THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

BEFORE THE

SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

DOCKET NO. 2015-04

SUPPLEMENTAL PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ROBERT W. VARNEY

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

July 27, 2018

Qualifications and Purpose of Testimony

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Robert W. Varney and my business address is 25 Nashua Road, Bedford, NH 03110.

Q. Who is your current employer and what position do you hold?

A. I am President of Normandeau Associates, Inc.

Q. Please describe your background, experience and qualifications.

A. My background and qualifications were included in my direct pre-filed testimony filed with the NH Site Evaluation Committee (SEC) Application dated April 12, 2016 and have not changed since then.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. My original testimony in this matter was filed on April 12, 2016 and was updated on March 29, 2017. I update my assessment of the Project's effects with respect to local and regional master plans and zoning ordinances, and provide further details regarding the outreach conducted to solicit the views of municipal and regional planning boards, UNH and residents. I also update my review of potential impacts of construction and operation of the Project on tourism and regional recreation. A recent decision rendered by the SEC in another docket necessitated updates and revisions to my testimony and reports. In addition, a number of intervenors in this proceeding have filed testimony raising concerns related to land use and municipal views. The purpose of my testimony, and accompanying reports, is to address these issues.

Q. Have you conducted any additional work since you last submitted pre-filed testimony?

A. Yes. Normandeau updated and revised Appendix 43, *Review of Land Use and Local and Regional Planning, The Seacoast Reliability Project*, *see* Attachment A to incorporate further discussions of the visual impact analysis conducted by David Raphael and potential construction impacts as described by Kenneth Bowes, David Plante, Lynn Farrington and William Wall. Revised Appendix 43 also details the extensive outreach that the Project Team conducted throughout the application process, provides updates on Master Plan and Zoning Ordinances, and more fully discuss the views of the municipal and

regional planning boards and municipal governing bodies. In addition, we updated the review of tourism and regional recreation and submit a more detailed analysis as Attachment B, *Review of Tourism and Regional Recreation in the Seacoast Region*, dated July 2018.

Land Uses

Q. Did you update reports on potential land use impacts and local and regional planning documents?

A. Yes, Normandeau updated and revised Appendix 43, "*Review of Land Use and Local and Regional Planning, The Seacoast Reliability Project*", *see* Attachment A. We also updated Appendix 46, *Review of Master Plans in Abutting Municipalities*, *see* Attachment C.

Q. What additional analysis do you provide regarding prevailing Land Uses?

A. In the updated Land Use report, we provide additional information regarding the existing conditions in and along the ROW, describe the outreach and design changes made as a result of the extensive outreach conducted by the Project team, and include consideration of relevant information contained in the visual assessment reports completed by LandWorks.

The current ROW contains active railroad and electric distribution lines, and is located in a densely settled area of the state where the infrastructure system consists of a mature road network, utility and electric line corridors and parking lots. The landscape is relatively flat level terrain with areas of tree cover, suburban residential and commercial development, a few open fields and the Great Bay Estuary. Tree heights throughout the area range from about 30 to 100 feet with an average height of 71 feet, and the most typical mature tree height is approximately 85 feet. Tree heights and locations were taken into account when reviewing structure locations and types with abutters to minimize visibility.

The proposed structure heights for the overhead sections for this reliability project range from 50 to 103 feet, with a typical structure height of 84 feet. These are predominantly single pole structures. Other designs, such as H-frame side-by-side structures, are used in certain locations to avoid and minimize potential visibility. The Project will be located underground in certain locations, including under Main Street in

Durham and Gundalow Landing, the Frink Farm and Hannah Lane in Newington. For the crossing of Little Bay, the Project will be buried in the Bay floor. In a few sections, the existing overhead distribution lines will be upgraded and/or relocated from the corridor to allow for greater flexibility in structure types and spans to keep the structures at or below tree height. Where distribution is not removed from the ROW, a side-by-side structure configuration has been designed in an effort to keep structures at or below tree height where possible.

The current ROW is on average about 100 feet wide, with a 60-foot maintained corridor. Much of the unmaintained edges (approximately 20 feet +/- on either side of the ROW) will need to be cleared, depending on the location and structure type (*see* SEC Application Section 301.03(g)(3) for details).

