

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

April 7, 2014 - 6:21 p.m.
Littleton Opera House
2 Union Street
Littleton, New Hampshire

In re: **SEC DOCKET NO. 2014-02**
NEW ENGLAND POWER COMPANY d/b/a
NATIONAL GRID: Application of
New England Power Company d/b/a
National Grid for a Certificate
of Site and Facility to Construct
a New 230kV Tap Transmission Line
in Littleton, New Hampshire.
(Public meeting and Public
Informational Hearing)

PRESENT:

SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:

Cmsr. Thomas S. Burack
(Presiding as Chairman of SEC)

Chrmn. Amy L. Ignatius
(Vice Chairman of SEC)
Cmsr. Robert R. Scott
Cmsr. Martin P. Honigberg
Dir. Meredith Hatfield
Cmsr. Jeffrey Rose
Dir. Philip Bryce
Dir. Glenn Normandeau
Dir. Craig Wright
Dir. Brad Simpkins
Kate Bailey, Engineer
(Designated as PUC Engineer)

N.H. Dept. of Environmental
Services

N.H. Public Utilities Comm.

N.H. Public Utilities Comm.
N.H. Public Utilities Comm.
Office of Energy & Planning
Dept. of Res. & Econ. Dev.
DRED-Div. of Parks & Rec.
Fish & Game Department
DES-Air Resources Division
DRED-Div. of Forests & Lands
N.H. Public Utilities Comm.

Counsel for the Committee: Michael J. Iacopino, Esq.

COURT REPORTER: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

ALSO PRESENT:

Counsel for the Applicant:	Barry Needleman, Esq. (McLane, Graf, Raulerson & Middleton) Mark Rielly, Esq. (National Grid) Patrick Quigley (Nat. Grid) Peter Walker (Vanasse...)
Counsel for the Public:	Lauren J. Noether, Esq. Senior Asst. Atty General Department of Justice

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

I N D E X

PAGE NO.

MOTION BY VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS to designate Kate Bailey to serve as the Engineer in SEC 2014-02	6
<u>SECOND BY CMSR. HONIGBERG</u>	6
<u>VOTE TAKEN ON THE MOTION</u>	6
MOTION BY DIR. NORMANDEAU that the Application contains sufficient information for the SEC to carry out the purposes of RSA 162-H and to accept the Application as complete	12
<u>SECOND BY VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS</u>	12
<u>VOTE TAKEN ON THE MOTION</u>	13
PRESENTATION OF THE APPLICANT BY MR. QUIGLEY	14
QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY:	
Vice Chairman Ignatius	19, 34
OTHER QUESTIONS BY:	
Ms. Noether	22
QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC AS (as read by Chairman Burack)	26
PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY:	
Ms. Warner	35
Mr. Moore	36

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Good evening. My name
3 is Tom Burack. And, I'm the Commissioner of the
4 Department of the Environmental Services for the State of
5 New Hampshire, and in that capacity also serve as the
6 Chair of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. I
7 will be the presiding officer in this matter before the
8 Committee today. And, again, we're here for a public
9 meeting of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee.
10 The Site Evaluation Committee is established pursuant to
11 RSA 162-H. The membership of this Committee includes the
12 Commissioners or Directors of a number of state agencies,
13 as well as specified key personnel from various state
14 agencies.

15 Yes. And, I apologize. I'm not sure
16 why this is fading in and out.

17 At this point, I'd like to ask the
18 members of the Committee who are present at this meeting
19 to introduce themselves, starting with my far right. And,
20 we'll pass the microphone down and see if it helps.

21 MS. HATFIELD: Meredith Hatfield -- oh,
22 sorry. Meredith Hatfield, Director of the Office of
23 Energy & Planning.

24 CMSR. SCOTT: Bob Scott, Commissioner,

1 New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.

2 DIR. NORMANDEAU: Glenn Normandeau,
3 Director of New Hampshire Fish & Game.

4 DIR. WRIGHT: Craig Wright, Director of
5 the Air Resources Division, Department of Environmental
6 Services.

7 MS. BAILEY: Kate Bailey, Engineer with
8 the Public Utilities Commission.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Amy Ignatius,
10 Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission, and, by
11 statute, Vice Chair of the SEC.

12 MR. IACOPINO: Mike Iacopino, Counsel to
13 the Committee.

14 DIR. BRYCE: Phil Bryce, Director of
15 Parks, in the Department of Resources & Economic
16 Development.

17 CMSR. ROSE: Good evening. Jeff Rose,
18 Commissioner of the Department of Resources & Economic
19 Development.

20 DIR. SIMPKINS: Brad Simpkins, Division
21 of Forests & Lands, within the Department of Resources &
22 Economic Development.

