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PROCEEDINGS
(Hearing resumed at 2:25 p.m.)
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: SO let's resume hearing. If the witness could be sworn in.
(WHEREUPON, AARON CULLEN was duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.) DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Mr. Cullen, would you state your full name and business position, please.
A. My name is Aaron Cullen. I am the manager of Middle Office and Credit Group at Eversource Energy.
Q. And I've given you two exhibits. The first one is Exhibit 4, which is the March 29, 2017 substitute prefiled, direct and amended testimony of Aaron Cullen. Do you have that in front of you?
A. I do.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: And I'll note for the record that there's a duplicate document of this also as Exhibit 77, but it's the same document.
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BY MR. NEEDLEMAN :
Q. And I also have given you Applicant's Exhibit No. 5, which is the April 12th, 2016 prefiled testimony of Mike Auseré. Do you have that?
A. I do.
Q. And attached to the Auseré testimony was Attachment B, which contains certain financial information as of April 12th, 2016. And I understand that that has recently been updated and submitted to the Committee as Exhibit 192; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to either of those pieces of testimony?
A. I do.
Q. All right. Could you -- which one? Which exhibit?
A. Exhibit 005 .
Q. Okay. Is your microphone on?
A. It is.
Q. All right. So with respect to Exhibit 5, if you could tell us the page number and the line number where you have a change.
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A. Sure. On Page 3, Line 19, where we specify the various credit ratings of Public Service of New Hampshire, the first rating reference of $A$ and stable outlook for $S \& P$ is actually now A with a positive outlook. The Moody's rating of Baal positive outlook is now A3 with stable outlook, and the BBB+ rating of Fitch, a positive outlook, is now A- with a stable outlook.
Q. Any other changes or corrections?
A. Yes. On Page 4, Line 21 , it makes reference to all three credit ratings of Eversource Energy having stable outlooks. I just want to clarify that. Since this testimony was written, S\&P's outlook has increased from stable to positive, and so has the Fitch rating to positive outlook.
Q. Any others?
A. That is all.
Q. Subject to those changes and corrections, do you adopt both pieces of testimony and swear to them as your own?
A. I do.
Q. Thank you.
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MR. NEEDLEMAN: All set, Madam Chair. PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Thank you. First questioner is Attorney Patch for the Town of Durham.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. PATCH:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Cullen. My name is -- is this on? Good afternoon. My name is Doug Patch. I am counsel for the Town of Durham and the University of New Hampshire, and I have a few questions for you.

First of all, as you've said, you've adopted what's Exhibit 5, the testimony by Mr. Auseré. Did I say that correctly?
A. Auseré.
Q. Auseré. Thank you.

And I'm looking at, I've got it up here on the screen, Page 6, Lines 1 and 2, where it says that the Project is regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and that FERC permits utilities to establish transmission service rates through a formula; correct?
A. That's correct.
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Q. And his testimony goes on to say that the formula rate recovers a return on investment; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Does FERC still have a return rate that includes an incentive to build transmission projects?
A. I know that there's been a lot of discussions going on for the past few years regarding that rate. I'm not close enough to that process to speak specifics. I only know that the rate had moved quite a bit over the last couple years, and I'm not sure exactly where the current rate is right now.
Q. And when you say "moved," up, presumably; right?
A. Well, I believe there were some claims that plaintiffs that may have argued it lower. I think the main argument was to get it lower than what it has been historically. But where the current rate is now, I'm not sure.
Q. The idea of an incentive rate, though, was an attempt by FERC to try to get companies like yours to build more transmission projects.
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So they were essentially giving you a healthier rate of return; is that fair to say?
A. That's fair to say.
Q. And it sounds like you're probably not familiar then, when this project was originally proposed back in the 2010 or 2012 time frame, what the situation was at that point in time?
A. I do not know.
Q. Is Eversource currently recovering a return on investment for any other transmission projects in New England?
A. Sure. Every transmission project the Company has should be earning a FERC-regulated return.
Q. And are you familiar with what rate of return they're getting on those projects?
A. I am not.
Q. Do you have a general sense at all or --
A. I believe it's in the 10 or 11 percent range.
Q. How many projects does Eversource have like that, transmission projects?
A. I could not say.
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Q. Assuming the Project is approved, then do you have any knowledge of what you anticipate the rate of return on the investment on this project will be?
A. It will be whatever is permitted by FERC.
Q. Presumably in that 11 to 12 percent range?
A. Depending how those hearings settle out.
Q. And is it true that the way this works, the more you spend -- for example, if you spend 84 million as compared to 74 million for the SRP project, the more that your company spends, the more the Company recovers from ratepayers through the return on investment?
A. The more that's spent, obviously, yes, there would be more return. However, it should be noted that FERC obviously will subject the Company to a prudency review to make sure those costs were properly incurred.
Q. Is there disincentive to spending more on the Project, other than, you know, as long as you can justify it from a prudency perspective? The more you spend, the more recover; correct?
A. Ultimately we're trying to serve the
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necessary requirements of ISO-New England and making sure that the network is operating effectively. Beyond that, I can't say -- I can't answer your question any more specific.
Q. Are you familiar with what the ISO does in terms of original estimates for a project as compared to, you know, what the final number is? Do they go back and look? Do they in any way make a recommendation and say to FERC, Well, gee, the original estimate had been 50 million and it went up to a 100 million, and therefore the FERC got to dock the Company in some way or required a sharing of whatever that increase is? Are you familiar with that?
A. Yeah, unfortunately I'm not familiar with how that process works. That's not specific to financing, the line of question.
Q. And then are you familiar at all, to the
extent the Project is considered a reliability project, the total cost, including the return, is recovered from all ratepayers in New England as compared to the situation we heard about earlier in this
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proceeding, where if it's a reliability project, but in some way favors a particular region, then there may be limits on the number of ratepayers in New England from whom it could be recovered? Are you familiar with that at all?
A. I'm familiar with Mr. Quinlan's testimony and Mr. Bowes' testimony on this, and Mr. Andrew. I would defer to their testimony, as they are the experts much more than $I$ am on that specific subject.
Q. Okay. That's all the questions. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Thank you.
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Cullen. I'm Susan Geiger, and I represent the Town of Newington.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I believe in your supplemental prefiled
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IWould defer to theirtestimony, as they arethe experts much more than $I$ am on thatspecific subject.