An existing electric line ROW is the prevailing land use for the Project corridor. Prevailing land uses along the corridor include the existing electric ROW which traverses across forests, agriculture, residential, commercial/industrial, transportation and utility, conservation, historical and archaeological, wetlands and water resource, wildlife habitat, and institutional/government areas. Almost all electric lines in New Hampshire typically pass through or along a wide range of land uses in a community, as does the road network. These uses have co-existed with the electric utility corridor as a part of the fabric of local development and there is no reason to expect any changes to the continuation of these uses as a result of the Project. As discussed more fully below, the Project has been carefully designed to address the views of local communities, the University of New Hampshire (UNH), businesses and residents to help ensure it is not incompatible with adjacent land uses.

Q. Was the Project designed to minimize impact on prevailing land uses?

A. Yes. To ensure the Project does not negatively impact existing land uses, Eversource conducted extensive outreach to municipalities, residents, businesses, regional planning commissions and other entities to understand their views and concerns and to receive their input as to how to best site the Project within the existing electric corridor with the least amount of impact to adjacent uses. *See* Outreach Supplement, Supplemental Testimony of Kenneth Bowes and David Plante, Attachment A. This process resulted in

numerous project design modifications, some of which were quite significant, that are designed to avoid, minimize and mitigate potential effects from construction and operation of the Project. These Project improvements include revisions to the line design resulting in reduced number of structures; lowered structure heights; relocated structures; relocated transition structures, reduced visibility of structures; changed structure type from monopoles to a side by side design; minimized tree buffer removal; upgraded and relocated distribution lines; minimized environmental impact including reduced wetland impacts; secured rights for underground design at certain locations in Durham and Newington; revised access plans to minimize traffic impact; restricted underground construction schedule to minimize impacts to events/activities; accommodation of some encroachments in the right-of-way; refined construction plans for the crossing of Little Bay, proposed materials and colors that are optimized to blend in with surroundings or mimic existing features in the ROW and proposed vegetative screening in various locations.

Q. Will the addition of the Seacoast Reliability Project to the existing ROW change the character of adjacent land uses?

A. No. Due to the context of the landscape and the final Project design—which accounts for significant design modifications made by the Applicant in consultation with host communities—the addition of SRP to the existing ROW will not change the character of the adjacent land uses.

Q. Have concerns been raised regarding the Project's compatibility with prevailing land use?

A. Yes. Of the four Project host communities, two have intervened in the SEC process: the Towns of Durham and Newington. Newington has raised concerns about the compatibility of the Project with adjacent land uses in the residential area of the Town. After redesigning the Project to locate it underground through the Newington Center Historic District and Hannah Lane residential neighborhood, there are only two remaining overhead sections through residential areas in Newington: one section that runs parallel to Little Bay Road before it transitions underground, and another that crosses Fox Point Road and runs parallel to Nimble Hill Road before turning and running through Pease Development Authority land parallel to the Spaulding Turnpike.

The Project will not be highly visible to local residents who travel on residential roads near the Project corridor. The Project will be underground when it crosses Gundalow Landing, Little Bay Road, and Nimble Hill Road. The Project will also be underground across the Darius Frink Farm field and the Historic District, both of which are important aspects of the town's character. For the overhead section along Little Bay Road, the structure and line design were reconfigured along the tree line to reduce structure heights to 65 feet and 70 feet, thereby reducing visibility of the Project from Little Bay Road. The visual assessment concluded that visibility from Little Bay Road in this area will be minimal due to the existing hedgerows that grow along the sides of the roadway which blocks most of the views of the corridor. Therefore, the Project is "not noticeable unless one is looking for it through the opening in the hedgerow at driveways." *See* pre-filed direct testimony of David Raphael, April 16, 2015, p. 14. Eversource also will work with the residential property owners in the area to plant vegetative screening to reduce visibility of the Project.

Eversource also redesigned the overhead section of the Project that runs parallel to, and south of, Nimble Hill Road eliminating two structures from the open field and creating a longer span, reducing the visibility of the Project. The Newington Station power plant, with a large stack and flashing light, is currently visible from this area of Nimble Hill Road. The visual assessment of this section concluded that "the potential for visual effect, or visual change, from the Project, while moderate, does not rise to a level of having a significant adverse effect on the scenic qualities of Nimble Hill Road." *See* Supplemental Pre-filed Direct Testimony of David Raphael, at p. 5.

