



November 21, 2008

Marcia Spencer Famous
Land Use Regulation Commission
22 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0022
(207) 287-2632

**Subject: Revised LURC Grid Scale Wind Energy Development Application
Stetson II Wind Project, T8 R4 NBPP, Washington County, Maine**

Dear Marcia:

I have enclosed for your review and comment the Grid Scale Wind Energy Development Application for the Stetson II Wind Project in T8 R4, NBPP, Washington County, Maine. I have amended the application in several places to respond to the items set forth in your November 10, 2008, request for additional information. To facilitate your review, the following summarizes in italics the items raised in your November 10, 2008, comments and provides a response or, in most instances, simply a cross-reference to where the information is provided in the revised application.

1. Concerns raised by Steve and Diana Gonzalez (attached) - The applicant has spoken to Steve and Diana Gonzalez on several occasions regarding their concerns. Additionally, the visual and sound impacts of the project are discussed in detail in the visual and sound reports found in the application. See Section 16 and 17. The estimated sound level contour map (Exhibit 16, Figure 7) identifies what the sound level will be in the areas around the project. Predicted sound levels will be less than 45 dBA, and would be 35 dba around eastern and southern shore of Upper Hot Brooke lake. Neither Upper Hot Brook Lake nor the other lakes within the area are scenic resources of state or national significance and therefore in accordance with 12 M.R.S.A. § 685-B(4)(C) and 35-A M.R.S.A. § 3452, views from those locations are not included in the visual impact assessment. Finally, the project is located within the expedited zone and therefore does not require rezoning to a D-PD zone and an associated analysis of alternative project sites. An analysis of alternatives to the turbine and road layout and wetland impacts is included in the application. See Section 5.
2. Submit with the revised application an original applicant signature on the copy designated as the "original". Copies of the application may have a photocopy of the signature.
Included in original
3. Notification – The public notice of filing sent to abutters and others living in the area of the project stated that requests for public hearing must be submitted within two weeks of the date of filing. In actuality, the two week period starts at the date of the application being accepted for processing. Of course, this date has not yet been established. Especially given the concerns that apparently are popping up with some of the locals, a corrected notice should be re-sent so that there is no concern that the public process has not been properly accommodated. The revised notice should state that people should contact me to find out the date the application is accepting for processing.
See Section 23 and Exhibit 23.

4. In reference to the concern the Navy expressed about all wind power projects in Maine during the review of LURC's rule changes, were they notified of this project? If so, who was notified, and when?
See Section 8.
5. Development description – The project description summary narrative was very brief, so at the least the following should be added:
 - a. Length of collector line
See Project Description
 - b. Type of permanent met towers
See Project Description
 - c. A sample drawing of a turbine and a foundation
See Exhibit 5A
 - d. Have geotechnical borings to determine the type of foundation been done yet? If so, please submit with the application the results. If not, please explain when this will happen and why you believe it is not needed at this time.
See Section 15
 - e. Roads – gravel? Maximum slope? Width? Who would be responsible for post-construction maintenance?
See Project Description
 - f. Re-vegetation of road sides, and stockpile stabilization – how would this be accomplished?
See Section 6.2 and Exhibit 1 Sheet C15
 - g. Lighting during construction if night construction is needed?
See Section 8
 - h. Water source for dust control? (trying to avoid just taking it from a stream)
See Section 9.4
6. Wetlands
 - a. The S-3 form states P-WL2 and P-WL3 impacts. There are no stream crossings included. Are there going to be any stream crossings, including upgrades to existing crossings, of perennial and intermittent streams for either the roads or the utility line? Under LURC's rules, stream channels and any wetland within 25 ft of the stream channel, are P-WL1 wetlands.
See Section 11 and Exhibit 11A
 - b. Please supply wetland delineation field forms
See Exhibit 11B
 - c. Was an in-stream work window specified? If not, why?
See Section 11
 - d. Temporary impacts? If so, where, by what, and when removed?
See Key Facts Table, Section 6, and Section 11