The next questioner will be

Attorney Geiger for the Town of Newington.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. GEIGER:Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Cullen. I'm SusanGeiger, and I represent the Town ofNewington.
testimony, what's been marked as Applicant Exhibit 5, you indicated that this project is going to be financed through long-term debt issued by the Company; is that correct?
A. The Project, like every type of similar project, will initially be funded using cash from operations. To the extent cash from operations isn't sufficient, we then look to the short-term markets where Public Service of New Hampshire will borrow funds from Eversource's parent via its commercial paper line. At a certain point in time, once those short-term borrowings grow to a meaningful size, then we would look to convert that into long-term debt.
Q. Has that conversion occurred yet?
A. It has not, as we have not spent money on this project.
Q. But there's been some money spent for development on the Project; right?
A. Sure. Any small amounts that would be spent to date would be probably out of normal operating cash flows.
Q. Okay. Fair enough.
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You've indicated that when it is time to convert some of those short-term borrowings to long-term debt, that you would have to get prior approval from the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. So, since you just indicated you haven't engaged in that long-term debt issuance, you have not gone to the PUC for any prior approvals relating to this project, as far as the debt is concerned?
A. At this time, Public Service Company of New Hampshire has no outstanding long-term debt authority. So when the time comes that that is required, we will then seek that approval.
Q. Okay. And getting back to a question asked by Attorney Patch about regionalizing the cost of a reliability transmission project, is it your understanding that the costs associated with this project would be recovered by the Company from all ratepayers in New England because the Project serves a regional purpose?
A. That is the Company's position, as stated by
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Mr. Quinlan.
Q. And what is New Hampshire's share of those regional costs as a percentage? Do you know?
A. I believe in the Merrimack Valley discussions, it was the load factor in New Hampshire is around 9 percent for the full state. I think at the time it was around 6-1/2 specifically to PSNH customers.
Q. Okay. But it would be for the state of New Hampshire customers; correct?
A. Correct, yes. If the regionalization of costs, well, yes, went through all of New England, it would be 9 percent.
Q. So if this project were to cost $\$ 136$ million, for example, or $\$ 135$ million, then New Hampshire ratepayers would pay for 9 or 10 percent of that. Using the 10 percent for easy math purposes, that would be, what, \$13.6 million; right?
A. Subject to check, I would agree with you, yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEIGER: That's all the questions
I have. Thank you.
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PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Thank you. Ms. Ludtke for the Conservation Law Foundation.

MS. LUDTKE: No questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Ms. Frink.

MS. FRINK: No questions.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Crowley-Joyce Revocable Trust, Attorney Richardson? Not here.

Anyone other than Counsel for the Public asking questions? Any other party other than Counsel for the Public who desires to ask questions of this witness?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Okay. Attorney Aslin, you're up.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Cullen.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. My name's Chris Aslin. I'm acting as Counsel for the Public in these proceedings. And I think $I$ just have one thing to ask you about,
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following up on the other questions already asked.

In terms of potential future decommissioning of the Project, Ounderstanding that the Company's position is that decommissioning is unlikely, but let's assume hypothetically that decommissioning obligation arises -- in that instance, in what way would the Company raise funds for decommissioning and recover those funds?
A. If there was an immediate requirement to decommission the line, it would initially be funded no different than I described for the original construction, where we start funding that probably through normal cash flow from operations and short-term debt as needed. In parallel, we would then seek from the FERC an asset retirement obligation to begin collecting through the FERC tariff rates the required revenues to properly decommission.
Q. And from what part of your current rate base or rate bases -- sorry. From what part of the tariff does that funding come through? Is that part of the transmission piece of the
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bill?
A. I believe it would be, yes.
Q. And so that would be funds raised from PSNH customers only or from all New Hampshire customers?
A. It could potentially be a regionalized rate or a regionalized collection.
Q. Okay. And hypothetically, if decommissioning were to cost $\$ 100$ million, approximately how long would it take to recover that amount through the tariff, if you could estimate?
A. Honestly, I could not estimate that.
Q. If you had a $\$ 100$ million capital outlay, do you know how long it takes the Company normally to recoup those costs through its rates?
A. I do not.
Q. You don't. Okay. Fair enough.

MR. ASLIN: No further questions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Does anyone on the Committee have questions for Mr . Cullen? Attorney Iacopino.

QUESTIONS BY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS AND/OR COUNSEL:
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Q. Mr. Cullen, does $\$ 84$ million remain the expected investment of Public Service in this project?
A. I am aware of no other changes to that number.
Q. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: NO further questions from the Committee?

Is there any redirect?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: No, thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Thank you, Mr. Cullen.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Our next witness will be Dr. Lisa Shapiro. First questioner of Dr. Shapiro, once she's sworn in, going next in order will be Doug Patch for the Town of Durham and UNH. First get her sworn in and adopt her testimony.
(WHEREUPON, LISA M. SHAPIRO was duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

DIRECT EXAMINATION
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BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
Q. Please state your name and business position for the record.
A. Lisa Shapiro.
Q. I'm going to give you two documents, which I believe you're familiar with. The first is Applicant's Exhibit 9. This is the April 12th, 2016 prefiled direct testimony of Lisa Shapiro, and the second is Applicant's 83, which is the amended prefiled testimony of Lisa Shapiro, dated March 29th, 2017.
(Documents handed to witness.)
Q. Am I correct that both of those documents are your testimony in this case?
A. Yes, but I believe the March 29, 2017 replaced the first testimony.
Q. Okay. Understood. I'm sure people will ask you questions about that.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you have changes or additions to either of those pieces of testimony?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you swear to and adopt both pieces of \{SEC 2015-04\} [Day 6 AFTERNOON ONLY] \{09-21-18\}
testimony?
A. I do.
Q. Thank you.

MR. NEEDLEMAN: All set.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Thank you. Attorney Patch.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. PATCH:
Q. Good afternoon.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. As I think you know, I'm counsel for the Town of Durham and University of New Hampshire, and I have a few questions.
A. Okay.
Q. I'm looking at Page 83 -- I'm sorry -Exhibit 83, Page 6. And I'm looking at Lines 26 to 27. And is it fair to say that you're essentially saying this project will have nothing but positive economic benefits?
A. No.
Q. No? Okay. Could you explain?
A. Sure. My report was on the jobs and the economic impact associated with the construction and operation of the Project.
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So I looked at taxes and I looked at the construction and the amount of money that would be spent in New Hampshire. In terms of any potential negative impacts associated with construction or operation, $I$ deferred and looked to other experts who concentrated on potential negative impacts.
Q. So the REMI model that you described on, I think it's on Page 5 of Exhibit 83, does that take into account any negative effects on the economy?
A. The REMI model takes into account what you input into the model. And there was no data that was available in the record that was provided or that $I$ was aware of that the negative impacts rose to the level of something that could be modeled and put into REMI. REMI only analyzes what you put in. So I put in the spending of the construction. Any potential negative impacts were dealt with separately by the other witnesses. And I have reviewed a good deal of their testimonies.
Q. So, just to summarize then, the REMI model
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does not take into account any disruptive effect the Project would have on traffic, on the ability to access local businesses, ultimately on revenues that might be brought in as a result of tourism or whatever, you know, impacts that would occur as a result of construction like that. It would not take those into account.
A. I did not have data available that suggested those negative impacts were to the level that they should be modeled to see if there were any further indirect or additional effects that would arise from that.
Q. Did you have any information at all about negative effects, or did you seek out any such information?
A. I reviewed what the construction folks were looking at. I asked them when I was putting together the testimony, in particular when $I$ was asked to do the jobs and the income and the taxes. I directly asked counsel, Will somebody be looking at and measuring and assessing potential negative impacts? Yes, through the various folks. And I asked if
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[WITNESS: SHAPIRO]
anything rises up to the level of a measurable impact that would be appropriate to put into a model, then I'd like to be kept apprised of that. And then once those testimonies were put in, I did review them. And I also looked at intervenors' testimony and Counsel for the Public and again was not seeing anything that I could model and either provide in a supplemental that would suggest that construction impacts or any of the other potential negative impacts were not being mitigated. There wasn't some type of plan that I should be saying, okay, I need to look at that REMI and consider whether there's some type of broader impact.
Q. I'm going to show you an exhibit. It's TD/UNH 21. I don't know if you've seen it before. But there are two responses to, I guess they were actually technical session data requests from May of this year that were asked of Todd Selig, who is the town administrator in the Town of Durham. Have you seen these responses to tech session data requests?
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A. No.