Q. Did you update your review of potential impacts to historic resources?

A. Yes. We updated Section 4.8 of the Report with additional information regarding the Project team's outreach and consultation with the NH Division of Historical Resources (DHR), US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Durham Historic Association, the towns and other consulting parties. The DHR determined that no significant archaeological sites will be affected by the Project, but identified four historic resources that would be adversely affected including the Newmarket and Bennett Roads Farms Historic District; Durham Point Historic District; Little Bay Underwater Cable

Terminal Houses Historic District; and the Alfred Pickering Farm (*see* letter from DHR to USACE dated June 20, 2017).

The Project will be located underground through the Frink Farm property, which is part of the Newington Center National Register Historic District. Frink Farm was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1987 with a boundary increase in 1991. In addition to locating the Project underground through the property, the existing overhead line across the farm will be removed and relocated to existing poles on the street, restoring the historic landscape and view of the area. The DHR found no adverse effect for this area.

After consultation with the parties, the Project team proposed avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures for each of the four resources, which include measures such as protecting stonewalls in Durham by rerouting access points to openings in the stone walls and using timber mats to protect the integrity of the walls; stabilizing and relocating the historic cable terminal house in Durham; creating interpretive displays for Durham and Newington that feature the historic underwater cable and terminal houses; and chimney restoration projects for two historic structures in Newington.

The NHDHR issued a final report on August 1, 2017 summarizing the process to date, and stating that they anticipate concluding negotiations to minimize and mitigate potential adverse impacts to historic properties. The agreements will be codified in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Applicant and USACE and in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with NHDHR. The NHDHR proposes four conditions should the SEC approve the application. These include incorporating the mitigation agreements; changes to the design would require consultation with the DHR/SHPO to resolve any issues; if any unanticipated archaeological, cultural or historic resources are discovered, the applicant shall consult with the DHR/SHPO and resolve any issues if necessary; and authorizing the DHR/SHPO to specify the use of any appropriate technique, methodology, practice or procedure associated with the archaeological, historical, or other cultural resources affected by the Project.

Q. Did you review the impacts of construction on land use?

A. Yes. Construction impacts of the Project will be temporary in nature. The construction process will be coordinated with the host communities, property owners and

others to avoid and/or minimize disruptions. As noted below, a MOU has been executed, and others are anticipated to be executed, that are specifically designed to address such issues.

The Project will be constructed utilizing conventional overhead, underwater and underground electric transmission line construction techniques. Construction activities include the establishment of marshalling yards and lay down areas; surveying and flagging of boundaries and resources; vegetation removal and corridor mowing in advance of construction; installation of soil erosion and sedimentation controls; construction of access roads and work pads; relocation of existing utility infrastructure; installation of foundations; installation of new structures; installation of conductor and shield wire; installation of underground cable; installation of submarine cable; substation construction; restoration of corridor; and testing and commissioning. *See* Application for Certificate of Site and Facility, dated April 12, 2016, pages 21-37.

Construction activities will be conducted in accordance with best management practices and limited to what is necessary to provide access to proposed structure locations, facilitate safe equipment passage, provide safe work sites, and maintain safe clearances. Potential temporary construction impacts include traffic delays or rerouting, and construction-related noise and fugitive dust. Section 301.03(g)(9) of the SEC Application describes construction activities and mitigation measures in detail. Construction phasing will be carefully planned, executed, and coordinated with local communities. *See* Pre-filed Direct Testimony of David L. Plante, April 12, 2016.

Construction of the overhead and underground sections will not affect local land use. The Applicant has negotiated a MOU with the Town of Newington (including an Addendum to the MOU to address blasting, if needed) and is in the process of finalizing MOUs with UNH and the Town of Durham. The MOUs address, or will address, the construction hours, general scheduling and establish lines of communication for the duration of construction. Provisions of the MOUs include protocols for daily and weekly meetings; abilities to stop construction; use of public roadways; road construction and restoration standards; financial guarantees for damage; the hours and days for construction; time of year restrictions for excavation; identification of access routes to certain overhead

structures; use of weathered steel structures in wooded sections and galvanized steel for some structures; procedures for tree removal, relocation and disposal; conformance with state and federal rules for blasting; vegetative screening and plantings and repair and/or replacement of any existing utility systems impacted during construction.