23 CMSR. HONIGBERG: Martin Honigberg,
24 Commissioner of the Public Utilities Commission.

1 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. I will now
2 turn to Commissioner Ignatius from the Public Utilities
3 Commission for an appointment process.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
5 This is a matter of business for the Public Utilities
6 Commission. By statute RSA 162-H:3, we are required, when
7 the full SEC is in session, to take up the matter that we
8 designate an engineer to participate. I would like to
9 move that we designate Kate Bailey, who is an engineer on
10 the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission, to serve as
11 engineer on this panel.

12 CMSR. HONIGBERG: Second.

13 CMSR. SCOTT: Second.

14 CMSR. HONIGBERG: I beat you that time.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Moved and
16 seconded by Commissioner Honigberg. All those in favor,
17 this is just the Commissioners, all in favor, please
18 signify by saying "aye"?

19 (PUC Chairman and Commissioners
20 indicating "aye".)

21 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: That's
22 unanimous. Thank you. Thank you, Kate.

23 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. I will now
24 introduce our third agenda item for tonight's meeting.

1 Noting that in the earlier portion of this meeting,
2 covered by a separate transcript, we received a briefing
3 on some rulemaking and legislative matters, and then
4 considered a motion in Docket Number 2014-03 pertaining to
5 Granite Reliable Power, LLC. This third agenda item
6 involves Docket Number 2014-02.

7 By way of background, on February 10,
8 2014, New England Power d/b/a National Grid filed an
9 application for a certificate of site and facility to
10 construct a new 230 kilovolt transmission line in
11 Littleton, New Hampshire. The Applicant proposes to
12 construct a 230 kV tap transmission line off of the
13 Applicant's existing C203 transmission line to the
14 Littleton Substation, located at 266 Foster Hill Road, in
15 Littleton, New Hampshire.

16 The site where the facility is proposed
17 to be constructed is primarily zoned Rural, while the
18 northernmost portion of the site is zoned as Commercial
19 III. The site comprises forested land located immediately
20 to the west of an existing right-of-way that is currently
21 occupied by three other transmission lines. The existing
22 right-of-way is approximately 450 feet wide and would be
23 widened through tree clearing by approximately 135 feet to
24 accommodate the new C203 Tap Line and to ensure proper

1 clearances from falling trees.

2 The new C203 Tap Line is proposed to be
3 a 230 kV line spanning from the existing C203 line to the
4 proposed bus structure inside the Littleton Substation.
5 The Tap Line will be approximately 160 [1,160?] feet, that
6 is 0.2 miles in length, and will consist of four wood pole
7 transmission structures. These structures include a
8 35-foot three-pole terminal dead-end structure, two
9 H-frame suspension structures at 70 and 80 feet tall,
10 respectively, and one guyed 80-foot H-frame dead-end
11 structure. The spacing and height of the structures will
12 be similar to the spacing and height of the structures on
13 the adjacent D204 Tap Line. The conductor, a 795 ACSR
14 Drake model, will span the structures in three phases
15 beginning with the three-pole terminal dead-end structure
16 and ending at the bus. Two three-eighth inch seven-strand
17 extra-high strength, or EHS, steel shield wires will begin
18 at the second tap structure and will terminate at the
19 substation bus. Project Plans are included with the
20 Application as Appendix K.

21 The purpose of the Tap Line is to
22 provide power to a second autotransformer in the Littleton
23 Substation that PSNH will install in order to address the
24 reliability needs for the New Hampshire and Vermont areas

1 that have been identified by ISO-New England, otherwise
2 known as the Independent System Operator of New England.

3 On February 24, 2014, the Attorney
4 General appointed Assistant Attorney General Lauren
5 Noether to serve as Counsel for the Public in this docket.

6 As required by RSA 162-H:7, IV, the
7 Committee expeditiously provided notice to all state
8 agencies appearing to have some jurisdictional authority
9 over any part of the Project.

10 On February 27, 2014, the Department of
11 Transportation, or DOT, responded indicating that, other
12 than overweight vehicle permits, there does not appear to
13 be any aspect of the construction of the Project that will
14 be subject to DOT jurisdiction.

15 On March 5, 2014, the Division of
16 Historical Resources reported that they have made a
17 determination that there is no potential to cause effects
18 on historical resources.

19 On March 25, 2014, the Water Division of
20 the Department of Environmental Services, or DES,
21 responded and indicated that the information provided in
22 support of the Wetlands Application and the Section 401
23 Water Quality Certification Application is sufficient for
24 review.

1 The purpose of tonight's public hearing
2 may be two-fold. First, the Committee shall review the
3 Application and determine whether the Application is
4 complete and contains sufficient information to carry out
5 the purposes of RSA 162-H.

