact on property values and the economy	1

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Manchester	Visual impact studies need to be independent, not provided by the applicant but by a separate agency within the state.	38
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Manchester	One issue that our table did get hung up on was the noise question—it was really hard to come to an answer because noise is so subjective.	277
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Manchester	I'm a developer and engineer, firmly believe that smaller is better. You don't need to have a statewide plan, we need to recognize that what is needed in the city is much different than a rural area. You can have a set of standards that is different in each area. This would also keep the cost down for applicants.	276
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Newington	There should be consideration of local standards for visual impacts as well as noise standards.	385
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Newington	Noise ordinance –permitted	384
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Noise: regional local preference.	172
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Noise needs to be defined beyond decibel level!	168
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Visual Impacts: Allow the State to establish guidelines e.g. ME WEA.	217
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Noise & Visual Impact: Allow local governments to set their own visual impact standards that the SEC defers to.	216
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Visual Impacts: Develop standards to prohibit visual disruption --height restrictions, Ridgelines/Elevation-- that impacts miles from the site of an Instillation.	213
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Add "vibration" to noise and visual impacts for various projects, especially wind farms.	119
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Addressing Visual Impacts: local gov. preference on visual.	169
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Infrastructure noise should be included in the SEC Guidelines.	208
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	SEC Guidelines should include nighttime noise limits of no greater than 40 db outside and 30 db inside resident homes, or a limit of 5 db above ambient noise.	207
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Sub frequency noise not addressed from windmills.	121
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Visual and project should include how they effect local & regional economy.	123
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	If impact studies are needed, the project proposers should pay. The studies should be done by an impartial firm.	390
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	There should be a local preference on visual impacts.	102
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	If go with a State standard, allow local option and then go with the more stringent of the two.	108

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Noise Impacts: Local communities set all criteria for noise & visual. Not over ruled by SEC.	145
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	When considering site issues, remember to address the visual impact of the resulting transmission line; e.g. Route 25 in Rumney.	84
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	In 2007, wind siting guidelines were made but never enacted. The SEC should just follow these guidelines—streamline process, cut down on anxiety.	68
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	For noise levels. Absolute vs. relative should NOT have statewide, because difference of rural vs. non rural environments.	194
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	For noise, rural environments are different than larger cities such as Manchester, Concord.	193
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	State Noise Standard: Absolute as a ceiling, AND relative as described	82
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Noise & Visual: Filing requirements should include studies conducted by impartial, unbiased consultants somehow removed from the applicants' influence on the study outcomes. Applicants should not be able to pay for the study results they want. The results should be objective.	130
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	SEC should develop a visual impact study to include revenue associated with tourism as an analysis point.	221
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Noise: more in winter.	178
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Local preference for addressing visual impacts.	137
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Visual: just bury it.	171
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Local noise standards as a regional standard.	230
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Height restrictions.	150
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Absolute standard --kind of like requirements for future plants-- determined by review process.	224
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	SEC develop specific requirement state-wide.	225
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Since the visual impact is obviously high priority whether discussing wind farm or Northern Pass projects and this fact is clear from the response from these meetings that visual impact is at the top of the list, how is the SEC going to use this information to analyze projects that will be in the works before you reformulate the SEC process? Will there be consideration to what you are hearing at these meetings? Will you delay unnecessary projects to protect the residents of NH?	236
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Visual & noise impacts should be considered as a regional issue rather than simply as a community issue.	104

