

**THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
BEFORE THE
SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

DOCKET NO. 2015-04

AMENDED PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF LISA K. SHAPIRO

**APPLICATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
D/B/A EVERSOURCE ENERGY
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF SITE AND FACILITY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW
115 kV TRANSMISSION LINE**

THE SEACOAST RELIABILITY PROJECT

March 29, 2017

1 **Qualifications and Purpose of Testimony**

2 **Q. Please state your name, title and business address for the record.**

3 A. My name is Lisa K. Shapiro and my business address is 214 North Main Street,
4 Concord, NH 03301. I am Chief Economist at Gallagher, Callahan & Gartrell, P.C.

5 **Q. Please briefly summarize your relevant background and employment**
6 **experience.**

7 A. I hold a Ph.D. in Economics from Johns Hopkins University and have
8 approximately 20 years of experience in analyzing New Hampshire property taxes as part of my
9 job. My doctoral dissertation was on property taxes and voting behavior with a case study of
10 New Hampshire. I was the lead author on the seminal study on the then-proposed new statewide
11 property tax enacted in New Hampshire. I also prepared the analysis of the estimated property
12 taxes paid by the proposed Portland Natural Gas Transmission System. I have prepared property
13 tax analyses for a variety of private and institutional organizations. I have consulted for utilities,
14 merchant generators, and manufactures to assist with property tax analysis, including testifying
15 and representation before the New Hampshire Legislature on legislative proposals regarding
16 property taxes.

17 I have authored a number of economic impact studies, reports, and presentations on the
18 economic and fiscal impacts of infrastructure investments and public policies. I have provided
19 expert economics testimony before the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission, and I have
20 also testified before the New Hampshire legislature on the economic and policy impacts of
21 proposed legislation concerning electric industry restructuring, the Renewable Portfolio Standard
22 (“RPS”), the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (“RGGI”), pollution control tax exemptions,
23 utility taxes, and other business and tax proposals.

24 I have also served on the boards of the New Hampshire Retirement System, the Federal
25 Reserve Bank of Boston’s New England Public Policy Center Advisory Board, Josiah Bartlett
26 Center for Public Policy, and was a member of Governor Shaheen’s New Hampshire
27 Commission on Education Funding. For further information, please see my CV, attached hereto
28 as Attachment A.

29

1 Actual taxes paid by SRP would depend on the total cost and market value of the SRP
2 property in each community, government spending, other sources of revenue, and the tax base,
3 after construction.

4 In order to develop an estimated range for the SRP first year annual tax payment post-
5 construction, simulations were run using different assumptions on tax and growth rates, and the
6 taxable value of SRP in each community.

7 **Q. Please provide an overview of the costs of the project within each of the**
8 **proposed host communities?**

9 A. Approximately 90 percent of the total Project costs are allocated to Durham and
10 Newington. For the other two proposed host communities, about \$3.5 million in Project cost is in
11 Madbury and about \$4.5 million in Portsmouth. Appendix 44, State and Local Tax Revenue
12 Data, shows the estimated Project allocated cost in each community, and as compared to the
13 most recent (2015) town valuation.

14 **Q. Can you please summarize the estimated SRP local property tax payments**
15 **for the first year post-construction?**

16 A. Actual taxes paid will depend on the value of the SRP property in the community,
17 local spending, other sources of revenue, and the tax base. Revised Appendix 44(a), State and
18 Local Tax Revenue Data, reports the estimated range of SRP first year local property tax
19 payments. Ranges are based on different simulations using current and actual tax rates and
20 spending levels, different growth rate assumptions, and a discounted simulation on SRP property
21 value in a community to estimate a lower range of payment to provide a higher degree of
22 confidence. Details on the specific assumptions and results for the nine different simulations run
23 to develop the range are reported in Appendix 44, State and Local Tax Revenue Data.

24 **Q. Can you please explain what local property taxes are referred to when**
25 **estimating the SRP local property tax payments?**

26 A. Local property taxes combine the municipal or city property tax with the local
27 education property taxes.

28

1 **Q. Are the estimated SRP first year local property tax payments to the four**
2 **Seacoast communities offset by any increase in local expenditures?**

3 A. I am not aware of any increased expenditures on local services due to the addition
4 of approximately \$84 million in taxable base in the four Seacoast communities. The Project is
5 not expected to cause any direct increase in the number of students, nor increased need for public
6 safety protection services, nor other infrastructure investments or expenses for roads, water,
7 sewer or fire protection. Thus, it is not expected that the SRP estimated property tax payments
8 are offset by any direct increased demand for and expenditures on local services.

9 **Q. Does the addition of the approximately \$84 million in taxable property in the**
10 **proposed host communities provide fiscal benefit to other communities?**

11 A. Yes, through tax base sharing. Durham and Madbury are in a cooperative school
12 district with a third community, Lee. Because the costs for education are shared in part based on
13 the total equalized property value in each community, the tax benefit (through tax payments and
14 reduction of existing property owner's share of local expenditures) of the SRP property in
15 Durham and Madbury will in part be shared with Lee. Similarly, communities throughout
16 Strafford and Rockingham Counties and across the State will benefit fiscally.