Well, I'm going to walk through just a couple things in here with you.

The first one, the question is:
"Identify businesses and tourism destinations in the Town of Durham that may be negatively impacted by construction and operation of the Project."

And after a rather lengthy objection, there's an answer there which says, "Our best estimate is that there are 194 total businesses in Durham, and 84 of those are impacted by tourism." And then there's a listing of conservation areas frequently visited by visitors to Durham. And then it says, "Whether and how many of those businesses and tourism destinations will be negatively impacted by construction and operation of the Project will depend on a number of variables which have not yet been determined, including the construction schedule, parentheses, which year it takes place, what times during that year, the time of day, the days of the week, whether the
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work is completed within that schedule, the routes and times of day when those routes are used, and how many construction-related vehicles use those routes. Because of the range of different businesses and tourism destinations, the locations of those businesses and tourism destinations, and the times of day that are important to them, and because there are so many undetermined variables, it is impossible to identify with any certainty the businesses and tourism destinations that may be negatively impacted by construction and operation of the Project."

Do you have anything in that that you would disagree with?
A. Well, I'm just seeing this for the first time, so I'm trying to think through whether I would agree with it or not. What comes to mind is that there's been a lot of discussion with the Construction Panel and a lot of work I've seen in the docket about construction schedules. There's MOUs with communities. There's business disruption, you know,
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mitigation and dispute resolution process. So each of these issues that are raised that are not known at the time before you start a project, I mean, that's kind of a statement saying, Well, there's a lot of businesses I don't know. But the record is replete with all kinds of substantive things getting at this. And I still haven't seen anything rise to show me that connection.
Q. But you wouldn't disagree that there will be disruptive effects as a result of construction on businesses in Durham, would you?
A. "Disruptive"? I don't know what disruptive -- every time there's construction on 106 I get disrupted getting to work. So I'm just not sure what the level -- yes, no one likes to --
Q. I mean, different levels, obviously. And we have no idea of knowing is essentially what Mr. Selig is saying. But there will be presumably some disruptive effects. Would you admit that?
A. Right. I think every construction project
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has disruptive effects. I think there's been quite a bit of testimony about how to reduce that, including, in particular, the mitigation dispute resolution process, as well as the agreement with Counsel for the Public to honor all the MOUs, as well as go above and beyond where the MOUs don't cover in terms of time of day for construction, local roads, working with municipalities, making sure the roads are put back to their original perspective.

So, yes, there's disruption. There's a plan that I've been listening to and reading in the record to address that. I'm not an expert to say what's left or if there is anything not covered by that.
Q. I'm going to ask you to look at the second question that's in this exhibit. It says, "Identify any road races or other public events in the town of Durham, excluding events at UNH, which the Town believes may be impacted by construction and operation of the Project."

And then I'm going to read the answer.
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"Our best estimate is that there are typically between 30 and 40 road races and public events that occur during the course of a calendar year off the UNH campus in Durham. The impact of the Project on these road races and public events will depend on a number of variables, including" -- and I won't read it all. Again, it's essentially the same variables I think were listed in the first one. And it concludes by saying, "Because there are so many variables that remain undetermined at this point in time, it is impossible to answer the question."

Again, do you have any reason to disagree with that?
A. Well, I agree that, in theory, all these things are important to look at. It's really the last sentence, "because there are so many variables that remain undetermined at this point." It seems like there's actually quite a bit of those variables that are involved in planning and mitigation and MOUs. So I'm not sure -- you know, time of year, time of day construction to address precisely these types
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[WITNESS: SHAPIRO]
of issues to reduce the impacts.
Q. It might help to reduce it, but obviously there's no way to totally eliminate the impact. Would you think that's fair?
A. I think all construction projects will have some impact.
Q. Okay. That's all my questions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Thank
you. Attorney Geiger is next.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Shapiro.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Now, your prefiled testimony provides information about the Project's impacts on local property tax revenues; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you make some estimates about the additional revenues that local or host communities of the Project will see as a result of new tax revenue that the Project brings; is that correct?
A. On the host communities, as well as the counties and the state.
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Q. Okay. Did you factor into your calculation any offsetting decrease in tax revenues that might be realized as a result of tax abatements that are granted to properties or property owners whose properties may decrease in value due to the construction of this project?
A. Again, the abatement issues and whether the construction of a project would have basically a negative impact on some type of neighboring property which could lead to an abatement, the impact of the construction on neighboring project is being handled by other witnesses, Dr. Chalmers and Mr. Varney. So, again, that is something that is important to look at.