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	What about individual homeowners affected by higher wind noise.	227
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	Noise: Noise standards should be set for winter. It's a lot quieter in the winter in the woods & on the lake.	114
3 - Noise & Visual Impacts	Plymouth	There should be consideration of accumulative effect of noise from energy projects	103
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Groveton	On alternative routes, both #2 & #4 should be required	256
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Groveton	Should consider use of existing facilities & route	254
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Groveton	The questions on requiring use of existing rights of way should include state-owned ROWs	299
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Keene	It would be helpful to create incentives for applicants to provide alternatives—e.g., provide a greater likelihood of approval because there are options to consider. The chances for achieving balance and for mitigating impacts will be greater if alternatives/options are available.	349
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Keene	For alternative routes/sites, we should consider environmental impacts—wetlands, water table etc. Wildlife, pollution of air/water/land from building & operating the facility	353
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Manchester	Alternatives analysis: SEC applications should include a NEPA or least adverse impact criterium!	12
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Manchester	Alternatives routes: Consideration of advancements & progress in technology must be considered—archaic technologies like overhead transmission lines should be disfavored.	29
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Manchester	Project developers should have an independent analysis of project. This would make sure the project is credible and offer options for alternatives, for example, there are many wind consulting companies that could help make sure project is quality.	6
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Manchester	Suggestion for alternative routes/sites: Combine the use of an existing right of way and require burial within it—consider together, rather than having those options be mutually exclusive.	270
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Manchester	For the alternative routes question, a different option should be to Require burial option within an existing right of way , combining options 2 and 4	20
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Plymouth	“Alternate Site Options to Consider” B&C are not mutually exclusive, thus the choices could be expressed as A, B, C, B&C, D, B&D.	127
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Plymouth	I believe there is legislation in ME & CT regarding undergrounding.	98

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
4 - Alternative Sites/ Routes	Plymouth	The SEC needs to be required to consider alternatives to any proposal and the alternatives must include conservation/efficiency measures. These measures create local jobs and save people money while reducing consumption, dependence, pollution and environmental degradation. This in stark contrast to projects like Northern Pass and so-called renewable wind which make corporations money, increase consumption, dependence, pollution and environmental degradation. When will we learn the true costs of cheap energy--increased consumption, global warming, pollution, inefficiency, dependence (do you require electricity to flush your toilet?) and a country full of people who have lost their jobs to machines. Renewables are a pipe-dream that we can consume energy at the same heedless level as before but new sources will be green and therefore OK. The utilities want us on the train they're driving. There's still time to get off.	393
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Groveton	Alternative route options should include "it's not needed, don't even do it"	301
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Groveton	Independent need assessment	252
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Groveton	Must include reinstatement of need in application and as criteria and it should have been a part of the workshop & the discussion – see other states	247
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Groveton	Energy Policy must affirm NH's rural pristine wilderness in balance with preferred methods of energy generation	264
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Groveton	Very important issues you have left out: WHO should be able to use the SEC process and thus bypass local jurisdictions? Status quo: Currently, eligibility for SEC decision making is based mainly on project characteristics. Option to consider: SEC process eligibility should be based on project NEED—private projects that are not meeting any proven need should NOT be eligible for the SEC process and should have to meet local requirements just like any other for-profit proposal in those local communities	268
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Groveton	Need should be considered	265
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Groveton	Put "Need" back into SEC	237
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Groveton	Energy policy—a smart policy is necessary	239

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Keene	The applicant should be required to demonstrate need for the project before being allowed to proceed on the other criteria. "Need" would have to be defined to include only NH needs.	343
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Keene	Recommendations for 2007 study committee should be reviewed & most of it adopted as a state strategy	339
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Keene	On energy policy, there has been no build-out analysis on the RPS; how many miles of ridgeline is that goal equal to? I was proud when we signed onto 25x25, but now I've looked into it and there are a lot of unintended consequences	307
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Keene	Energy policy should require that the energy be needed in the state of NH.	332
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Keene	Tonight there were some things that were not addressed or glossed over in terms of things the SEC should be required to consider—when we talk about energy policy, I don't feel there was an emphasis on the idea of need for power. In Antrim, I didn't feel that they fact that the buyers were in RI affected SEC decision at all.	315
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Keene	Energy projects should be based only on NH "Need"	346
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	Today the NH SEC hears all energy projects if they are of a certain size. There is no requirement that each project provide a public benefit. This should be a requirement. The SEC should not hear energy projects that are "not needed" and do not qualify as having a public benefit.	26
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	Need for the energy—how the energy will benefit NH and outweigh the costs	24
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	Projects not needed to keep the lights on should not be regulated by the SEC	58
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	It is inaccurate to say that NH does not have an energy plan, it is simply outdated.	63
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	Must show NEED	27
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	Public benefit vs state benefit: CT requires an analysis and determination of "Public Need". NH does not NEED more power as a net exporter; NH Needs LOWER ENERGY COSTS – applications should include & be evaluated on this benefit!! Does SEC consider the relative value of a technology? For example, wind contributes little power compared to its visual/noise impacts; to achieve 24x24, will wind get us there?	11
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	State energy policy: the arguments against status quo were related to the lack of an energy strategy	43