17 **Q. Please summarize the estimated SRP property tax payments in the first year**
18 **after construction to the county and state governments.**

19 A. The Project is proposed to be located in two different counties—Strafford and
20 Rockingham. SRP tax payments to Strafford County are estimated at approximately between
21 \$122,000 and \$135,000 and to Rockingham from between \$36,000 to \$40,000. County budgets
22 to be raised from property taxes are allocated to each community in a county based on the total
23 equalized value of property in that community. Because of this shared responsibility for county
24 budgets, all communities within each of the two counties share in the benefit from the new SRP
25 taxable property county tax payments.

26 Utility property also pays the state utility education tax directly to the state. Utility
27 property does not pay the state property tax at the community level, but pays the state directly at
28 a higher fixed rate of \$6.60 per thousand of assessed value. The estimated first year utility
29 education property tax SRP payment is estimated at about \$500,000 to \$612,000. The state uses
30 these revenues to distribute back to communities throughout the state for state aid to education.

1 Environmental Services, to estimate the economic benefits of enacting legislation to join the
2 Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (“RGGI”), and by the New Hampshire Economic and Labor
3 Market Information Bureau (“ELMI”) to estimate the economic impacts from closures of large
4 pulp and paper mills in the North Country, construction of a new federal prison in Berlin, and a
5 potential closure of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. The REMI model simulates the dynamic,
6 interactive effects over time and across industries that result from a change in the economy, such
7 as a large investment in an energy infrastructure project. The model used in this study was a
8 twenty-three sector New Hampshire-specific REMI model.

9 **Q. Did you model different scenarios using the REMI model?**

10 A. Yes, I did. I modeled base case scenarios using several different policy variables that
11 can be used to account for in-state expenditures in the areas of construction; professional and
12 technical services; power and communication structures; and equipment products. The results of
13 the base case scenarios provide the basis for the ranges of results reported here. I also looked at
14 sensitivity scenarios that assumed that some of the workers involved in the construction of the
15 proposed Project would be paid at higher rates than workers in the power and communications
16 structures sector. Higher rates of pay would have the effect of reducing the estimated number of
17 jobs that will result from a fixed construction budget. Some of the electrical line workers who
18 work on the proposed Project may experience higher pay because, according to the US Bureau of
19 Labor Statistics, these types of workers can encounter serious hazards on the job, including
20 working with high-voltage electricity, often at great heights; the work can be physically
21 demanding; if needed, some work can occur during irregular hours (evenings, weekends, and
22 holidays); and to become proficient, most line installers and repairers require technical
23 instruction and long-term on-the-job training.

24 **Q. What types of economic impacts is the Seacoast Reliability Project expected**
25 **to have in New Hampshire?**

26 A. The Project will create economic benefits locally and statewide by increasing
27 jobs, economic output (sales), gross state product (“GSP”), and personal income during the
28 construction phase of the proposed project, 2015 through 2019. The Project will also add
29 additional taxable property in the four host communities, and SRP will pay property taxes

1 locally, and to two counties and the State over the life of the Project. The estimated benefits
2 associated with the construction of the proposed Project are explained below.

3 **Q. How much will be spent during the construction phase of the proposed**
4 **Seacoast Reliability Project and what types of goods and services will be purchased?**

5 A. The estimated cost of constructing the proposed Project between 2015 and 2019 is
6 approximately \$66 million. Additional Project costs for financing, other indirect expenses, the
7 remaining contingences, and expenses incurred prior to 2015 and after 2019, bring the total
8 Project cost estimate to approximately \$84 million. Of this total, an estimated \$19.1 million will
9 be spent on New Hampshire workers and businesses. Construction of a large energy facility
10 typically utilizes a mix of in-state as well as out-of-state vendors and workers including those in
11 specialized fields. Expenditures will be made on local goods and services related to civil
12 engineering, project management, site work, general construction, crane services, electrical
13 services, steel work, welding, and other high-value construction-related work.

14 **Q. What is the estimated number of direct construction jobs associated with the**
15 **construction of the proposed Project?**

16 A. The REMI model estimates that the direct construction work force will be
17 approximately 31 workers or fewer in the non-peak years of construction (2015, 2016, and 2018)
18 and 24 to 52 construction workers during the peak year of construction, 2017. PSNH has
19 indicated it will work to maximize the use of construction-related workers from New Hampshire
20 to the extent they are available. To the extent workers do not live in the area and come here to
21 work, demand could increase for lodging, food and sundries. Those purchases are not estimated
22 nor included in the model.