6 If the Committee finds the Application
7 to be complete and accepts the Application, the Committee
8 shall thereupon hold a Public Information Hearing as
9 required by RSA 162-H:7, VI-a and 162-H:10, I.

10 At the Public Information Hearing, the
11 Applicant will present information about the proposed
12 facility to the Committee and to the public. In addition,
13 the public will be permitted to ask questions of the
14 Applicant by writing those questions on the cards and
15 handing them to me, and I will then read the questions to
16 the Applicants. In addition, the public will then have an
17 opportunity to make public comments about the Application
18 or the proposed facility.

19 On March 13, 2014, we issued an Order
20 and Notice for this hearing. The Order and Notice was
21 published in the Union Leader, a newspaper of general
22 statewide circulation, on Wednesday, March 19, 2014, and
23 in the Littleton Record, a paper of general circulation in
24 Grafton County, on March 21, 2014, and, on March 22, 2014,

1 in the Caledonian Record, a paper of general circulation
2 in Grafton County. Affidavits attesting to publication
3 were filed with the Committee on April 2, 2014. The
4 authority for this hearing is set forth in RSA 162-H:4,
5 II, and RSA 162-H:10.

6 So, let's start by taking appearances in
7 this matter. And, I would ask counsel for the parties to
8 please introduce themselves.

9 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Mr. Chairman, can we
10 take a moment and come up to the table?

11 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Sure.

12 (Short pause.)

13 MR. NEEDLEMAN: I'm Barry Needleman,
14 from the law firm of McLane, Graf, Raulerson & Middleton,
15 representing the Applicant in this matter.

16 MR. RIELLY: I'm Mark Rielly, in-house
17 counsel for National Grid.

18 MR. WALKER: Peter Walker, Director of
19 Environmental Services with Vanasse Hangen Brustlin,
20 working for New England Power in this case.

21 MR. QUIGLEY: I'm Patrick Quigley, the
22 Project Manager for the C203 Tap Line Project.

23 MS. NOETHER: Lauren Noether. I've been
24 appointed Counsel for the Public.

1 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. I'm sorry,
2 sir. On the end, would you just repeat your name for us.

3 MR. QUIGLEY: Sure. It's Patrick
4 Quigley. I'm the Project Manager for National grid on the
5 C203 Tap Project.

6 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you very much.
7 I sorry, I just didn't catch it before.

8 MR. QUIGLEY: You're welcome.

9 CHAIRMAN BURACK: All right. Let's now
10 turn to the issue of completeness. And, does any member
11 wish to make a motion on the matter of completeness of the
12 Application?

13 MR. IACOPINO: Mr. Normandeau.

14 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Director Normandeau.
15 I'll pass the microphone down to you.

16 DIR. NORMANDEAU: Mr. Chairman, based
17 upon the letters received from the state agencies, my own
18 review of the Application, we find the Application
19 contains sufficient information for us to carry out the
20 purposes of RSA 162-H, and we accept the Application as
21 complete.

22 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Moved by Director
23 Normandeau. Is there a second to the motion?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Second by Commissioner
2 Ignatius. Is there any discussion of the motion?

3 (No verbal response)

4 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Seeing none, all in
5 favor, please signify by saying "aye"?

6 (Multiple Committee members indicating
7 "aye".)

8 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Any opposed?

9 (No verbal response)

10 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Any abstentions?

11 (No verbal response)

12 CHAIRMAN BURACK: It is unanimous. The
13 Application has been accepted. So, having voted to accept
14 the Application, we will direct Counsel to the Committee
15 to memorialize our reasons for acceptance into an order
16 that will be distributed for signatures of the Committee
17 members voting to accept the Application.

18 And, we will now move into the Public
19 Information Hearing portion of the proceedings. As I
20 indicated previously, the public information portion of
21 these proceedings will start with a presentation by the
22 Applicant. Thereafter, we will ask Counsel for the Public
23 to speak to you and to explain her role in the process.
24 We will then take questions for the Applicant from the

1 Committee, and then from the public. If a member of the
2 public has a question for the Applicant, you should write
3 your question on an index card that is being provided by
4 Mr. Iacopino and bring it forward to him. We will try to
5 group the questions by subject matter, and I will ask the
6 questions of the Applicant.

7 Once we have completed the public
8 questions phase of the proceeding, we will move to the
9 public comment phase. During the public comment phase,
10 any member of the public can make a comment or statement
11 about the proposed Project or the Application. If you
12 wish to make a public comment or statement, you should
13 sign the speaker list that are available by the door here.
14 During this portion of the hearing, public speakers will
15 be invited to the microphone by the Chair.

