

Re: Request for Review of Out of Time Petition to Intervene

New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee Docket No. 2015-06 Northern Pass

March 27, 2016

Pamela G. Monroe, Administrator New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee 21 South
Fruit Street, Suite 10 Concord, NH 03301-2429

Dear Ms. Monroe,

We respectfully request to intervene in the SEC's proceedings under Docket No. 2015-06 relating to the proposed Northern Pass transmission line. Per the SEC's regulations, we are directing this electronic request to you, with copies to the SEC's distribution list for this proceeding as noted in the "cc" below.

We are filing this petition to intervene after the February 5, 2016 deadline and requesting your review at this time because the Applicants did not indicate that they would file their former preferred overhead project, which passes near our property, as the Alternate Route until February 26, 2016.

Attachment 1 to "Application Updates re: New Rules," filed with the SEC on February 26, 2016, is titled "NPT Project Maps – Alternate Route. Preliminary Design. February 2016. Additional Information." It is posted at Tab 261 on the SEC website page for the Northern Pass docket. Attachment 1 contains an updated map (dated February 2016) of the Alternate Route near our property.

The Applicants state that they are submitting these updated, February 2016 maps as additional information on "the one alternate route that [they] considered technically available, although not preferred, but that is in reality not a viable alternative" (Cover letter, February 26, 2016, also at Tab 261). Given the ambiguity of this statement and lacking a legal guarantee that this route, which was the preferred route for five years, will not be revived as the preferred route at some point in this proceeding, we are petitioning to intervene in order to protect our affected property interests, as is our statutory right.

Our particular rights, duties, privileges, immunities or other substantial interests that may be adversely affected by the Alternate Route relate to the property that we own at 484 Paine Road, Easton NH 03580.

We are a non-abutter to the proposed overhead project on the Alternate Route. We retired to New Hampshire six years ago, in search of the outstanding scenic surroundings of Easton and Grafton County. We bought the oldest house in Easton (circa 1800), restored it, and now enjoy a view shed that includes portions of the White Mountain National Forest and undeveloped ridgelines from all points. Our 160-acre property lies, at the closest point, roughly one mile from the proposed Alternative

Route. The towers along this route would immediately become highly visible from our house site. It would be the view from the front yard, as well as almost every vantage point on the property. In addition, every aspect of our recreation would be affected by the towers as we would encounter them on the way to ski, fish, hike, bike, snowshoe, cross-country ski and more. To the North on NH116 in Easton, the towers would pass through the frequently visited towns of Sugar Hill and Bethlehem. To the South on NH116, NH112 and I93, we would see the towers when we take trips to other frequented destinations such as Woodstock and Plymouth and Portsmouth.

Additionally, we are very concerned that the construction phase would degrade the water quality in Reel Brook and the Ham Branch, into which the streams from our property flow. In 2014, we placed 115 acres of our property in an USDA/Natural Resources Conservation Service – Wetlands Reserve Program conservation easement. The objectives of this easement are to ensure water quality for the health of the watershed, and specific steps are being taken to promote communities of aquatic significance, including brook trout, in the tributaries of the Ham Branch. In short, this depends on water quality within the Ham Branch itself to allow upstream passage of viable trout.

Finally, it is an obvious conclusion for anyone who has worked in a business, making investment decisions as we have, that the introduction of these proposed towers would greatly impact our real estate property values.

Our property interests are unique and substantial. To combine our interests with those of others would limit our procedural rights and would hinder our ability to protect our property effectively, as is our statutory right.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Roy R. Stever and Deborah P. Stever
484 Paine Road Easton, NH 03580

Cc: SEC distribution list for Docket No. 2015-06 as of March 27, 2016.