23 **Q. What does the REMI model estimate for the total number of New Hampshire**
24 **jobs, broken out by direct, indirect, and induced, resulting from the construction of the**
25 **proposed Project?**

26 A. Based on the input data that \$19.1 million will be spent in New Hampshire during
27 the years 2015 through 2019, the REMI model estimates that the annual average total number of
28 New Hampshire jobs during the SRP construction period is between 30 and 46 depending on the
29 assumptions and modeling specifics. The peak number of total jobs in 2017 is estimated to be
30 between 54 and 97, depending on the assumptions and modeling specifics. These estimated

1 employment impacts reflect direct New Hampshire employment in occupations tied directly to
2 the construction of the Project, as well as indirect and induced in-state employment through the
3 multiplier effect. Indirect and induced jobs reflect New Hampshire jobs at companies supplying
4 goods and services to the proposed Project and its workforce, as well as jobs resulting from
5 spending in the local economy by direct and indirect workers employed due to the Project. In
6 general, a little more than half of the estimated jobs are considered direct jobs, and a little less
7 than half are indirect and induced jobs.

8 **Q. What does the REMI model estimate for the annual average total number of**
9 **New Hampshire jobs, broken out by key industries?**

10 A. The REMI model estimates that the annual average total number of New
11 Hampshire jobs (direct, indirect, and induced) in the construction industry will range from 13 to
12 24 , with a peak of approximately 28 to 58 in 2017, the peak year of construction. The annual
13 average total number of New Hampshire jobs in the professional and technical services industry
14 will range from 6 to 7, with a peak of approximately 7 to 9 in 2017. The annual average total
15 number of New Hampshire jobs in the retail trade industry will range from 2 to 4, with a peak of
16 approximately 3 to 7 in 2017. And the annual average total number of New Hampshire jobs in all
17 other industries (for example, manufacturing, wholesale trade, finance and real estate) will range
18 from 7 to 10, with a peak of approximately 13 to 20 in 2017.

19 **Q. What estimates does the REMI model produce for economic output (sales)**
20 **and Gross State Product as a result of Project construction?**

21 A. Economic output, or sales, captures all of the intermediate goods purchased as
22 well as all of the final goods and services that are captured in Gross State Product. Based on the
23 assumption that \$19.1 million will be spent during the four-year period 2015 through 2019, the
24 REMI model estimates New Hampshire's average annual sales to increase by about \$6.7 million
25 to \$7.1 million per year and average annual Gross State Product to increase by about \$4.3 million
26 to \$5.0 million per year during the four-year period. In 2017, the peak year of construction, sales
27 will increase by \$13.9 million to \$14 million and GSP will increase by \$8.8 million to \$9.8
28 million. On a cumulative basis over the construction phase, the state's economic output will be
29 an estimated \$26.9 million to \$28.3 million higher and GSP an estimated \$17.3 million to \$19.9
30 million higher than they would be in the absence of constructing the proposed Project. To the

1 extent that less than \$19.1 million is spent locally, or there are greater leakages from New
2 Hampshire for a project built on the seacoast than there are on average statewide, these estimates
3 would be somewhat reduced. To the extent that project expenditures in New Hampshire are
4 greater than \$19.1 million, the REMI estimates for economic impacts would likely also be
5 somewhat higher.

6 **Q. What estimates does the REMI model produce for personal income as a**
7 **result of Project construction?**

8 A. The estimated employment impacts and economic activity associated with
9 construction of the proposed Project will in turn lead to greater personal income for New
10 Hampshire workers. Based on the REMI model, and as a result of the direct, indirect, and
11 induced economic activity, personal income in New Hampshire is estimated to increase by a total
12 of \$8.1 million to \$12.3 million on a cumulative basis over the construction period, averaging an
13 annual increase of about \$2.0 million to \$3.1 million during the construction period 2015-2019.
14 Personal income is estimated to peak in 2017 within the range of \$3.5 million to \$6.1 million.

15 **Q. Please summarize the results of your analysis.**

16 A. The results of simulation analyses estimate that in the first year of operation, the
17 Project will pay between \$1.6 to \$2.2 million in total property taxes. This overall estimate can be
18 broken down into the following categories:

19 * \$982,000 to \$1.4 million to the four local communities

20 * \$158,000 to \$175,000 to the two counties

21 * \$500,000 to \$612,000 to the State for redistribution to local school districts through
22 state aid.

23 The Project will also pay property taxes during the construction based on what is
24 completed each year and will continue to pay property taxes throughout the life of the Project.

25 PSNH estimates that of the approximately \$84 million total budget, approximately \$19.1
26 million is expected to be spent directly on materials and services supplied by New Hampshire
27 companies and workers. Using the standard basic REMI economic model for New Hampshire,
28 the economic impact of the construction of the SRP project on New Hampshire is estimated to
29 support 54 to 97 total New Hampshire jobs during the peak year of construction, and about a \$27
30 million to \$28 million cumulative increase in New Hampshire's economic output.

31

1 **Q. In light of these changes, do the conclusions in your pre-filed testimony of**
2 **April 12, 2016 remain the same?**

3 A. Yes, they do.

4 **Q. Does that conclude your amended testimony?**

5 A. Yes.