16 So, we will now turn to the Applicant
17 presentation. Attorney Needleman.

18 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
19 If we could have just one minute to finish setting this
20 up, we'll be ready to go.

21 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Certainly. We'll just
22 take a pause for a moment here.

23 (Short pause.)

24 MR. QUIGLEY: Well, good evening. Thank

1 you again for hearing our case here tonight. I'm Patrick
2 Quigley, the Project Manager for National Grid for the
3 C203 Tap Project in Littleton, New Hampshire.

4 First, I'd like to just go through the
5 Project history, how the problem was discovered, and then
6 go across the design phase, and then, ultimately, the
7 final design we have planned for this Project.

8 The overview of this 230 C203 line, or
9 the main line, is 6.6 miles long, and it connects
10 Comerford to Moore Dam. The -- sorry. The Map Legend,
11 Spot Number 1, as you can see here [indicating], is the
12 Comerford 230 yard, and Moore Dam 230 yard, right here
13 [indicating]. Littleton, this is the substation right
14 here [indicating]. The Project location is within this
15 little red box [indicating]. This is where the proposed
16 Tap Line is to be.

17 The Project History. This Project
18 reflects the work of the ISO-New England-led study with
19 participation from National Grid, Vermont Electric Power
20 Company, Unitil, and Northeast Utilities. Again, ISO-New
21 England is the Independent System Operator of the New
22 England bulk power generation and transmission systems.

23 FROM THE FLOOR: Could you stand to one
24 side?

1 MR. QUIGLEY: I'm sorry. They manage
2 the reliability, daily operation, as well as the future
3 regional planning of the regional bulk power and
4 generation of the transmission systems.

5 This study identified this Project as a
6 solution to address certain thermal, voltage and
7 short-circuit needs for New Hampshire and Vermont through
8 a period ending in 2020. ISO-New England approved
9 National Grid's Proposed Plan Application, which is a
10 solution, on March 7, 2013 to construct a new C203 Tap
11 Line.

12 The existing conditions on this
13 right-of-way, as stated before, is already an existing
14 transmission facility corridor, where you can see National
15 Grid's D204 lines right here [indicating], and the
16 existing second autotransformer, which is owned by
17 Northeast Utilities, are right here [indicating]. As well
18 as there's a Q190 line and the VELCO K60 line. The Q190
19 is owned by PSNH.

20 The ISO-New England-led study determined
21 that energizing the second transformer, as I previously
22 showed, within Northeast Utilities' Littleton Substation
23 will increase the reliability to the area. Without a
24 second autotransformer, an outage of the existing

1 transformer, which is currently in service, which is next
2 to National Grid's D204 line, it will put an undue strain
3 on the transform located at Moore Dam. One way to look at
4 this is the transmission facilities are, in fact, in a way
5 just like a highway, where, through transformed voltages,
6 they step them down, as would be an off-ramp on a highway
7 to get to your ultimate destination, or the customers.
8 So, in order to create a balanced area, we are creating
9 more off-ramps to get to the customers into PSNH's, excuse
10 me, territory.

11 Through an alternatives analysis, we
12 looked at two methods to get the transmission line from
13 the C203, located here [indicating], to the
14 autotransformer over here [indicating]. They are deemed
15 the "Western Alternative" and the "Eastern Alternative".
16 Ultimately, the Western Alternative was selected as the
17 preferred route over the Eastern Alternative for the
18 following reasons: Environmentally, it's going to require
19 less swamp matting to get to the proposed structures,
20 because there's an upland access road that is preexisting.
21 Will not require any underground cabling to reach the
22 second transformer at the Littleton Substation. And, it
23 will also enable us to remove one of the structures that
24 was originally planned through the conceptual engineering.

1 I will show you, on the previous slide, right here
2 [indicating] is that access road, that's all upland. And,
3 all we have to do to get to the new proposed structures is
4 to make little off-ramps to get to those locations.

5 On safety concerns, we have a much
6 greater room for clearance on the proposed Western
7 Alternative, because one side -- only one side of the
8 C2 -- sorry, the Western Alternative is occupied by an
9 existing transmission facility. On the Eastern side, as
10 you can see, I just want to go back to that again, we are
11 surrounded by other lines for worker safety. So, this
12 will ultimately provide a much safer access path, going
13 this route [indicating] to the transform. And,
14 ultimately, it is the most cost-effective solution. This
15 is a ratepayers' project, because it is a reliability
16 project. And, ultimately, we need to look for our
17 ratepayers' best interests. In this straight route taken,
18 that Western Alternative will provide that most
19 cost-effective route to get to the transformer energizer.