Specific provisions for the Town of Newington include wildlife protection and monitoring, landscape restoration, and using the Town's engineering firm for construction monitoring, inspection and approval. Proposed provisions for UNH include installation of an electrical duct bank crossing under Main Street which will be constructed and funded by Eversource, and avoiding impacts to UNH playing fields and surrounding utilities.

The Project team also conducted meetings and site visits with officials from the Town of Madbury and the City of Portsmouth to discuss construction processes, identify any potential issues and to establish and maintain lines of communication. Construction of the Project has been carefully designed to address local issues and to avoid and minimize potential impacts to adjacent land uses.

Q. Have you reviewed traffic control measures to assess impacts to residences, businesses, tourism and land use?

A. Yes. I reviewed the traffic control plans developed by Louis Berger and submitted with the SEC application as Appendices 18 and 18a as well as the Pre-filed and Supplemental pre-filed Testimony of Lynn Frazier and the accompanying Traffic Impact Analysis Report. As demonstrated by Ms. Frazier, the construction of the project is not anticipated to have a significant appreciable impact on traffic. In addition, based on Ms. Frazier's testimony, the Project will have in place adequate traffic management strategies during construction. Moreover, as described in the Supplemental Pre-Filed Testimony of Mr. Bowes and Mr. Plante, the Applicant will continue its persistent outreach to businesses, which will further reduce and avoid potential impacts.

Q. Will construction and operation of the Project have an adverse impact on businesses?

A. No. The Project will not have any adverse effect on businesses. There are only a few areas where the Project crosses or is adjacent to businesses. In Durham, the Project is located underground and across the railroad tracks from the UNH Dairy Bar

Restaurant/Amtrak Station. A gardening business is also located on Longmarsh Road within the ROW; the Applicant has been coordinating with the gardening business owner to address the business concerns and minimize potential impacts.

The Project team has conducted outreach to the boat tour companies that sometimes operate in Little Bay and is confident that potential impacts can be avoided or minimized.

In Newington, the Project crosses the commercial area east of the Spaulding Turnpike. The Project team is coordinating with The Crossings and will conduct pre-construction meetings with management to ensure that the traffic control plan accommodates the mall's access and circulation needs throughout construction. The Applicant will coordinate closely with these businesses to avoid and minimize potential construction impacts.

Although Eversource does not expect or anticipate that the Project will result in a loss of business income, the Company will continue to work with these businesses and address any concern that may arise. *See* Supplemental Pre-Filed Testimony of Kenneth Bowes and David Plante.

Master Plan and Zoning Updates

Q. Have you updated your review of master plans and zoning ordinances?

A. Yes. I updated the master plan and zoning summaries presented in *Review of Land Use and Local and Regional Planning, The Seacoast Reliability Project*, to incorporate recent revisions and planning board activities, and discuss the Project with respect to these documents. In addition, I summarize the extensive outreach activities the Project team conducted to better understand the views of municipalities, UNH and residents, and how the Project used this input to address these concerns by redesigning, negotiating MOUs, and providing support for local mitigation projects.

Q. Have you reviewed the Project in relation to local master plans?

A. Yes. Where master plans are more general in nature and do not address specific projects, including energy projects, the Project design is in line with the overall planning principles found in these documents. As described above, the Project has worked with local communities, UNH and residents to design the Project to be compatible with the existing electric line and adjacent land uses. The design is also consistent with and supports the planning goals expressed in these local master plans.

For example, the Project supports Madbury's goal to preserve its rural atmosphere and landscape. By using an already developed corridor, the Project preserves other open spaces in town. The Project also obtained an easement from an abutting property owner, purchased a parcel adjacent to the ROW and made design changes including eliminating a few structures and reducing structure heights, all of which helped to further minimize impacts. The Town of Madbury appears to be satisfied with the Project's outreach measures, as evidenced by the letters from the Board of Selectmen to the SEC dated July 23, 2015 and July 5, 2018.