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	“need” for energy needs to be accounted for; see the ISO-NE studies. Demand is decreasing.	39
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	I think it’s very important that we develop an overall state energy strategy, and that it be done on a rolling basis, rather than a static 10-year plan. Need to adapt to change and make sure that we always have something in place. Look to business strategies as a guide.	280
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	Rushing ahead to make decisions without a strategy is like saying we need to hurry up and go somewhere without knowing where we’re going. I don’t know if it’s possible to instate a moratorium during the development of the strategy, but I worry that without a roadmap, how do you know where you’re going?	281
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	It is very important for any state energy policy/strategy to be truly realistic, not the result of the influence of energy industry lobbying.	17
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	RPS can’t be met when we sell all the power out of state.	33
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Manchester	RPS requirements sound nice but an inherently unreasonable. In the case of wind, for example, 25% would translate to hundreds of miles of towers.	32
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Newington	Key questions need to be asked regarding how the SEC evaluates net public impact/benefit – the costs to people/environment vs amount of energy being generated & going into the local energy supply, not southern New England.	371
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Newington	Need to define “adequate supply of energy”—consider that conservation is a “source”!	376
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Newington	It’s a little disappointing that there wasn’t more discussion about determination of public need as part of this process. What that level should be and how it should happen is up for discussion, but it should have been discussed	368
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Newington	Take into account the “need” for a proposed project	377
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	Do not approve any new energy projects until an updated energy policy is in place for NH.	118
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	Should evaluate need if other applicants proposing projects with the most updated technology – should consider all & choose the project that has the least impact.	107
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	REC’s must stay in NH.	153
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	Restore a “need” for new energy facility.	152

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	Size of project should not matter, but should definitely be essential for NH and non profit.	94
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	NH must have an energy policy that applies to NH's needs, not the wants of for-profit companies.	392
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	One worrisome issue, as I am sure you are aware, was the lobbying effort by the utilities to remove the notion of “need” from the legislation.	124
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	Energy Policy: NH resident needs should be in policy w/no regard for the need from other states.	117
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	RECs should be credited to state where it’s produced.	140
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	SEC – Only hear NH essential, non profit applications.	89
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	In order to restore fairness to the process, unneeded utility projects should be significantly penalized. Allowing utilities to site unneeded projects on public land or in public view is a form of stealing from the public.	126
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	I think the wind projects, or any other renewable projects in NH ought to be required to sell all their power in NH, not to other states. If we’re going to live with the disruption, we should get the benefits.	66
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	One important criteria was never addressed – public need.	83
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	SEC – Must have energy policy – include possibilities of tracking nuclear waste, etc.	92
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	Energy policy is a must.	173
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	Is there pressure that the SEC has to approve projects that will help 25% in 2025.	196
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	Is 25% produced in NH or Sold in NH?	205
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	State energy policy needs to be put in place before SEC can consider any new elective projects.	162
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	Topic 3: Re-establish NEED.	180
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	Need for new energy in NH should be main priority.	166
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	I’m embarrassed to live in a state that doesn’t have a state energy policy; there should be no SEC review or approval of facilities unless and until the state adopts a formal policy.	284

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	I was very disappointed that tonight we didn't discuss the fact that the SEC doesn't have any requirement that the NEED for the power is evaluated. We've made it really easy for anyone who wants to build or sell power to do it in NH, but maybe we don't need all that power, and why should we have to look at wind turbines so that people in other states don't have to?	286
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	REC's should remain in NH, not sold out of state.	183
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	Wind projects should sell 100% of power generated to be used in NH, not MA & CT as in the recently proposed Wild Meadows.	189
5 - State Energy Policy/ Determination of Project Need	Plymouth	While a state energy policy is a great idea, we shouldn't allow it to be overtaken by project opponents and let them drag this whole process on further.	291
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Groveton	Should respond to local input	253
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Groveton	Local permitting vs local input should also be part of the discussion--see Colorado. Everything else has to go before local boards. Should include non-needed energy projects	248
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Groveton	Send/Require reports on local voting to SEC from every municipality involved and those affected by the project. SEC must meet specific criteria to overrule any local veto. Any over-ride must be upheld or overturned by Governor and council. Five checks = 100%	259
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Groveton	Projects must meet local OK to continue	238
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Groveton	In projects not for reliability but for private gain, whose 'vote' is more important, the industry pushing the project or the citizens of the area impacted?	244
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Keene	Intervener funding—Town selectmen and planning board should always be able to hire experts and legal counsel at applicants	361
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Keene	Town standards should be respected by SEC	363
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Keene	We did what we were supposed to and allowed to, developed our own ordinance, and then that ordinance was put on trial. The procedure should have provided the experts we needed to defend our ordinance.	312
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Keene	If an applicant appears before a local planning board, the applicant pays for all experts required by Board. It should work the same way if a municipality is an intervener. This should also include legal fees.	321