20 As previously discussed, we will need to
21 widen the right-of-way by 135 feet to install the C203 Tap
22 Line. The final result will be a line which is
23 approximately 0.2 miles long. It will consist of four new
24 wooden structures; three H-frame structures, one terminal

1 dead end, and one -- dead-end H-frame, sorry, with
2 associated guying and anchors. And, this will reflect the
3 spacing and height along the D204, which was the adjacent
4 circuit.

5 By following the Western Alternative,
6 the end result will be four structures, as previously
7 stated, going along just the other side of this existing
8 access road right here [indicating]. And, that was all.

9 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Anything else to your
10 presentation itself?

11 MR. NEEDLEMAN: No.

12 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Okay. Very good. Are
13 there questions from the Committee? Chairman Ignatius.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
15 And, I'll just throw out the question, and anyone who
16 thinks best to answer it, please feel free. You've
17 described it as a "reliability project" and that it "will
18 reduce the risk of outages". Does it also increase any of
19 the power flow? Is there any increase in the amount of
20 electricity that's distributed as a result?

21 MR. QUIGLEY: No, there's not. Again,
22 this is a 230 kilovolt line off an existing 230 kilovolt
23 system. And, this has to do with load-balancing. So, if
24 you want to take a scale, if something were to occur on

1 the D204 line, it's going to put a lot of undue stress at
2 the other locations. With this other option, it will be
3 able to alleviate the load for the general system. So, it
4 would not increase that.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
6 Another question. The Application says that "the efforts
7 to obtain easements to use the PSNH properties are
8 underway." What's the status of those discussions?

9 MR. QUIGLEY: The easement, which was
10 obtained just last week and registered, from TransCanada
11 Hydro is complete. On Public Service of New Hampshire's
12 side, we are still finalizing that.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And, do you
14 anticipate any problems in finalizing that?

15 MR. QUIGLEY: No. This is to serve
16 Public Service of New Hampshire. So, without the
17 easement, we will not be able to construct the line.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
19 Another easement question. There's adjacent property
20 that's owned by the State. And, there's reference to
21 "conservation easements", what is that called? Associated
22 with relicensing of the Fifteen Mile Falls Hydro Project.
23 Can you give a little more information about that
24 conservation easement and whether there's any impact on

1 that land as a result of your proposal?

2 MR. WALKER: The land in question is
3 owned by TransCanada. And, there was a large conservation
4 easement that was negotiated at the time of the FERC
5 relicensing of the Fifteen Mile Falls. And, that easement
6 was granted to the New England Forestry Foundation. Pat
7 just indicated that the negotiations to acquire that land
8 with TransCanada has been documented. National Grid has
9 been in touch with the New England Forestry Foundation.
10 They didn't see any adverse effect on the conservation
11 easement.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: So, maybe help
13 me. I might be misreading your language, and thinking it
14 means something it doesn't. At the bottom of Page 4 of
15 your Application, it refers to "State-owned property
16 administered by the Adjutant General's Department". Is
17 that a different -- is that something different than the
18 easement? And, if so, can you give me a little more
19 explanation of that?

20 MR. WALKER: What we were attempting to
21 do at that location, there is State-owned land abutting
22 the -- I believe it's the TransCanada parcel. It's not
23 affected by our Project in any way.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And, do we know

1 if the Adjutant General is aware of the proposal?

2 MR. WALKER: That's a question I'm going
3 to have to refer to Grid. I'm assuming -- I will assume
4 that, because they're an abutter, they were notified as
5 part of the normal wetlands process. If they are, in
6 fact, directly abutting the wetlands impact.

7 MR. QUIGLEY: And, regarding that, I do
8 not know the answer to that. But I certainly now will
9 take that as a take-away, if you'd like?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Certainly.
11 When we get to the next phase of this, that would be good
12 to understand a little better about that.

13 MR. QUIGLEY: Certainly.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Are there other
16 members of the Committee who have questions at this time?

17 (No verbal response)

18 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Seeing none, I'd like
19 to turn now to Counsel for the Public to ask, Attorney
20 Noether, do you have any questions you'd like to pose?

21 MS. NOETHER: Yes, please. Thank you,
22 Commissioner. Again, my name is Lauren Noether. I'm a
23 Senior Assistant Attorney General with the State of New
24 Hampshire's Attorney General's Office Environmental

1 Protection Bureau. And, I'm here as a representative of
2 the public, to ensure that the Project and the build-out
3 is an appropriate balance of environmental protection, as
4 well as with regard to adequate energy production. It
5 sounds like this isn't building added energy capacity. Is
6 that my understanding? It's not going to add to --

7 MR. QUIGLEY: Well, it will add to
8 capacity in the sense of reliability and overall system
9 health.

10 MS. NOETHER: Okay.

11 MR. QUIGLEY: For the general system
12 network.

13 MS. NOETHER: Understood. Is this
14 working? Yes, it is. Okay. I had a question also about
15 the easement, the New England Foresters's easement. It
16 said several times in the Application here that they were
17 on board with this Project. But is there anything in
18 writing from them?