In my experience, abatements on energy projects, while they are out there, and I am aware of some abatements that have been granted in some places in some communities, in my 20 years of experience, I have never seen the abatement level rise anywhere to a significant level that offsets, significantly offsets the new taxpayers' payments to the
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town.
Q. Right. Understood, understood. I wasn't asking if there was a complete offset. I was just asking whether or not your calculation of revenues was net of any declining tax revenues attributable to tax abatement.
A. No.
Q. Okay. I believe in response to questions from Attorney Patch you talked about the REMI model and modeling any negative inputs. And I believe you said you had not done that; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And if I understood your testimony correctly, you said you weren't aware of anything that rose to the level of being able to model; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Could you give me an example of something that would rise to that level that you would need to model it for negative effects?
A. Well, $I$ think if $I$ had seen in the testimony something that put forward that many businesses would be cut off from their
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customers for a long period of time during a prime tourism season, and therefore there would be a loss of revenue, $I$ would be looking to try and see is this something that rises to such a large level, or is this something, for example, that the Counsel for the Public witnesses have put in that they've identified as negative to that level. And I'd want to review whether that would be there. So when I looked at the testimonies, I didn't see the order of magnitude of number of businesses and the duration to rise to the level that we find something beyond even the range that $I$ already have in my model.
Q. Okay. Did you look at -- are you aware that this new transmission line is proposed to run through the parking lot of the Fox Run Mall?
A. I am.
Q. Okay. And if you could take a look at what I've put on the Elmo. That comes out of the Applicant's Volume 2. I believe they're in the environmental maps. This is a -- would you agree this is a depiction of that, of the location of those lines near the mall?
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A. This is the first time I'm looking at maps. So I will say that if that's what you're saying it is, then I'll agree for purposes of questioning.
Q. Okay. And would you agree, at least from this map, it appears that the new line will run through the parking lot?
A. You asked me about the lines. I'm not familiar with reading these types of maps. That's not my expertise. I looked at the testimony about the locations and that they had been mitigated and moved and that the owner of the mall seemed to be satisfied, based on the record. So that was how I had made my conclusion, not doing view scapes, because that's not my expertise. So I don't understand the -- you'd have to walk me through how to read this map.
Q. Well, $I$ guess the precise location is really not the point. The point is that you are aware that this high-voltage transmission line will be transecting the parking lot at the Fox Run Mall. I think you heard about that conceptually. Whether you've seen this
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map or not, you know about that.
A. Right.
Q. Do I understand you correctly that you believe that the owner of the mall's concerns about this project have been totally addressed by the Applicant?
A. I don't know if they're totally addressed. It seemed like they were addressed to some degree. I don't know whether there was a settlement. But when $I$ was reading it, it seemed like it was moved and there was some discussions going on. I was not aware that that was an outstanding issue of impact. It seemed like there was -- it was proposed one way and it was moved, and I didn't hear anything else about it.
Q. But would you agree that if the line were to be constructed in proximity to the mall, that it could have the effect of disrupting the mall's business?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, the mall, $I$ think there's different ways to deal with parking and how many spots
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would be taken up. Does it impact parking? I don't know. Just putting a hole in the middle of the mall, I'm not sure how that's disrupted. I would have to know --
Q. So you don't know. You do not know exactly, physically how this project will impact the mall or the mall's parking lot.
A. I remember reading that they were concerned about the location and asked that it be moved, or there was some discussions about moving it so that it would reduce the number of impacted parking spots and how it would impact it.
Q. And is it your understanding that those issues have been addressed by Eversource?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEIGER: I have no further questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: MS.
Ludtke, Conservation Law Foundation.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. LUDTKE:
Q. Good afternoon.
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A. Good afternoon.
Q. Can I call you Lisa?
A. No.
Q. Call you Ms. Shapiro?
A. Dr. Shapiro.
Q. Dr. Shapiro.
A. My parents would be happy.
Q. All right. Just seems kind of strange, that's all.
A. Okay, Attorney Ludtke.
Q. I went through your testimony, and I had somewhat specific questions on it. And do you have your testimony in front of you? And I'm working on, I think, the testimony that I have labeled as Exhibit 009. So I may have the older testimony. But I'm going to use page numbers from that.
A. Do you mind? 009?
Q. Yeah.
A. So that's the testimony that was replaced by the 2017. So this --
Q. Right. Well, that's the one I have, so that's the one I'm going to go through. I actually don't have a copy of the more recent
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one.
A. It was filed on March 29th, 2017.
Q. Well, anyway, the one I'm going through is Exhibit 009, and those are the page numbers and the lines that I'm going to be referring to.
A. Okay.
Q. So, in going through your testimony, you first state that the SRP is approximately a $\$ 77$ million electric transmission project.

Has that been changed and updated?
A. Yes. The March 29th, 2017 testimony that replaced that was based on the $\$ 84$ million update --
Q. So that 77 has gone to 84 .
A. Correct.
Q. Now, in terms of looking at the benefit to the communities, you say that the total cost of the Project has been allocated to the four host communities --
A. Correct.
Q. -- is that correct?

And when you talk about the total cost
of the Project being allocated to the
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communities -- and again, I'm focusing specifically on property tax payments -- is that the 84 million or a lesser figure based upon removing costs that would not be included in a property tax base?
A. Eight-four million.
Q. So 84 million has been allocated.
A. Correct.
Q. Now, $I$ know in the testimony that $I$ have in front of me, you talk about the total project cost as including engineering, project management, siting, material, construction and other costs, such as testing. And you removed those costs and come up with an estimated cost of construction of 60 million; is that correct? I'm looking at Page 5, and that would be Line 10.
(Witness reviews document.)
A. In the testimony that replaced that, that was written a little bit confusing. I think I was just reporting for the 60 million for an opportunity, a way to explain it. But in actuality, the 17.4, which is actually 19.1 in the replacement testimony, was based on
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all the categories of what the Applicant viewed out of the entire 84 million, how much of it is spent on New Hampshire local materials and workers.
Q. But in looking at property tax payments, what is taxed in the property tax is property, real property that is located within the boundaries of the respective towns; is that not correct?
A. Utility property is taxed differently. Utility property is all real property. So it's the entire cost of the Project, including things like AFUDC. The entire capitalized value of the Project is included, siting and everything. It's not just the pole and that pole costs $x$-amount of money. In utility property taxes, it's the whole cost of the Project is considered real property.
Q. When the town assesses a utility then, the assessment is based on the cost for the entire property. Now, who determines that?
A. For the local assessment, it's the local town. For the state assessment, it's the
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DRA. However, there is a study commission going on right now, which I'm sitting on, House Bill 324, to try and come up with a unified, consistent formula across all towns.
Q. There's no consistent formula right now?
A. Correct.
Q. Essentially what I'm asking is the value would be determined by the respective towns?
A. Well, the Supreme Court has acknowledged five approaches to value. And some towns use some combination, some towns use other combinations. Sometimes they take the DRA number. But you just can't make up anything. It is within the -- it's supposed to be within these five approaches to value.
Q. Now, one complicating value in this instance is that none of the town boundaries include the portion of the cable that's in Little Bay.
A. Well, the Company took the position, and that's why the entire 84 million was allocated. And in my attachments, I showed how much of the 84 million was allocated. They made the decision of how much would be
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allocated in Newington versus Durham. And I don't know whether they took the center of the Little Bay or what the legal basis for that is. But the Company took the view that the entire 84 million as taxable and allocated it to those four.
Q. How was it allocated? By what method?
A. I believe it's physical, based on how much of it is in each town.
Q. Well, if the town boundaries end on the mean high tide line, how then is it possible to determine the percentage of the cable, which is not in any town, and allocate the percentage of the cable to the towns?
A. Again, $I$ was provided by the Applicant on the -- you can see the allocation to Newington and Durham versus Madbury and Portsmouth. And I'm sure the Applicant would be happy to work with the Town of Newington and Durham if somebody felt that this was not allocated properly.
Q. I understand from your testimony that you actually did not derive the allocation methodology for assigning the value to each
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town.
A. Correct.
Q. That was given to you.
A. Yes.
Q. And did you examine it and determine whether you agreed or disagreed with it?
A. I looked at it. And in terms of how many miles were in each community, the types of construction that were in the two ends, the Madbury and Portsmouth, and then the big cost of the cable, the submarine cable, it seemed reasonable that about 90 percent of the Project cost was split between Durham and Newington. And it seemed a reasonable allocation based on looking at 13 miles, or 12.9 miles.
Q. Well, there would also be an allocation between Newington and Durham, wouldn't there be?
A. Well, that's what $I$ was provided. I was provided that by the Applicant. I
requested -- in all the projects I've done, including like a pipeline where there's over