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Keene	If in fact renewable alternative energy sources are important to NH and if the impacts of these types of facilities often effect the wildlife, local environment, etc. of our communities, and if 'home-grown' energy is important, is there a way to create a clear nexus for energy produced within our communities to stay in those communities?	313
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Keene	The SEC should be required to pay attention to local zoning—towns spend years developing theirs and continually improve it. Not fair for SEC to ignore it.	317
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Keene	If an applicant came in front of a planning board, the board could require the applicant to pay any fees incurred. But at the SEC, town has to foot the bill; in our case, it was FIVE times the total annual planning board budget.	309
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Manchester	SEC exemptions: If exemption based on adequacy of local regulations, then it's irrelevant, if municipality is over-riden or municipality does not enforce adequately. If exemption is based on agency permits, what factors are weighed & regulated through that permit process? Is agency review as comprehensive as SEC review?	14
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Manchester	Municipal influence: The SEC can overrule any municipal regulations. Does this mean statewide energy needs are seen as more important than local quality of life, economy, etc.? WHY?? NH is a NET EXPORTER OF POWER! The main provision for protection of public benefit is the definition of "UNDULY interfering". Needs to be crystal clear, or a process designed to promote balanced evaluation of it.	10
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Manchester	We should also revisit the idea of local control. The SEC shouldn't be involved in certain private projects at all—you don't have them involved in Walmart, etc.	279
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Manchester	My overarching concern is that communities need to have a voice and a vote in the decision making process.	275
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Newington	RSA 162-H:10 should be amended to allow the Committee to require that an applicant, upon approval by the Committee, be required to pay for studies reasonably necessary for municipal planning or governing bodies to evaluate local impacts of particular projects. E.g. noise, proximity to public library, transportation	381

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Newington	Thinking a lot about the issue of local control and what that means in a place like NH, why it's important. There's a lot rolling around in my head about what projects get looked at by the SEC in the first place. Shouldn't there be a threshold for projects that go to the SEC in the first place? As someone who has a house directly in the pathway of a major transmission line, I'm feeling powerless like I'm going up against this utility with very deep pockets who is extremely determined to have this project here, it doesn't seem like a fair fight. No matter what happens at the SEC or DOE approvals, ultimately the large companies with deep pockets have a level of access to decision makers that the average citizen does not have. As a citizen, where are the checks and balances to make it fair, so that there's justice and integrity to the process? For me, that's what towns do, they provide that to the citizens. We volunteer our time and come together and develop the ordinances and look at where we should have development and where should stay pristine, and where historical considerations have to be made. The towns are the center of NH. There should be a burden of proof on developers to establish that their project has some level of need in order to make it to the SEC. Otherwise, decisions should be made by local towns under their ordinances. The threshold for trumping local ordinances should be a very serious one. When you weigh a town government vs a state, it's easy to say the state should win, but towns are how we organize as people, and if 90% of towns are speaking out about something, that should not be overlooked. Local ordinances must be given full weight—otherwise I simply don't have any hope that the process will be fair.	366
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Newington	Role of local control over siting issues needs great attention—energy developer should not be allowed to trump local ordinances, especially for merchant projects.	372
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Newington	Intervener funding for municipal officials so they can bring on expertise & counsel	383
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Newington	Key questions need to be asked regarding which projects get reviewed at the state level/SEC vs remaining at the local level of decision-making, thru land use ordinances, referenda, etc.	370
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	SEC must have at forefront taking care of affected citizens NOT business or special interests.	88
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Each town affected should have a town officer sitting on SEC with voting rights with a minimum of equal public affected citizens as other voting block.	87