In Durham, many of the Project design changes at road crossings support the Town's guidance for new development in the rural areas as well as in the Rural/Core Transition areas, which is to screen new development from major roads where possible, and be sensitive to the views along major transportation corridors which the town considers important visual gateways. The Project will also be located underground as it crosses Durham's Main Street, and design changes were made near Little Bay to make the Project less visible. There is no discussion of the Project in the Future Land Use Chapter, or in the Community Forums held by the Durham Planning Board in 2017.

Newington is the only community that mentions the Project specifically in its master plan. In fact, Newington specifically amended its Master Plan to address the Project months after the Project was announced. In this post-announcement amendment, Newington's Master Plan suddenly deemed electric transmission projects as incompatible with residential uses. As described above, in Newington, the Project has worked very hard with the Town to address their concerns and has made several very significant changes to accommodate the local input. Specifically, the Project will be underground from Little Bay to the Flynn Pit, as well as the area across the Newington Center Historic District, Nimble Hill Road and through the Hannah Lane residential neighborhood. Both of the underground road crossings—Little Bay Road and Nimble Hill Road— are town-designated scenic roads. There are two overhead sections in the residential areas, with limited visibility from the roadway. Design changes have been made to this section to address the aesthetic concerns expressed by the Planning Board in in the Master Plan. The Newington Planning Board held visioning sessions and conducted an on-line

community survey about future land use in November 2017, and there was no mention of the Project in the summarized results.

In Portsmouth, the Project is generally consistent with the goals of the master plan. It is located within a highly developed power line ROW and is not within one of the five planning focus areas in the City's master plan.

Q. Please describe the outreach measures taken to understand the views of Municipal and Regional Planning Boards and Municipal Governing Bodies.

A. The Land Use report describes the extensive outreach measures that the Project team has undertaken to solicit the view of municipalities, UNH, and other entities and the Project changes that were made in response. *See* Outreach Summary, Supplemental Testimony of Kenneth Bowes, Attachment A. There are four municipalities that are host communities (Madbury, Durham, Newington and Portsmouth), and seven municipalities in New Hampshire that abut the host communities (Dover, Barrington, Lee, Newmarket, Greenland, Rye, and New Castle). Two of the four host municipalities, Durham and Newington, petitioned to intervene in the Project and have been directly involved and engaged prior to and throughout the NHSEC application process. Madbury and Portsmouth did not petition to intervene and have not expressed concerns about the Project. The Project team has met a number of times with Madbury and Portsmouth to update them on the Application. None of the municipalities that abut Project host communities petitioned to intervene in the Application process, nor have they expressed concerns about the Project. Neither of the regional planning commissions (Strafford Regional Planning Commission and Rockingham Planning Commission) has taken a formal position with respect to the Project and communication continues to be open should any issues arise.

The Project team began meeting with municipalities in late 2013, over two years before filing the SEC application. Specifically, prior to filing, the team held 18 meetings in person or by phone with the town of Newington, the majority of which were with the Planning Board Chair. The Project team met with the Town of Durham 25 times and UNH 23 times (some of which were joint meetings). In addition, the team met with the town of Madbury three times, the City of Portsmouth five times, and met with other municipalities in the region including Dover, Newmarket and Somersworth. The team also met with

numerous residents in each community to discuss the project, receive input and address concerns where feasible.

Following the submission of the application in April of 2016, the Project team received significant feedback from residents and other key stakeholders, and continued to meet with municipalities, businesses, agencies and property owners to refine the Project. Based on this feedback, the applicant proposed additional design changes, and filed an amendment in March 2017, reflecting additional changes in Project design and line configuration, including another underground section in Newington.

As noted above, the Project team has signed a MOU with the Town of Newington that covers construction of the Project through town and provides protocols for construction in municipal roadways. The team is in the process of negotiating similar MOUs with the Town of Durham and UNH. Outreach is ongoing and will continue for the duration of the Project.

Q. Did municipalities and regional planning commissions express their views in writing?

A. Yes. The towns of Durham and Newington submitted comments and pre-filed testimony to the SEC. Strafford Regional Planning Commission also submitted a letter to the SEC.