30 towns, that they make the allocation of
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how much of the Project is in each community.
Q. Do you have any idea how the property, taxable -- I suppose taxable property tax amount would be divided between Newington and Durham?
A. Well, again, that's in my testimony. If I went to the more updated -- I don't know if you want me to look at yours. It's been replaced. I don't know where it is in Exhibit 9. In my testimony, it's -- I'm sorry. I don't know what the nomenclature is. It has an allocation, estimated SRP allocated cost by community: 3.5 million Madbury, 43.3 million Durham, 32.9 million Newington, 4.5 million Portsmouth, for a total of $\$ 84.3$ million. And $I$ was provided those allocations by the Applicant based on their construction.
Q. So you didn't do any work to actually agree or disagree with the allocation between, let's just say Newington and Durham because that's 90 percent.
A. Well, again, as I mentioned a few minutes ago when you asked, I did look at the numbers of
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allocations, and it did seem to match in terms of where the miles and where the costs were. The submarine cable was a substantial portion of the Project, and presumably that's divided some way between the two towns. It seemed within the ballpark. If I had been provided something that had 25 percent in each community, that would have gotten my attention.
Q. So it didn't get your attention. It seemed reasonable. But you didn't conduct an independent investigation on your own to, for example, look at the amount of shorefront or the specifics on each town to say, well, 32 percent should go to Newington and 40-something percent should go to Durham.
A. No. I relied on the Applicant who has engineering drawings and is allocating the costs and building the Project to tell me how much construction is happening in each community.
Q. And I saw in your testimony that you were estimating -- and I know that this is going to be difficult because you don't know what
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the town's budget is going to be, so you don't know what the tax rate is going to be, et cetera. But you were using a number, a range of numbers somewhat less than one million to over one million for a total tax benefit. And that would be from the \$84 million?
A. Well, again, you're looking -- in the Applicant Exhibit 9, I'm not seeing the attachments that have the summary chart of what the taxes were in each town. I do have that from the testimony that replaced Exhibit 9, March 29, 2017. And the overall estimate of taxes was 1.6 million to 2.2 .
Q. Okay. So, 1.6 million to 2.2 million.
A. Correct.
Q. And if you took 90 percent of that and allocated that to Durham and Newington, you'd be at about 1.4 million. And so each of those communities is looking at somewhat less than a million dollars in property taxes? Let's say 700,000 or less.
A. No. Actually, that's not the way it worked. Specifically, I built up an estimate for the
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four different taxes that the utility pays.
Q. Yes, I was --
A. So the 1.6 to 2.2 is the local tax, the county tax and the state tax. So, 90 percent of it doesn't go to Newington and Durham because the 1.6 million to 2.2 includes the state utility property tax, which is about a half a million dollars, and it includes the two county taxes, and then you have what's left, which are the local taxes. So they are the majority, but not all of it.
Q. Okay. So, in terms of -- what I'm interested in is local property taxes.
A. Okay.
Q. Local property taxes alone. And what would be the total number or amount of local property taxes that would be realized by the location of these facilities in the towns?
A. Okay. It's between about --
Q. I have a chart on Page 9 here. I can read you what the chart says on Page 9. It says 956,000 to 1.4 million to the four local communities.
A. Correct. Again, that's been replaced by the
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supplemental testimony. Yes, that's the correct line to be looking at in that testimony. Yes.
Q. So what has that 956,000 to 1.4 million been updated to?
A. To 982,000 to 1.4 million.
Q. $\quad 1.4$ million?
A. Yeah, it's pretty much the same.
Q. Okay. So if you --
A. Slightly higher on the lower end.
Q. So that would be subject to the 90 percent allocation, that number?
A. Again, the allocation comes first. The allocation is of the value of the Project. Then I estimated taxes in each community, using their town's tax rate and some variations. So the allocation comes first. The 84 million was allocated to the four communities. Then I go to each community's tax rates and model some different scenarios to get an estimate for each of the four communities. I go into the two counties' tax rates and estimate it. Then I go into the state utility tax rate and estimate that.
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Q. What I'm trying to do is just sort of do a back-of-the-envelope approximation. I understand what you're saying in terms of tax rates on the respective communities. But what I'm trying to understand is if $I$ were in Durham or if I were in Newington and I wanted to know about how much extra money I would receive in property taxes from this project, what would that amount be? And I understand the difficulty in deriving it from this number because you have towns with different tax rates, et cetera. But would it be fair to say that, back-of-the-envelope calculation, Durham, Newington, would be about a half-million dollars in extra taxes?
A. Well, again, $I$ don't have to do back-of-the-envelope because it's in my filing and $I$ have a chart. So, for Durham it's 748,785 to 1.1 millions, and for Newington it's 132,000 to 194,000. So I have the estimates there.
Q. Okay. So Durham gets quite a bit more than Newington.
A. Well, Durham, the allocated part of the
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Project in Durham was 43 million versus Newington of about 33 million. And of course, Newington's tax rate is quite a bit lower than Durham.
Q. Right. And of those numbers that you got from Durham and Newington, did you look at what percentage of the total tax revenues collected each year that would comprise? So if $I$ were in Newington, how much tax revenue from Newington -- for Newington?
A. Newington was 132,000 to 194.
Q. So if I got $\$ 132,000$ from this project in Newington, what percentage of the total property tax receipts, approximately, would that be? I know you don't know what the tax rate's going to be for next year or whatever. But previous year budgets, you looked at those. What percentage would that be?
A. You know, I haven't looked at that recently. I don't recall. I did look at what level that would make them as a taxpayer, and it would put Eversource -- it would go from the seventh largest taxpayer in town to the third. But $I$ don't recall what the
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percentage is.
Q. That wasn't actually my question. I'll rephrase my question.