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	For each category of application analysis --i.e. historic sites, safety, visual, etc-- an applicant often brings in an "expert" with credentials. The SEC & Council for the public should never allow a one sided expert testimony to stand without an "expert" rebuttal. In Groton wind, Iberdola had a visual aesthetic "expert." NH didn't have an expert, so Iberdola's testimony by definition carried today. The SEC said no impact because there was no expert to the contrary. It was but one example of slanted analysis. NH is being out gunned by experts paid by developers!	111
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	If a major project affected several dozen communities in NH and the majority of them voted against the project, I cannot see how any common sense procedure would ever allow the SEC to approve such a project.	80
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Grafton – Rights based ordinance passed. Alexandria Groton?	229
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Multi-town coordination.	228
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Visual Impacts: Should SEC be able to override town zoning ordinances? NO!	81
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	How many meetings, votes, etc. take place before citizens' votes count.	192
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Give more weight to citizens & less to lobbyists/developers. Local opinion/control should ALWAYS be most important.	161
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	The SEC should not have authority to preempt municipal jurisdiction.	164
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	SEC should not have the right to over ride local gov.	170
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Topic a: Add statutory requirement that applicant has duly considered local, regional & public comment.	177
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	The towns and the residents of those towns affected by a proposed project must share in the process.	391
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Treat energy projects as regional impact w/all affected towns.	138
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Any facility proposed should have substantial support from the local community, such as 60% or more of residents in host and abutting towns.	182
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Stakeholders – why no impacted residents?	202

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Any facility that's proposed should have substantial support from the local communities—e.g. 60% in town vote that needs to happen BEFORE anything else. Siting has to be a local thing.	71
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	SEC should not be able to pre-empt local zoning ordinances. It's not outlandish for localities to expect way more control over what happens to us. Look at example of Colorado.	79
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	The definition of 'affected communities' ought to be examined. It's not just the host community.	75
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Any town that will see a project needs to have veto power over that project.	394
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	What weight is giving to noise – visual – public input municipal input.	122
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	The government is supposed to be of the people, by the people, for the people. It seems that in the legislature, the primary focus is on attracting businesses at the sacrifice of citizens and towns. The SEC needs to pay more attention to the people being affected. Each town needs a rep on projects affecting them.	77
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	I would like to ask the SEC to find ways to level the playing field. Companies have years in secret to develop their plans, and communities should be given at least a year or two to research the project, with the process paused. Maybe with funding provided by the applicant. We're competing against companies with billions of dollars in profits.	78
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Don't allow SEC to pre-empt local ordinances concerning height zoning of structures.	218
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Deny SEC pre-emption of local zoning.	219
6 - Consideration of Local Views/ Resources for Municipalities	Plymouth	Industrial wind projects should not be built in any watershed. Industrial wind projects should not go in tourist based economies. There should be a study on the sound that these wind towers make besides desimals. These sounds are making people sick. This why in Europe they have to be built 6 miles from where people live. The surrounding towns around these wind projects should be able to vote for or against if it effects their view.	133
7 - Other	Groveton	Does size of project call for different criteria	241
7 - Other	Groveton	More emphasis on changing technologies that may argue against obsolete/soon to be obsolete methods of generation and transmission, and also impact of conservation on need and new technologies that can meet it	251