19 MR. QUIGLEY: Yes, there is. In order
20 to obtain our easement from TransCanada Hydro, they had to
21 get the conservation land back from the New England
22 Forestry Foundation, in order to provide the easement to
23 National Grid for this Project. So, that was -- should be
24 recorded in the Registry of Deeds. That was part of the

1 process to get it from TransCanada.

2 MS. NOETHER: Thank you. Then, I'll ask
3 counsel about that. I was going to ask about looking at
4 the easement itself. What's the wetlands impact? I know
5 you mentioned the swamp mats and they're in the
6 Application here. But what's the total wetlands impact?

7 MR. WALKER: There are -- I'm going to
8 describe this as three different categories of impacts.
9 There are permanent impacts, permanent direct impacts.
10 And, those are the impacts that are associated with
11 actually permanently placing -- there would be nine wooden
12 poles placed as part of the Project. There's nine poles
13 in total. They're set in four different structures. And,
14 that's 64 square feet of impact.

15 MS. NOETHER: That's just -- that's the
16 footprint?

17 MR. WALKER: That is the permanent
18 change in wetlands is 64 square feet. We also would have
19 temporary impacts. Pat alluded to "swamp mats", which
20 is --

21 (Court reporter interruption due to
22 outside siren noise issue.)

23 MR. WALKER: Pat Quigley referred to
24 "swamp matting", which is actually a "best management"

1 practice, which is used to limit impacts to the wetlands.
2 So, swamp mats are just timber matting will be placed
3 temporarily during construction to make sure that we don't
4 excessively disrupt the wetlands and disturb the wetlands.
5 That total is just over one acre. It's about 47,000
6 square feet of temporary impact. There would be tree
7 clearing, and about two and a half acres of forest would
8 be cleared. And, of that total of two and a half acres,
9 about 2.1 acres is wetland. So, that area, 2.1 acres,
10 would remain as wetland, but it would change from a
11 forested wetland cover type to a scrub shrub -- what we
12 call a "scrub shrub" or an emergent, sort of -- probably
13 familiar with a marsh habitat. So, that's really what
14 would be happening there. But no permanent loss of
15 wetlands, other than the 64 square feet.

16 MS. NOETHER: And, again, the 64 square
17 feet is just the footprint, the footprint with regard to
18 the poles coming up?

19 MR. WALKER: Yes, the individual poles.

20 MS. NOETHER: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN BURACK: No other questions?

22 Thank you. We'll now turn to the public question portion
23 of this proceeding. And, at this time, I have only two
24 cards from members of the public, and there may be a third

1 one coming.

2 But the two that I had seen so far, and,
3 in fact, perhaps -- perhaps all of them, relate to one
4 other project that has been discussed, and we're
5 anticipating may be filed in the future with the Site
6 Evaluation Committee known as the "Northern Pass Project".
7 And, the question is whether or not this Project has any
8 connection in any way, shape or form, in any manner with
9 the Northern Pass Project?

10 MR. QUIGLEY: The answer to that is
11 "no". This is a reliability project by National Grid, who
12 has no affiliation with the Northern Pass Project, which I
13 also need to mention is a merchant line. So, none
14 whatsoever.

15 CHAIRMAN BURACK: So, there's no
16 connection between this Project and the Northern Pass
17 Project?

18 MR. QUIGLEY: None.

19 CHAIRMAN BURACK: If this Project -- if
20 the Northern Pass Project were not being built, would this
21 Project be built anyway?

22 MR. QUIGLEY: Yes, it would.

23 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Are there
24 any other questions? Oh, here's another question. Could

1 the parties, that is PSNH or Northeast Utilities or any
2 other party, at a future date, raise the voltage on these
3 lines?

4 MR. QUIGLEY: On these lines in
5 particular, referring to the C203 and D204 alone, are
6 owned and operated by National Grid. So, they can not.

7 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Could National Grid
8 raise the voltage on these lines?

9 MR. QUIGLEY: As they're built right
10 now, no.

11 CHAIRMAN BURACK: What would it take in
12 order to be able to raise the voltage on those lines?

13 MR. QUIGLEY: It would be a large
14 rebuild. But that's not what we're here for.

15 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you.

16 MR. QUIGLEY: Currently, they're only
17 being operated at 230 kV. All the equipment and
18 everything is all 230 kV only.

19 CHAIRMAN BURACK: So, to raise the
20 voltage on those lines, you would have to replace the
21 lines and replace the substation equipment as well?