What I'm interested in knowing is, of the total property tax receipts -- towns receive X -amount of money in property tax receipts every year -- what percentage is that 132 million?
A. No, 132,000.
Q. Yeah, 132,000. Excuse me. 132,000, what percentage of that is that to the total property tax receipts last year?
A. I don't have that number in front of me. I recall looking at it, and I didn't look at it recently. I don't recall.
Q. Do you know approximately how much Newington receives in property tax on a yearly basis?
A. Well, excuse me. I should take that back. It's actually right in my testimony, in terms of the percent of value. So, for Newington, a $\$ 32$ million project which is -- in

Newington, it would represent 3.3 percent of the tax base in 2015, which was the numbers that were most recent at the time. So if it
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represents about 3.3 percent of the tax base, it's a little bit less of the -- well, it's about 3.3 percent of local spending. It's a little bit different because of the state property tax. So it's about 3.3 percent.
Q. And that includes the school portion?
A. Yes. Local school portion, not the state school portion.
Q. Not the state property tax portion, but the school portion of the property taxes.
A. Yes. Local schools. There's two state -there's two education taxes at the local level, kind of a pure local tax that the utilities and everybody pays, and then the state education tax. There, the utility pays to the state. So the 3.3 percent is municipal spending, 3.3 of locally raised money for education, but it's not part of the state education tax.
Q. Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Ms.
Ludtke, I'm just going to interrupt you for just a moment because you've exceeded your estimate. You can still continue but --
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MS. LUDTKE: I have one more question.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Okay. Just giving you the heads-up.

MS. LUDTKE: I'm close. One more.
BY MS. LUDTKE:
Q. You said you made no allowance for depreciation on the value of the property?
A. I estimated year one, which is the full value of the total cost of the Project. But I did not estimate past year one of what the property taxes would be. That would be subject to whatever methodology is adopted and what ends up being settled on or litigated.
Q. Presumably over time, the 3 percent that Newington gets would decline and be a lower percentage --
A. Well, not necessarily --
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. -- as the property went down in value?
A. -- because Newington has such a significant part of their property tax base in utilities that are all subject to depreciation, I
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actually don't know if it would necessarily decline as a percent, even though it would be depreciating, because a big part of their properties are also depreciation. And it would depend on what happens to the rest of the town. But in general, you'd expect the value to decline over time. But whether it declines as a percent really depends on what else is going on in town and also if the state ends up adopting a formula that's different.
Q. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Thank you.

Attorney Brown for Durham
Residents. Oh, I'm sorry. That was for Mr. Varney. You don't have any questions; correct?
[No verbal response]
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: I read the wrong chart. And other than Counsel for the Public, there's no other party here to ask questions of Dr. Shapiro; is that correct?
[No verbal response]
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PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Okay. Attorney Aslin.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ASLIN:
Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Shapiro. How are you?
A. Good.
Q. I want to just follow up a little bit on the discussion you had with Attorney Ludtke. You were reading some numbers from your report, and $I$ just want to see if we have the right document.

While I slowly zoom out, I believe the updated figures that you referred to are in Applicant's 101. Does that sound correct? And eventually we'll be able to see it on the screen.
A. Yes, that matches.
Q. Okay. So this is Applicant's 101. And I think this is the amended tables that go along with your testimony?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And so those are the numbers, the percentages on the right, that you were referring to with Attorney Ludtke?
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A. Correct.
Q. And then on the second page, is that the estimated range of property taxes for the first year?
A. For the local portion. Correct.
Q. Yeah, local portion. Okay.

And you testified that these are only the first-year estimate for local -- or for all the taxes; right?
A. Correct.
Q. So, regardless of what type of depreciation is applied, this is the estimate for sort of the highest amount of tax that a town will be getting from this project?
A. In my opinion, the first year is usually the highest. However, some towns have been using methodologies where they trend the costs up each year and subtract depreciation. So it's possible. And I have seen some instances where some assessors have said that the trending cost increase is actually greater than the depreciation. And in that case, the value would actually go up. But that is not what $I$ expect, but it is possible.
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Q. Okay. So there might be some circumstance where these estimates would underestimate the tax in a given year?
A. It's possible.
Q. But more likely this is sort of the top will decline in some way with depreciation over time.
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. You also had some testimony earlier with I think both Attorneys Patch and Geiger about the REMI modeling. And I believe you said you did not model any negative economic inputs; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And generally speaking, the REMI model takes costs that are expended on a project and processes them in terms of their impacts to the economy?
A. If that's what you're modeling. I mean, if you're modeling like a gas tax increase, for example, which $I$ did a study on that, so I put it in as increased construction costs, which is more similar to this type of exercise than what you just laid out, but I
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also modeled a reduction in consumer spending because there the gas tax also would reduce personal income. So I modeled both at the same time into the REMI model.
Q. But in this case, I think you just modeled the input of added construction costs --
A. Correct.
Q. -- and the impact that would have on direct spending in the communities, as well as indirect and induced spending?
A. Correct.
Q. And direct spending is something that translates into sales in town and stores. And also are job salaries included in that?
A. If I may explain?
Q. Please.
A. So the direct -- the Applicant was estimating that out of the $\$ 84$ million budget, about 23 percent would be directly spent on New Hampshire labor and materials. So that's what they would be spending, as you laid out. Sometimes that then also leads, and in this case, also estimates indirect spending for the businesses that are supporting who you're
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spending directly with. So, yes.
Q. And so you said it was 23 percent of the Project budget. Is that the 19.1 million figure in your report?
A. Yes.
Q. So that's the amount of project spending, direct spending that was estimated to occur in New Hampshire.
A. Correct.
Q. And then that also triggers some indirect spending --
A. Yes --
Q. -- that's on top of that.
A. -- and induced.
Q. And induced. Okay.

You're aware that this is a reliability project; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that the cost of the Project will be recovered through rates on customers?
A. Correct.
Q. And I think we heard some testimony from Mr.

Cullen that about 9 percent of the Project cost will be recovered by New Hampshire
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ratepayers.
A. Correct.
Q. Did you factor into your analysis the expenditure of that rate increase for New Hampshire ratepayers?
A. No, I did not, for two reasons. One, it was relatively small. And you spread it out, unlike if it were 84 million all on New Hampshire. That would raise a different issue than I would look at to model.

The second issue is that, while there's a spending, there's also a reliability benefit. And I didn't model the reliability and what happens, you know, what is the value of reliability. So if you're going to -you'd want to at least consider that. So it was a very small number. And also, as a reliability project, that has certain energy benefits as well, although that's more difficult to quantify in this type of approach to modeling.
Q. So, the roughly 7-1/2-million-dollar cost to New Hampshire ratepayers is deemed too small. Is that in part because it's spread out over
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the economic life of the Project?
A. Correct, and because it's required. The flipside is reliability. So, you know, I want to take a look at, if $I$ were going to model the costs, I'd want to take into consideration what would be the value of reliability.
Q. So, essentially, your analysis is really just looking at the direct and kind of indirect piece of the spending on the project and didn't get into the nuances of some of these other potential benefits or impacts.
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Okay.
Questions from the Committee? Mr. Way.
QUESTIONS BY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS AND/OR COUNSEL: BY MR. WAY:
Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Shapiro.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Following up on a couple earlier things. I'm looking at your prefiled and looking at your amended. And when I look at the job estimates, seems like the prefiled in '16 had
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somewhat higher numbers than '17. And I notice that obviously the costs of the Project have gone up in '17 to the 84 million. I think I know why that is. But could you tell me what's responsible for bringing that number down?
A. Sure. The time between the first time I estimated and the second time I estimated, I had to renew the REMI model. And I've been doing this for over 15 years, and this was the first time. Every five years they do an update where they go back and actually do a deep dive into their data and realign it and bench mark. And although they update each year with new available data, you don't really see much change. But every five years they make a substantial look. And the relationship had reduced in New Hampshire between investments and the number of jobs since prior. So the data that they had relied on from the government of input/output models had changed. And I was perplexed when we first got the analysis, because how can $I$ put in more money and have less of an impact.
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So we did take a deep dive into a rather long conversation with REMI about why it happened. And the economic structure has changed. Not a big surprise. And it was reflected in the numbers. So the actual underlying model had reduced the relationship somewhat, so hence the output.
Q. Okay. Well, I didn't know.