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
7 - Other	Groveton	Conservation of energy must be part of consideration	240
7 - Other	Groveton	Restructuring Option not considered	245
7 - Other	Groveton	Not enough discussion/emphasis on economic impacts, full spectrum for local impact, regional & state—Some of this should be picked up as develop energy policies and strategies, but should be emphasized as part of this discussion	250
7 - Other	Groveton	Criteria SEC is required to consider: NEED, environmental impact, local economic impact	258
7 - Other	Groveton	No money in conservation -- is it even needed? No build alternative	255
7 - Other	Keene	We need to keep in mind the env impacts of new projects, and count those toward the total cost of the project—whether that means mitigation to prevent groundwater contamination, etc. Those costs should be covered by the applicant and not be deflected to local or county taxpayers	304
7 - Other	Keene	Local property values must be considered	333
7 - Other	Keene	I would like to say that I found some of these scores tonight surprising—I think it would be interesting to correlate the question on experience with SEC with other responses. Having been through the process, I don't think anyone who's actually been through it could have chosen some of the answers they did	305
7 - Other	Keene	A large concern I have is addressing as quickly as possible the changes necessary to actually reduce the speed climate change is having on our planet.	326
7 - Other	Keene	Wind seems to be pretty unique, and maybe the same SEC shouldn't be overseeing all types of projects. There are a lot of subtle considerations that are unique to wind.	306
7 - Other	Keene	The SEC should look at the effect of projects on NH electric rates. We should not be bound by a 25x25 standard if that is going to drive up electric rates. Jobs and affordable living is dependent on energy prices, this is one of those effects, like destruction of the ridgeline, or the deforestation of Southern NH for biomass, that is not desirable to achieve an arbitrary 25% number. I don't think that number even had much discussion before it was chosen, it's a 'feel-good' number. What does it actually mean?	311
7 - Other	Keene	SEC should consider total "cost" including changes to the environment—don't let a company externalize costs.	354

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
7 - Other	Keene	There was no mention of requiring conservation of ridgeline as mitigation for inevitable negative impacts of industrial development on a ridgeline—in cases where NH Wildlife Action Plan has designated the area as significant wildlife resource it should be automatic.	340
7 - Other	Keene	I haven't heard the term property values mentioned at all tonight. How local property values are affected should be a priority.	316
7 - Other	Keene	Taxation—towns don't understand the potential tax impact or penalty for a large project, especially for towns in multi-town school districts. How should this be handled? Involve DRA?	335
7 - Other	Keene	There has been no build-out analysis done for the RPS to determine how many miles of ridgeline would be developed—that's a major drawback. Good intentions, but no realization what it means—visually, wildlife, forest fragmentation	341
7 - Other	Keene	Not enough focus on environmental issues—wildlife, etc. was mentioned almost in passing.	319
7 - Other	Keene	SEC should evaluate the effect on NH electric rates and reject any project which increases the rates	360
7 - Other	Manchester	Enforcement & oversight during construction and post-construction to ensure compliance.	23
7 - Other	Manchester	Health issues other than noise should be discussed	57
7 - Other	Manchester	Subsidized power should be factored in when considering cost effectiveness as well as effect on rates	31
7 - Other	Manchester	Health was not mentioned as a reason to oppose energy projects; i.e. transmission lines cause cancer, wind projects numerous illnesses	50
7 - Other	Manchester	While all of this is being decided, we need a moratorium on new projects.	34
7 - Other	Manchester	Wind & solar can both be mitigated by being in a distributed network	56
7 - Other	Manchester	A similar hearing should be held to apply standards to pipelines. These questions related to wind & transmission lines. And what about offshore?	54
7 - Other	Manchester	Efficiency and reducing demand needs to be accounted for.	30
7 - Other	Manchester	Is the power dispatchable, dependable?	272
7 - Other	Manchester	We have to start replacing our carbon-based generation facilities with hydro, solar, and wind. Our population will be 500 million by 2055. The sooner we get started, the better for all concerned.	46

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
7 - Other	Manchester	It seems like we go through the siting process (where it goes, and the impact of it) in great detail, but we totally ignore how good the power plant itself is. E.g., if we had a miracle perfect power source, it has to go through the same process as a dirty, remote coal plant.	271
7 - Other	Manchester	Renewables should be prioritized, including wind; climate change & the environment should be a factor.	15
7 - Other	Manchester	Decommissioning capacity should be analyzed by SEC	13
7 - Other	Manchester	Criteria for project approval: RI explicitly includes “public health, safety, and welfare, “ NH is not explicit about protecting these community welfare elements	9
7 - Other	Manchester	The influence by lobbyists needs to be considered and reduced. They should not be able to weigh in and sway decisions as they do now.	37
7 - Other	Manchester	NH needs to discuss alternative types of renewables	2
7 - Other	Manchester	Cost of transmission lines needed to connect to grid?	273
7 - Other	Manchester	Emissions when connected to the grid (e.g., intermittent sources require fossil fuel back up.)	274
7 - Other	Manchester	Any new proposals to SEC should be subject to the new rules	42
7 - Other	Manchester	We need to address mitigation of impacts during & post construction.	282
7 - Other	Newington	SEC should consider net benefits of project when it evaluates it under RSA 162-H:16, IV	374
7 - Other	Newington	The statute should be amended to make clear that agency permit decision shall be available before public adversarial hearings. RSA 162-H:7 and 10 are ambiguous on this point	379
7 - Other	Newington	Why not SEC guidelines/standards for generation sites? What sites are “off-limits” to wind development, hydro? Or what sites are appropriate?	386
7 - Other	Newington	The state fire marshal should be represented on the SEC because safety issues are present in every project	378
7 - Other	Newington	NOT all renewable energy technologies are created equal—need to distinguish between hydro vs wind vs solar vs tidal vs biomass	375
7 - Other	Newington	How is the decision making for these issues different from the “home rule” decision made to defeat the Onassis refinery project in Durham back in the 70s?	373
7 - Other	Plymouth	What about supervision of applicant to hold them accountable.	198

