

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL**

**Petition of BNE Energy Inc. for a
Declaratory Ruling for the Location,
Construction and Operation of a 3.2 MW
Wind Renewable Generating Project on
New Haven Road in Prospect, Connecticut**

Docket/Petition No. 980

February 14, 2011

Prefiled Testimony of Calvin Goodwin

1. Please state your name and address for the record.

My name is Calvin Goodwin. I live at 19 Woodcrest Drive, Prospect, Connecticut.

2. Where is your home located in relation to the proposed site of the industrial wind turbines?

My home is located approximately 2,000 feet east of the proposed south industrial wind turbine tower.

3. What is your occupation?

I am a quality assurance manager of a local steel distributor.

4. How long have you lived in Prospect and why did you move here?

I have lived at my home on Woodcrest Drive for just over a 21 years. I live there with my wife and my two daughters, ages 17 and 21. I previously lived in Thomaston, Connecticut. A wonderful experience brought me this town. I was living in Thomaston with my wife and 5 year old son. When it was time for him to enter Kindergarten we decided to enroll him in the local Parochial school. Long story short his teacher and her husband are now our neighbors and best friends. If the turbines are sited at 178 New Haven Rd I will lose my best friends. They will move. That is an option that I cannot exercise.

4. Do you have any personal experience with respect to wind energy?

Yes. I visited the industrial wind turbine facility in Falmouth, Mass. From my experience in observing the industrial wind turbines in Falmouth, it is clear to me that the site proposed by BNE energy in Prospect is entirely inappropriate. I observed the turbines in Falmouth from a distance of approximately one-half of a mile. There was a constant, loud whooshing sound that would modulate as the blades passed the tower. It was comparable to the sound of a jet airplane overhead, with the difference that the sound that did not stop.

5. Why did you come before the Siting Council to testify concerning this application?

I have carefully studied much of BNE's Petition. I am not claiming to be an expert, but just a man with some common sense. Many places in the petition cause me to wonder as to the reliability of the data presented.

The petition wind study has a notation that a humidity gauge was not installed in time to allow a sufficient length of data, so the humidity at Tweed New Haven airport, twenty miles away. How can we trust results using data from offsite? How does this affect the wind calculations results?

The site map states that normal spacing was not used as the site has limitations. BNE 980 Vol. 1, p. 5 C. BNE did not make any outreach to the public until the public hearing on Oct 16 2010. Paul Corey stated at the meeting that it was not required and held at the insistence of the Mayor of Prospect. BNE also has distributed a misleading photograph through an ad and a flyer in the local newspaper and a town-wide mailing. The photograph is a simulated view of the turbines from 1.8 miles away overlooking the Naugatuck State Forest. It is a reproduction of the

image attached as Exhibit J, view 2 to BNE's Petition. This view tends to portray that the turbines are located in the middle of nowhere. The reality for homeowners in my neighborhood who are as close as two city blocks to 492 foot tall towers with a turbine as big as a school bus perched on top will be very different.

BNE's Petition describes the fall zone for the turbines, but neglects to mention that the fall zone of the north turbine would be into a wetland area. BNE Petition, Vol. 1, Sec. J, p. 29.

In addition, BNE states that the fall zone is 1.5 the turbine height, but does not provide a basis for this conclusion.

BNE's Petition also includes a report from Electric Power Engineers, Inc. that lists various turbines and their performance characteristics. BNE Petition, Vol. 3, Ex. N. While BNE has said that their preferred turbines are the GE1.6 MW XLE, BNE also states that the Vesta V100 1.8 MW provided the highest capacity factor of 39.8 % at the 100 meter hub height and the GE 1.6 XLE offers 36% at the 100 meter hub height. However, BNE has not signed a contract to purchase any specific turbines and states in a footnote that the use of the GE 1.6 MW XLE or the Vesta V100 1.8 MW turbine will require further "investigation" to "mitigate" this issue. BNE Petition, Vol. 3, Ex. N, p. 4. How can approval be sought when minimum requirements are not met? How can we approve without the adjacent land owners understanding a written approval to allow a fall across the property line. When are these additional studies to be conducted?