But I was also wondering, too, if that reduction, or maybe if there was a reduction, was that also the result of the fact that some route accommodations had been made, and route accommodations might result in a different input into the REMI model that could affect the number of workers as well? Is that something that could be contributing here?
A. No. I mean, because from, again, my focus on the construction budget and the estimate of how much would be spent on local labor and materials, it actually increased. When the Project numbers went from 77 to 84 million, the estimate on New Hampshire direct, you know, labor and materials, went from about 17
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[WITNESS: SHAPIRO]
million to 19 million. So it did actually increase, you know, not to do with these other types of things. In fact, some of these things that I've heard about would seem to increase the spending because a lot of the mitigation I've heard about in the proceeding more recently are New Hampshire-based spending. So that might have some additional impact over time.

But in terms of the Project costs and the estimates from the Applicant, they have that 19.1 million of what they estimated for spending, and it does include some things like land clearing -- not clearing -landscape afterward. So that was anticipated as part of why you have that 19.1 million spent locally.
Q. In terms of evaluating the impacts to businesses, I appreciate what you're saying. You've got to get information that comes to you. For you to actually have an input, it can't be anecdotal. You'd have to have some revenue numbers or something. And you've received nothing of that sort from any of the
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outreach that it's occurred?
A. Correct. And, you know, I did review the intervenor testimony to look at it, and especially with the, you know, the oyster farms. And I've sat in on the technical sessions to try and hear, you know, was there some estimate of some big number that $I$ missed. And $I$ just didn't see anything.
Q. So there's no big revenue loss, particularly, I take it, to its nth degree of loss of jobs.

You're not seeing anything like that --
A. No.
Q. -- or hearing anything like that.
A. No.
Q. And $I$ was listening to the thing on the Fox

Run Mall as well, and I understand what you're saying, being the parking lot. I was just thinking back to the other day, and I believe I was talking to Mr. Bowes. And he was saying that there really was not a good line of communication with the mall. So you don't really have anything to suggest one way or the other in that case --
A. Correct.
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Q. It's not that they're okay with it, it's you just haven't gotten information back or forth?
A. Yeah, I apologize. I remember reading something where it had changed. And I guess I misunderstood that that was based on the Applicant doing what they thought was best, not based on a line of communication. I was not aware of that.
Q. All right. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Any other questions from the Committee? Mr. Fitzgerald.

BY MR. FITZGERALD:
Q. Good afternoon. I'm neither an economist nor a doctor, so please bear with my lack of knowledge in this area.

Relative to local impacts particularly, are there impacts, and are they accounted for in your modeling from -- you know, for instance, construction workers buying services in the area where they're working and using hotels and things like that? Do those generally amount to much of an impact?
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You mentioned the negative impacts are usually pretty small. Are those of much impact on this?
A. In my experience, the construction impacts, in terms of the spending, are usually fairly significant at the local level. You know, you start moving a hundred people at the peak of heavy construction, you're spending a fair amount of money locally on goods and services. So that is what REMI is trying to get at, where you're spending the 19.1 million on, you know, engineering, on construction workers, on sanitation issues. And then those folks are -- those businesses are relying on other businesses, and then that also induces, which is what your example is, where you're then going and spending additional monies. So that's really what the REMI model is trying to get at. You know, the construction team is able to, with their experience, say, okay, I think we can get local labor and local materials for 23 percent of the cost of this project. But what kind of impact is that 19.1 million
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spent on the economy? How many jobs and --
Q. So you're accounting for more than just the direct construction spending.
A. Correct. With REMI, that's really the purpose of REMI is to try to get at that indirect and induced, so you get a flavor for the economic impacts from those spending.
Q. Okay. And that leads right into my next question. My very limited experience with REMI has been an evaluation of more regional policy aspects and so on. And I assume you chose it because it was appropriate for it. But is that generally the tool that's used to look at -- I mean, I realize it's large for New Hampshire. But in the scheme of the regional economy, it's not that huge. And you're looking at a rather limited area.

REMI is the appropriate tool for that?
A. Well, just to clarify, $I$ can't tell you how much of that 19.1 million spent on local New Hampshire and what it indirectly induces is the Seacoast Region of New Hampshire versus the state as a whole.
Q. Okay.
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A. So the level of analysis is New Hampshire. So I rented the New Hampshire model. So that's not uncommon at all in REMI to use the state-level model. And it takes into account that there's going to be leakages to Maine and Massachusetts, you know, for some of the benefits. Whenever you have a construction project in New Hampshire, there's going to be some benefits more regionally. But by looking at the New Hampshire model, I'm just trying to capture for the SEC the New Hampshire benefits.
Q. Good. Thank you very much. Appreciate it. PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Other Committee members? I have a couple.

BY PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Q. Just to clarify a couple things about property taxes.
A. Sure.
Q. The utilities in Little Bay, did I understand you correctly that PSNH/Eversource intends to allocate those utilities to Durham and Newington for property tax purposes?
A. Yes.
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Q. And the percentages that were in your tables there, those are the, at this point, the intended percentage allocations?
A. Yes.
Q. And you provided us with tax payment estimates to the various communities for the first year and did not provide us with an estimate of taxes paid over the life of the Project. I think you said it was too difficult to model given the number of variables. Kind of paraphrasing. But why did you not provide us with an estimate of the property taxes for the reliability project over the life of the Project?
A. Yes. From what $I$ have seen over time from the SEC, it's very rare to see anybody estimate past the first year, because the history in New Hampshire is there's such a divergent view of what the value of utility property is after the first few years, that you end up just arguing more. And so up until -- actually, I think $I$ was the first one to start putting it in. Years ago, with the Portland Natural Gas Transmission System,
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I also gave a 20-year estimate, as I did with Northern Pass. You rarely see it because most people are uncomfortable taking any type of estimate. So the only estimate you can really take, in my view, and the only one I'd be comfortable with, is the least possible number because $I$ don't want to suggest it's something higher. But of course, the towns have a view that it is higher. And probably the formula, if the state is successful, will be something in between. So, years ago it used to always be, well, just assume it never changes, whatever it is the first year. So because of the unknowns there, I think it's a good marker for the first year. And I think you can imagine there would be some decline gradually over time. It will not go to zero. I don't see that in New Hampshire, because under New Hampshire, the view is it still has some taxable value, even if it's still not generating revenue. That's been what I've seen. There are different views on that. People have different opinions about whether that's right or wrong. But as a practical
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matter, they're continuing to be taxed even after they're depreciated.
Q. Okay. So, clearly there has been a difference of opinion between what the utility may think their assets are valued at and what a community thinks they're valued at; therefore, that affects the property tax rate. In the past, Eversource has sought various tax abatements because of that disagreement, and hence the proposed legislation to help sort out all of that issue.