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
7 - Other	Plymouth	With the overwhelmingly negative public opinion of the SEC, how can they justify approving any projects until we resolve this?	64
7 - Other	Plymouth	Developers should provide a Property Value Guarantee.	158
7 - Other	Plymouth	Why does CT have moratorium on wind turbines and NH does not.	197
7 - Other	Plymouth	SEC guidelines should include omission of facility locations of areas of recognized high scenic value	159
7 - Other	Plymouth	Currently most of the “expert” testimonies are hired by the developer. There needs to be balance. We’ve all done research projects in school – skewing data to prove your point is done all the time. Reading through SEC filings & then doing more searching on your own can leave your head spinning.	165
7 - Other	Plymouth	Guidelines in place should be followed.	167
7 - Other	Plymouth	Topic 2: Property values economic source for NH – tourism #2.	179
7 - Other	Plymouth	Developers should pay cost of transmission lines, rather than taxpayers, especially if power produced in NH continues to be shipped out of state.	184
7 - Other	Plymouth	Developers should provide a Property Value Guarantee for a radius of 3 miles from project.	187
7 - Other	Plymouth	Use the 2007 wind power siting guidelines.	151
7 - Other	Plymouth	With public opinion so negative about the effectiveness of the SEC process, how can the SEC evaluate & approve any projects over the next year.	195
7 - Other	Plymouth	Developers should pay cost of transmission line.	156
7 - Other	Plymouth	What about decommission of wind turbine. \$, timeframe, etc.	199
7 - Other	Plymouth	What about negative impact on tourism, development of region.	200
7 - Other	Plymouth	What about impact of decrease in real estate values on areas where there are wind turbine.	201
7 - Other	Plymouth	Unintended consequences of facilities must be considered. Example – roads constructed for the turbines have allowed increased access for timber harvesting at the Groton wind project. The activity has compromised the clarity and quality of the Clark Brook in Rumney. Example – veterans living near the wind turbines in Falmouth, MA have experienced increased symptoms from PTSS.	209

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
7 - Other	Plymouth	PILOT programs place a burden on towns to negotiate with wind companies. The towns should receive support through a standing committee separate of the SEC, in which both engineering and fiscal concerns are addressed, on navigating any contract with these companies.	210
7 - Other	Plymouth	Fish and Wildlife Standards: existing commercial infrastructure.	223
7 - Other	Plymouth	Need conservation and protected species laws to bolster decisions.	226
7 - Other	Plymouth	There's a gaping hole that we need to address in the tax policy associated with these projects. Right now, statute allows for PILOTs, but something like NP doesn't fall within the category, and DRA is not following the PILOTs when they set equalization rates. We're seeing the utility companies using the state's DRA report against the towns for the tax abatement appeals. One arm of the state is being used against the other. Don't forget about the taxes when we're being sold these projects. PILOT should be for life	292
7 - Other	Plymouth	The SEC is a mish-mash of well-intentioned but ill-constructed guidelines. These guidelines are too subjective. One of the attendees likened our attempts at discussion to "writing on jello." The first question the SEC asks should be "Is this proposed energy project needed for system reliability?" The second is "How is this need determined?" The third is "Who gets to decide?"	387
7 - Other	Plymouth	Any power project should be required to post a bond that would guarantee that the land and environment be returned to the state it was before the project after the plant is decommissioned regardless of the cost.	190
7 - Other	Plymouth	Should bonds be set aside at the expense of the constructor to cover such a cost and return the land to its original status?	110
7 - Other	Plymouth	I've met lots of residents & tourists and most knew that there were wind turbines in the area but over 50% did not know that more were proposed. Everyone wanted to know who was profiting, and how they can be allowed, and what they could do to fight it. Concern ranged from aesthetics to environmental protection; many were tourists who felt that having turbines in the area would destroy what's special about Newfound—it's a pristine area. I was originally for wind power, but it has to be sited where it makes sense-- sustainable wind that doesn't destroy our ridgelines in newfound.	65