BNE's Petition also acknowledges that they cannot meet the recommended spacing requirements for their preferred choice of turbines at this site. BNE Petition, Vol. 3, Ex. N, p. 4. They note that 4X rotor diameter is generally recommended (1312 ft.), but propose spacing of 2 X rotor diameter, (656 ft.) due to site limitations. The smaller spacing will also have a negative

impact on turbine power production. In other words, the site is too small.

As a citizen of this state town and country I feel that sufficient doubt exists on safety, the accuracy and trustworthiness of the data presented in BNE's Petition. The result of such uncertainty is unnecessary risk to the health and safety of the citizens of Connecticut, especially those who have the misfortune of living in close proximity to these industrial machines.

The minutes of the Connecticut Clean Energy Fund's (CCEF) meeting of June 24, 2010 further reflect the hasty judgment and inaccurate and misleading information that have been the hallmark of this project from the start. These minutes show the Wind Prospect and Wind Colebrook projects were represented to be 10 MW each wind systems at the time CCEF funding was approved. Paul Corey recently told the Prospect Planning and Zoning Commission that this was based on their belief at the time that four 2.5 MW turbines could be sited in Prospect.

Given the fact that the Prospect site, by BNE's own admission, is not of a sufficient size to properly space even two 1.6 MW turbines, the representations made to CCEF can only reflect gross incompetence or deception. It was based on these false representations that the CCEF found it to be "in the interests of ratepayers, and that funding be approved for the Project in an amount not to exceed \$397,625 for Wind Prospect and \$380,375 for Wind Colebrook."

(Attachment A)

I heard testimony from a representative of the CCEF that as we have expended these funds we do not want to lose them by any denial of this Petition. We are also told that because those funds have been committed and in large part spent, we must proceed forward with great haste, without putting reasonable regulations in place and without the answers to many critical unanswered questions, lest BNE's opportunity to obtain another government handout be lost.

If the CCEF had any reasonable regulations to follow they would have realized not only that four turbines could not possibly fit on this site, but that it is a totally inappropriate site for any industrial wind turbines because of its size and its proximity to homes. Instead, the good citizens of Prospect have been required to contribute their hard-earned savings to hire experts, attorneys and consultants to fight an unfair battle against an energy company that is funded with our own electric bill payments to hire their experts, attorneys and consultants. If thoughtful consideration had been given to reasonable regulations, standards and setbacks, I respectfully submit that no one would have proposed this site and all of this agony could have been avoided.

But that is in the past. There is still an opportunity to ensure that despite having started down a very wrong path, we can reach a correct conclusion that will not put the health, safety and peaceable enjoyment of residents in their home at needless risk.

I do not know how BNE came to the conclusion that four turbines were inappropriate. The same company that did not know four turbines could not be sited on this property wants you to rely on their incomplete and misleading data and representations to give them permission to forge ahead and place my family's health, way of life and safety at risk. The fact that funds were committed and issued at an inappropriate stage of development, based upon false information is a reason to stop and reconsider, not a reason to continue forward continuing to rely on the same dubious sources on information.

Every location I have researched that is located near residents noise is an issue. During a town sponsored trip to Falmouth Mass, our bus was met by a group of Falmouth residents. Their message was: "Do not allow a turbine near your neighborhood." Based upon what I observed, I could understand why. We need to listen to the experience of residents living near operating wind

turbines. They have the facts, not the projections, estimates and empty promises that BNE provides.

Don't be fooled like the CCEF and the regulators and residents of Falmouth!

6. Is there anything else that you would like for the Siting Council to consider?

Yes. We decided to adopt a child when our son was eight years old. We traveled to the Dominican Republic and adopted a two year old boy, who is now twenty four and proudly serving his country in the US Army. We adopted Kelvin's sister later that year as an infant. We were then later blessed with Catherine who is now 17.

I have attached a the pages of a power point presentation Catherine made two years ago as a school project. View the presentation and you will understand the quality of life we have in the back yards of my neighborhood. Our right to maintain this quality of life deserves your consideration and respect. It is the goal of our request for regulations and sensible siting decisions that protect the health and welfare of our State. Do not allow my daughter to lose her place of refuge.