But until that is sorted out, what is the position of Eversource, or the Applicant, PSNH, concerning seeking tax abatements? Are they willing to pledge not to, as they did in Northern Pass, or just going to kind of see how things shake out?
A. Yeah, I'm not aware. But my experience is that, because there's a known method of net book, that the utilities, including Eversource, are not seeking abatements. So there is some number you can predict and know that it's not going to go below that. I
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don't know why it would be in anybody -- in any taxpayer's interest to file an abatement if it's at that net book -- it's at that net method. So it's really -- if the town ends up valuing it something substantially higher, then $I$ don't know. I don't know.
Q. Fair enough.

Concerning the estimates of the jobs, your analysis of those jobs, were those just New Hampshire residents, or was it other folks coming in to work in New Hampshire?
A. These are estimates being New Hampshire
Q. Okay. And would you be the correct witness to talk about the claims process, or is that Mr. Varney, should there be a business loss as a result of the Project?
A. I have a general understanding just from reading it. Which witness did you think was --
Q. Is it Mr. Varney? Who is the witness that we'd talk to if a business suffers a loss, say Ms. Heald and the nursery business, or the oyster farm? We're told there's a claims
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process that they can submit to try to document their loss and receive some reimbursement.
A. Well, $I$ can give you a little bit of an overview because this was something that was extremely important to me. Because as a witness that's estimating for the SEC what is the jobs, income and taxes associated with the Project, I want to be apprised of what the potential offsets are, some of the questions that came up before, and if there's any type of mechanism to make somebody whole, because then I can feel like I didn't miss anything because if there is some unintended, negative impact on somebody to be able to make whole.

So $I$ did review, and my understanding is it's basically a mitigation and dispute resolution process. And it's really four steps. So if you're a business or an individual property owner -- the first thing is that right out of the gate the Company has agreed, I guess through this process, the Applicant would post the information about
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the Project. And if anybody contacted the Company and had any concerns, they must respond to them within 10 days and try and work out a mitigation plan to make sure. So, even, you know, right up front you want to try and not get to anything not farther. So that's, like, step one.

Step two is if that business is not happy with the folks they meet with and they don't feel like they got the right mitigation plan for their plantings or whatever it is, they can go to the next level in the Company and ask for an executive review within the Company. So take it outside the Project team and kind of push it up a little bit for somebody in the Company to see if you can get some relief there.

And if they're still not getting what they want, they're still not feeling they're getting the compensation because something bad happened, they can then elect to go to non-binding mediation. Now, that would then take them out of the courts, you know. It's not binding, but $I$ think you are then out of
the courts.
And if you still can't get the right thing through a non-binding mediation, where the mediator is off of the, you know, web site of who's considered an appropriate mediator in New Hampshire, then you get to the fourth aspect, which is a dispute resolution process. And here I think the concept is that the SEC would appoint somebody, like a retired judge, an independent, retired judge. And they can mediate the dispute, or whatever the correct legal word is on that, to address that.

And also there would be $\$ 100,000$ to fund that dispute resolution process, which is kind of like the fourth leg of it.
Q. So that's good to hear. Maybe that's in the record somewhere. I wasn't aware of all that, so $I$ appreciate that.

Maybe on a more simple level, if they worked with Eversource and got a plan in place, but despite the plan something goes a little bit awry and they can't get access to the business for three days and they suffer a
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loss, in other projects I think there's been a process where they can document that loss and seek reimbursement. That is the case --
A. Correct.
Q. -- here as well; correct?
A. Correct. That is correct. It's for damage to property. But more what I think you're getting at, Madam Chair, is loss of business or loss of income. So, again, documenting that. And/or diminution in the value of your property. So it also covers that as well.
Q. Thank you. I have nothing further.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY:
Attorney Iacopino, do you have any questions?
MR. IACOPINO: No.
PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Okay.
Anybody else? Any redirect?
MR. NEEDLEMAN: Madam Chair, I think
the proposed stipulated conditions between Eversource and Counsel for the Public was filed on Monday with the Committee, and that's in there along with a series of other ones.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. NEEDLEMAN:
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Q. Going back to this issue of the Fox Run Mall, if we could put up Exhibit 140 again, Attachment A. This is the Outreach Summary that was attached to Mr . Bowes' testimony. And I wanted to go to the bottom of Page 14, the Outreach Summary. And at the very bottom of Page 14 there's a header "Crossings at Fox Run Mall." Then you go to the top of Page 15, and there's a description there of all of the Project's dealings with Fox Run Mall.

So my question is: Were you aware -- I know you were generally aware that the Project had reached out and tried to deal with Fox Run Mall. Were you aware of the extent of the dealings and that efforts had started in July of 2015, according to the Outreach Summary?
A. No, I had forgotten that. Now I'm aware. I did read this and it slipped my mind.
Q. The questions from Ms. Geiger, you know, were do you think that there could be some adverse impact associated with the Project at the mall, and did you account for it. I guess my question for you is: If these dealings had
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been going on for the course of the last few years, and the owners of the mall had the opportunity to raise these concerns with the Project, in your opinion, do you think if they had those concerns they would have raised them?
A. Yes. I think that's why my recollection was it was not an issue because $I$ thought it had been dealt with. Actually, it had been attempted to deal, but nothing else had come back -- so, yes, that is my opinion. If somebody's concerned, they would contact the Project.
Q. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Okay.
We actually finished ahead of schedule. And thinking we would go longer, we let Mr. Varney go home. So we'll be done for the day. Enjoy your weekend. We'll see you back here --

Thank you, Dr. Shapiro, for your
testimony.
We'll see you folks back here
Monday morning when we will have Mr. Varney.
MS. MONROE: We have the lineup is
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Dr. Chalmers will go first, followed by
Dr. William Bailey. And if time permits, we'll start with Mr. Varney.

PRESIDING OFFICER WEATHERSBY: Okay.
Thank you all.
(Whereupon the Day 6 Afternoon
Session was adjourned at 4:00
p.m., with the Day 7 hearing to resume on Monday, September 24, 2018 commencing at 9:00 a.m.)
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