22 MR. QUIGLEY: That's correct.

23 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Are there
24 any other questions from members of the public at this

1 time? Yes. Can you write your question down?

2 FROM THE FLOOR: Well, I wrote it down,
3 and you didn't read it as I wrote it.

4 CHAIRMAN BURACK: I'm sorry. What I
5 attempted to do is to subsidize -- is to summarize the
6 questions. And, I did not read them exactly as they were
7 written, because they were repetitive of each other.

8 MR. IACOPINO: Want me to have her look
9 at them or --

10 CHAIRMAN BURACK: She certainly can.

11 MR. IACOPINO: Okay.

12 FROM THE FLOOR: The question is, would
13 these guys sign anything, would they make anything other
14 than statements, something legal that would state that it
15 is in no way connected to the Northern Pass?

16 CHAIRMAN BURACK: So, again, I will
17 repeat the question. The question is whether or not the
18 Applicant is prepared to make a written statement that
19 this is not in any way connected to the Northern Pass
20 Project?

21 MR. NEEDLEMAN: I can take that, Mr.
22 Chairman. The representation has been made, and I'm not
23 sure how else it can be done -- I'm sorry. The
24 representation has been made that it's in no way connected

1 with Northern Pass. And, I'm not sure there's anything
2 more that can be done other than that.

3 FROM THE FLOOR: If it's not in writing,
4 then it has no binding --

5 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Please. I do have a
6 recollection, I thought that there was a statement in the
7 Application itself with respect to that question. Am I
8 not recalling that correctly?

9 MR. NEEDLEMAN: I don't recall it being
10 in the Application, no.

11 MS. BAILEY: It's on Page -- got to find
12 the page number, Page 21 perhaps. Page 8. Yes, 21 on my
13 pdf file, Page 8 in the Application. It says "The ZBA
14 inquired about height, noise, lighting and whether the Tap
15 Line was associated with the proposed Northern Pass
16 Project, which it is not."

17 FROM THE FLOOR: What about in the
18 future?

19 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Thank you
20 for reading that. I did hear a question as to whether or
21 not there would be any further connection between the
22 Northern Pass Project and this Project. Could you answer
23 that? Would there be any future connection between them?

24 MR. QUIGLEY: I'm sorry. Could you

1 repeat that again?

2 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Would there be any
3 future connection between these two projects that we've
4 been discussing, that is the Project that we're
5 considering this evening and the Northern Pass Project?

6 MR. QUIGLEY: No. Again, this is a
7 reliability project. And, it has no affiliation with the
8 Northern Pass. This is a ratepayers' reliability project.
9 That's all there is to it.

10 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Are there
11 any over questions from the public? Yes. Could I ask you
12 just to write your question down on a card please. And,
13 we'll just take a moment here.

14 FROM THE FLOOR: Okay. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN BURACK: And, after we've done
16 the question portion of this, then we will turn to a
17 public comment portion.

18 (Short pause.)

19 FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN BURACK: One individual has
21 indicated that this person was at the ZBA hearing on this
22 matter, and that there -- to this individual's knowledge,
23 there's no signed statement swearing that this document or
24 that this Project has no connection with Northern Pass.

1 And, the question is, is the Company prepared to sign
2 something so stating?

3 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Well, first of all, Mr.
4 Chairman, I don't believe there is anything where it
5 requires the Company to do that. Notwithstanding that,
6 for the benefit of the people in the crowd, there will
7 come a point, at the adversarial proceedings, where this
8 witness will be under oath and sworn. And, if anybody at
9 that point wants to ask that question, I'm sure the
10 witness will again reiterate under oath what they
11 reiterated tonight, which is that there is no connection
12 between the two projects.

13 CHAIRMAN BURACK: I take it from your
14 response at this point, counsel, that the Applicant will
15 not be willing to sign a legal document, a contract
16 stating that there will never be a connection between this
17 Project or easement and the Northern Pass Project?

18 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Again, Mr. Chairman,
19 perhaps, if somebody thinks that there is some connection
20 that we're not being forthcoming about, they could point
21 to that. It's hard to disprove a negative. We have a
22 representative here from the Company who has made a
23 representation to this Committee and to the public that
24 there is no connection, and they are prepared, at the

1 appropriate time, to make that assertion under oath. So,
2 I'm a little bit mystified as to what more can and is
3 required to be done in this context.

4 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Another
5 question. If there were a change in ownership, could the
6 use of this line change, this proposed line?

7 MR. QUIGLEY: The way it's being
8 proposed, no. It's being -- it's been designed to operate
9 at 230 kV AC.

10 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. Another
11 question. Can the AC transmission line be retrofitted to
12 carry a DC or direct current?