Newington's main concerns included aesthetic impacts to residential and historic sites, construction impacts on municipal roadways, ensuring that any existing contamination from PFOS and PFOA is properly addressed and relocation of the 34.5 kV distribution line to local roadways. The goal of Eversource is to address the concerns identified by municipalities and planning commissions and significant progress is well underway to do that with the mitigations efforts and MOU's. The Project was redesigned to be located underground through the Newington Center Historic District and the Hannah Lane residential neighborhood; the MOU negotiated with the town addresses issues relating to construction on municipal roadways; the MOU negotiated with the Rockingham County Conservation District addresses issues relating to PFOS and PFOA; and the Project team will work with the town on the relocation of the distribution line to the local roadways.

The Town of Durham submitted pre-filed testimony (also on behalf of UNH), the

main concerns of which covered four points: the consideration of a "Gosling Road Autotransformer Alternative;" a request that the SEC hire an independent consultant to evaluate the impacts of horizontal directional drilling (HDD) under Little Bay and compare it with the proposed jet plowing method; a concern about the visual impact of the concrete mattresses during low tides; and the town's desire to negotiate a construction related MOU with Eversource. The SEC declined to: (1) consult with ISO-NE regarding the Gosling Road Autotransformer Alternative (Order on Partially Assented-To Motion to Consult With ISO-New England, Docket No. 2015-04 (April 24, 2018)) and (2) to hire an independent HDD consultant (Hearing on Motions, Tr. p. 53 (May 29, 2018)). The visual impact assessment conducted by Mr. David Raphael of LandWorks determined that the concrete mats will have a "minimal visual presence", and "will be a very minor feature of the Landscape, and will only minimally affect the viewer's experience of the water, the bay, and the views to the shoreline." *See* Concrete Mattress Addendum, dated July 17, 2017.

The Strafford Regional Planning Commission, submitted a letter to the SEC which references the Great Bay Ecosystem Service Assessment report "How People Benefit from New Hampshire's Great Bay Estuary" dated November, 2016, and how it identifies human activities, such as dredging, as "stressors that may have a negative impact on key habitats due to suspended sediments, though the modeling does not specifically calculate the impacts from individual dredging and underwater transmission line projects." The method of the installation of the cable in Little Bay has been the subject of substantial study, and careful planning has been conducted to ensure that it will be constructed in an environmentally sound manner, consistent with federal and state permit requirements.

The Project team has worked diligently with and listened to concerns voiced by regional planning boards, governing bodies, UNH, residents, businesses and other organizations and have incorporated their concerns into the Project design, resulting in a project that is reasonably compatible with the context of the landscape in the region and is supportive of the general goals and policies of local and regional land use planning documents.

Tourism and Regional Recreation

Q. Have you updated your review of this Project with respect to potential

effects on tourism and regional recreation?

A. Yes. As described in the purpose section of this testimony, I conducted further evaluation of tourist-oriented attractions and regional recreation facilities in the Seacoast region promoted by the New Hampshire Office of Travel and Tourism Development and regional chambers of commerce, and submitted Attachment B, *Review of Tourism and Regional Recreation in the Seacoast Region*.

Sources of information included the NH Division of Travel and Tourism, regional chambers of commerce (Greater Dover Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber Collaborative of Greater Portsmouth), local communities, businesses, and other organizations. The report is based on an extensive review of publications and websites that promote activities and events in the region (a complete list of the resources is included in the report). I visited each tourist-oriented site in the vicinity of the project corridor and considered factors such as parking, traffic, scenic views, schedules and ways to avoid and minimize potential impacts. I also considered tourist-oriented sites and activities submitted by the towns of Durham and Newington in response to data requests from Eversource at the technical sessions held on May 16, 2018. The Town of Newington provided a list of tourism-based businesses, destinations and events that the Town believes will be affected by construction and/or operation of the project. All of these were considered as part of the analysis. The Town of Durham did not identify specific tourism-oriented businesses, sites or activities, other than the use of conservation areas by residents and visitors. All of the conservation areas and trails listed above, as well as the Great Bay estuary, were considered in the preparation of this report. However, tourist-oriented businesses, sites and attractions within the Town of Durham identified by other sources were considered as part of the analysis.

