

## Oral notes for May 15<sup>th</sup>

by Eric (Ric) Werme, <https://wermenh.com/wind/hmmh-oral-testimony.pdf>

In my .pdf submission two weeks ago - Critique, Comments, and Weather: a review of the Rand and HMMH sound studies, I tried to stick facts and analysis.

Today I'd like to shift a bit to the emotional side, in particular, "disappointment."

I'm disappointed that I did not find the contract with HMMH, in particular what they were told to study.

I was disappointed to read "access to properties to conduct the monitoring was not available."

I was more disappointed to read that the property owners wanted monitoring to be done from their properties – I don't see how negotiations led to that miscommunication.

I was disappointed with the dates and weather HMMH chose to study, and am extremely disappointed that after a difficult day impaired by strong ground level winds, the next day was chosen for its forecast of light winds.

I shall be disappointed if this subcommittee chooses to accept the HMMH report over the richer and more valuable 2021 report by Rand Acoustics.

I understand that Antrim Wind Energy submitted a review by Epsilon Associates that rejected the Rand report in part due to (and I quote) "NH SEC Rule Site 301.18.e requires that monitoring include periods with the wind turbines in both operating and non-operating ("background") mode[s]. This was not done during the Rand testing period. ... Mr. Rand's failure to comply with this basic SEC requirement renders his conclusions meaningless since there is no basis for differentiating turbine noise from other noise."

On the other hand, today's report similarly states "since HMMH had no control over or contact with the operators of the Antrim Wind turbines, HMMH could not get them shut down for periods to enable measurement of background sound levels."

In summary, I will be disappointed if you accept the HMMH report today.

Thank you.