7. Financial capacity – Exhibit 2B: I didn't see any supporting information in the application for the letter from First Wind, for example, a copy of last year's company financial report.
See Exhibit 2C.
8. Subdivision history – Exhibit 4B: Please supply additional information about the camp leases – when the leases were formed, do they define lots, what the transfers have been if any, etc.
See Revised Exhibit 4B.
9. Because Rt. 169 is a county?/state? road, I assume the ownership of the road is by the county/town, and as such divides Lakeville Shores' ownership in T8 R4 NPBB. Is this correct?
See Revised Exhibit 4B.
10. Will the parcel be co-used for continuing forest operations by Lakeville Shores, like the Stetson Mtn. project? Will the parcel be accessible by the public after construction?
See Section 7.4; and Project Description.
11. Erosion control - How will erosion control be managed by the applicant during the clearing by the forest operations contractor? As you know, this has been identified as an issue for these projects. Forestry activities are not accustomed to meeting typical development erosion control requirements, and as such stricter oversight is apparently needed.
See Section 10.
12. Agency contacts - There appears to be some redundancy of materials between Appendix F of Exhibit 11, Exhibits 12A and 12B, Exhibit 13, and Exhibit 14. Is there anyway to consolidate these into one "Agency Contacts" section, and then refer the reader to this section? I can go either way, but seemed like it might save paper.
Exhibit 11 now points to the other exhibits.
13. Soils – I will have to wait for Dave Rocque's feedback during the permit review to determine if the Class C Medium High Intensity soils survey is adequate, given what we already know about the general area from the review of Stetson I. Did Al Frick consult with Dave as he worked on this?
See Section 15 and Exhibit 15.
14. Specify when the temporary trailers will be removed. How will wastewater generated on-site during construction be disposed of? Would there be porta-potties located at the trailers?
Section 7.1 and Section 9
15. Application fee – I will need to consult with Scott Rollins about the application fee before finalizing it, and he is not in today. I'll try to get that wrapped up on Wednesday. Tomorrow is a holiday for us, as you know.
Will be submitted when fee is determined.

Please do not hesitate to contact me (207-729-1199) should you have any questions during the course of your review.

Sincerely,
STANTEC CONSULTING

Emily F. Walsh
Project Manager

PN 195600401



Stantec

Friday, November 07, 2008

TO: Marcia Spencer Famous, Senior Planner
Maine Land Use Regulation Commission
22 State House Station Augusta, Me 04333
207-287-4933
Attn: Marsha Spencer-Famous, all other parties involved

RECEIVED
NOV 10 2008
LURC-AUGUSTA

RE: First Wind Project / Stetson II OPPOSITION

We are writing to inform you that we, along with numerous other property owners, are strongly opposed to the installation of wind turbines or transmission lines proposed for the Owl and / or Jimmey Mountains in Danforth, Maine on Hot Brook Lake.

The proposed project will severely impact the property owners on both Upper and Lower Hot Brook. We have spent our life savings and invested heavily into our retreats on beautiful lakefront property so that we can retire with quality of life, peace, and harmony.

The lake is at elevation 300' +/- . The top of turbines will be at elevation 1200' +/- . The top of Jimmey is within one mile from our homes which are located on the east side of the lake. We will be looking at numerous white mechanical metal objects towering 900' above our heads for the rest of our lives.

We will lose quality of life in many ways.

When the wind is blowing the turbines will produce sound decibels which will bounce or reverberate off the lake and right into our homes at deafening levels. I am a builder and have inquired with engineers and attorneys about the effects of the noise levels from the turbines bouncing off the water and they tell me we have a strong and viable case.

The best alternative to the Stetson expansion is to the south along the 400-500' ridge to Tolman Hill. Tolman already has a road network, a supportive infrastructure, is in line with current turbines, and is not directly abutting lakefront property. There are also many other ridges to the south including Rollins.

This letter is to strongly urge you to look into viable alternatives to placing turbines on Owl and Jimmey mountains or to reject the application for installation of those turbines. I also request that all landowners be notified in writing, given ample time to respond, and have the right to voice or write their objections prior to any further consideration of the Stetson II application.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Steve & Diana Gonzalez
13326 SW 28 Street
Davie, FL 33330
954.817.3030
SG/dh cc: legal