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
7 - Other	Plymouth	Decommissioning; all projects should be required to post a bond to guarantee that land gets returned to the state it was in. The amount should not be pre-set, because it could be artificially low.	67
7 - Other	Plymouth	SEC guidelines should include the omission of facilities in areas of recognized scenic value. If we take away our scenic value, we take away the essence of NH	72
7 - Other	Plymouth	The biomass plant that's existing right now is only 3 miles from the wind farms that are going to go up. Newfound lake shouldn't be a dumping ground. These decisions need to be about more than the 25% RPS number, nobody should have to live with ALL of these things in their area	76
7 - Other	Plymouth	Energy Policy has to include tax impact. Law should require PILOTS with all municipalities on all projects before SEC, not just renewable ones. Additionally, DRA should be required to follow PILOTS in setting equalization rates, and the use of DRA 83-F reports against municipalities in any tax abatement appeal should be prohibited.	86
7 - Other	Plymouth	Commitment for decommissioning & costs.	95
7 - Other	Plymouth	State should use most updated technology.	106
7 - Other	Plymouth	What consideration is being made to remove these structures once they reach the end of their useful life?	109
7 - Other	Plymouth	Impacts: Local, regional economic impact.	149
7 - Other	Plymouth	Visual: Regional economic impact/tourist industry.	115
7 - Other	Plymouth	Must require accurate models of exact development proposal – size.	135
7 - Other	Plymouth	Dartmouth Analysis – adopt conclusions.	143
7 - Other	Plymouth	Look @ Cape Cod Commission DRI review process & structure.	141
7 - Other	Plymouth	Abandon wind in NH & put solar panels on every commercial roof in the country.	136
7 - Other	Plymouth	Should include serious evaluation and assessment of all other impacts – transpo, econ, wildlife, plants, vernal pools, taxes, property values.	134
7 - Other	Plymouth	Who funded the lobbyists for the people? That's a joke!	125
7 - Other	Plymouth	Noise & Visual: All of the options very important to me. Difficult to choose between big picture climate change – air quality vs. wildlife, noise, visual which address more specific projects & can vary depending on type of project.	120
7 - Other	Plymouth	Purchase Option: Must offer buy-out for any homes impacted by sound.	116

Public Comments Received at Workshops

Topic Area	Location	Comment	#
7 - Other	Plymouth	Must require true and valid accurate resource assessments by professional independent contractor, not applicant, who will change data in thier favor.	139
8 - Cumulative Impacts	Keene	Case by case is a weakness. There should be a cumulative impact considered for 2nd, 3rd facilities in a region. Cumulative impacts on wildlife, noise, aesthetics should all be considered.	342
8 - Cumulative Impacts	Manchester	Cumulative impact consideration	25
8 - Cumulative Impacts	Manchester	There needs to be consideration of the cumulative impact of multiple projects in one area	41
8 - Cumulative Impacts	Manchester	There is nothing in the statute that allows for cumulative impact of multiple projects, each project is evaluated in a vacuum.	283
8 - Cumulative Impacts	Plymouth	SEC Guidelines must include cumulative impact of energy facility siting.	206
8 - Cumulative Impacts	Plymouth	SEC should be required to analize and compare the potential benefits to NH versus the potential costs to NH prior to considering any wind power project weighing issues like: 1. Visual Impact of the project; 2. Impact to the environment i.e. noise, flicker, water run off; 3. Life safety issues; versus short and long term benefits to NH.	188
8 - Cumulative Impacts	Plymouth	The most concerning thing is the cumulative impact of facilities—there isn't anything addressing cumulative impacts right now. Developers are working independently of each other and don't seem to understand the overall impact on our area.	70