13 MR. QUIGLEY: Not to my knowledge. But
14 that's -- I'd need an engineer to answer that. I'm the
15 Project Manager here. But the way it's set up right now,
16 no.

17 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Can you provide some
18 information on the height and style of the towers for the
19 lines, as well as what the clearance is to the wood line?

20 MR. QUIGLEY: Yes. I can bring up my
21 slide again. Well, currently, the D204 line is set up as
22 wooden H-frame structures. They're also 70 to 80-foot in
23 length, except for the three-pole terminal, the terminal
24 dead end that is underneath the main lines. This is being

1 designed to follow that exactly. Again, wood structures,
2 H-frames, except for the three-pole terminal dead end,
3 similar heights, and almost identical spacing.

4 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. And, what
5 will the distance again be to the wood line, to the tree
6 line?

7 MR. QUIGLEY: One hundred twenty-five
8 (125) feet, center line to center line. Oh, I'm sorry, to
9 the tree line? One hundred (100) feet.

10 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. I don't
11 believe we have any other questions at this point from
12 members of the public. So, what I'd like to now do is
13 turn to the public comment phase of this proceeding, and
14 invite members of the public, if they would like to, to
15 please step forward to this microphone to make a brief
16 statement. I would encourage you, please, to introduce
17 yourself and tell us what -- where you reside, and provide
18 again with a brief statement. Please make your statements
19 relative to this particular proceeding, and not to other
20 matters that are before the Committee or may come before
21 the Committee in the future. This, again, is a public
22 comment period regarding this particular application.

23 Yes. I'm sorry. There's another
24 question here.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, as people
2 are getting ready to make their comments, let me just ask
3 one clarifying question. If there were, in the future, if
4 this Project is approved and there were a request in the
5 future to change the use of it, or to convert it from AC
6 to DC, or to increase from 230 kV to something higher,
7 would that -- is it your understanding that that would
8 have to come before the Site Evaluation Committee for a
9 formal amendment?

10 MR. NEEDLEMAN: I don't -- I don't know
11 the answer to that question, because I don't have clearly
12 in mind, as I sit here, all the jurisdictional
13 requirements in the statute. It's something that I could
14 go back and look at, but I just don't know at this point.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, let me
16 state it in my own view, and tell me if you think I'm
17 wrong. If the Project were to be certificated for an AC
18 line, and down the road you were to be interested in a DC
19 line, that would be an amendment to the certificate that
20 would require Site Evaluation Committee approval, to my
21 understanding. Would you disagree with that?

22 MR. NEEDLEMAN: No, that sounds correct.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
24 And, if there were a change in the ownership from National

1 Grid to Public Service for this line, that would be an
2 amendment to the certificate that would require Site
3 Evaluation Committee approval, in my mind. Would you
4 agree with that?

5 MR. NEEDLEMAN: I agree with that.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you. So, we
8 will now turn to the public comment phase. And, Attorney
9 Iacopino will assist us in bringing people forward here.

10 MR. IACOPINO: Nobody signed up. So, I
11 don't know if there is anybody in the audience who wishes
12 to speak.

13 CHAIRMAN BURACK: There is one
14 individual. Would you please come forward.

15 MS. WARNER: Hello. I'm Dr. Deborah
16 Warner. I'm a resident in Littleton. I am also concerned
17 with the other comments that you've heard about the
18 Northern Pass. And, I do hope that, if you do grant this,
19 that you specify in the permit that it is not to be
20 converted, and it is not to be related to the Northern
21 Pass.

22 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you for that
23 comment. Are there any other members of the public who
24 would like to share comments with us this evening? Sir,

1 please step forward and introduce yourself.

2 MR. MOORE: My name is Eddy Moore. I'm
3 the Chairman of the Littleton Zoning Board of Adjustment.
4 And, it's also our understanding at the public hearing
5 that we held, don't remember the exact date, but it was
6 well documented in our information that this has nothing
7 to do with Northern Pass. Period.

8 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Thank you, sir.
9 Again, any other members of the public who would like to
10 provide a comment this evening?

11 (No verbal response)

12 CHAIRMAN BURACK: Seeing none at this
13 point, let me just describe for you and just remind you
14 all that everyone will have an opportunity to provide
15 public -- written public comments until we issue a final
16 order on the docket in this matter. And, you can follow
17 the docket in this matter on the Site Evaluation
18 Committee's website, which at www.nhsec.nh.gov.

19 I wish to thank everyone for their
20 participation in this evening's proceedings. And, we will
21 now adjourn the Public Information Hearing in this docket.

22 Having done so, is there any other new
23 business to come before the Committee from members of the
24 Committee?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

(No verbal response)

CHAIRMAN BURACK: Seeing none, we will
stand adjourned. Thank you.

**(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at
7:08 p.m.)**