Categories of tourist-oriented activities and events that were inventoried include water-based activities on Great Bay/Little Bay (public boat and access sites; boat tours; charters; motorized and non-motorized boating; rowing clubs; fishing; and shell fishing); UNH events and activities; regional trails; running and cycling; scenic roads; golf courses; camping; lodging, restaurants and shopping; special events; historic sites and museums; and agricultural activities.

The report concludes that while there are numerous destinations, activities and events in the Seacoast region, there are no major tourist attractions located adjacent to or near the project corridor. There are a few activities and sites along the project corridor that could be temporarily impacted during construction. These include UNH event and athletic facilities (the Whittemore Center, Dairy Bar/Amtrak Station, UNH Field House/Wildcat Stadium, and Paul Creative Arts Center); water-based activities on Great Bay/Little Bay (including tours conducted by Portsmouth Harbor Cruises and Gundalow Company); and the historic district and The Crossing mall area in Newington.

Potential temporary construction impacts include rerouting traffic, noise, vibration, construction vehicles and other associated construction impacts. The installation of the underwater cable in Little Bay could impact boat traffic in the cable crossing area for a few days in the fall. These will be limited in duration and scope for construction of the line, and for each of these locations, the Project team will continue to coordinate and communicate with each point of contact to ensure that temporary impacts are avoided and minimized.

Other Projects

Q. Is there a similar project that has been approved recently in New Hampshire?

A. Yes. The SRP is similar to the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project ("MVRP"). MVRP was approved by the NH SEC on October 4, 2016 and construction completed in 2017. While SRP is a 13 mile 115kV overhead, underground and underwater electric transmission project, MVRP is a 24.5 mile (18 miles in New Hampshire) 345 kV overhead electric transmission line project. The structures approved in MVRP, while typically H-Frame structures, were similar in average height to SRP at approximately 80 to 90 feet above grade. MVRP was constructed within an existing ROW corridor of approximately 18 miles through four municipalities in Southern NH (Pelham, Windham, Hudson, and Londonderry) and another 6.5 miles in Massachusetts. The MVRP is more visible to the traveling public than SRP as it crosses Interstate 93, NH Route 28, NH Route 128, NH Route 102, NH Route 111, NH Route 111A, and NH Route 38. It also passes over the Apple Way, a state-designated scenic byway and runs along the Musquash Conservation Area, with an area over 1,000 acres and over 20 miles of marked and highly

used trails. The MVRP also runs along or across several other conservation lands.

In its *Decision and Order Granting Application for Certificate of Site and Facility*, the SEC found that the context of the project and siting it in an already existing ROW was consistent with the orderly development of the region, that the Project will be consistent with Master Plans and Ordinances of the effected communities, that the Project would not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region. NHSEC Docket No. 2015-05, Decision and Order at 58–59 (Oct. 4. 2016).

In addition, the SEC stated that "Our consideration of the impact of the Project on the orderly development of the region is informed by the fact that this Project is a reliability project that has been determined by ISO-NE to be necessary to assure continued system stability and reliability to the region." *See id.* at p. 58.

Eversource conducted extensive outreach with the host communities, residents and businesses to ensure that their views were heard and concerns were addressed throughout the Project. This effort was applauded at a December 8, 2017 celebration at the Elwood Orchards Farm Stand in Londonderry, where local and state elected officials commended Eversource for its community engagement, responsiveness and collaborative communications with the towns and adjacent property owners through the entire construction process. It was noted that Eversource even donated timber to the Londonderry Historical Society to create lumber for the restoration and rebuilding of the historic Reverend Morrison House.

Q. In consideration of this additional information and analysis, are your conclusions remain the same as in your pre-filed testimony of April 4, 2016 and March 29, 2017?

A. Yes. Similar to the MVRP, the Project will have little impact on local land use, tourism or property values and that positive impacts are anticipated for local, regional and state tax revenues and the economy. In addition, the Project will provide a reliable supply of energy to Seacoast Area. The Project will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region.

Q. Does this conclude your amended testimony?

A. Yes, it does.