

Statement to NH SEC by John E. Carroll, Professor Emeritus, University of New Hampshire

Ladies and Gentlemen of the NH Site Evaluation Committee,

I am John Carroll, Professor Emeritus of Environmental Conservation at the University of New Hampshire, and a Durham resident. I have a few very brief points to offer for your consideration:

1. UNH is, obviously, our flagship state university, a public institution owned by and supported by the people of New Hampshire. You have in recent months been hearing testimony from one of our fine marine scientists, Dr. Steve Jones, a long-time colleague of mine in my department at UNH, the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. Steve has provided to you a good deal of his scientific knowledge and insight relative to the Great Bay marine ecosystem. I urge you to listen carefully to Steve and take very seriously what he has to say about Eversource's plans to essentially roto-till the bay bottom and the ecological ramifications of such an action. Listen to Steve and take him very seriously. The poisons underlying the bottom sediment, accumulated over 200 years, are indeed worrisome.

2. If you, and we, have learned anything about the experience of Northern Pass, another Eversource project, it's the value of burying the lines. If agreement could have been reached to bury the lines on Northern Pass, the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests and other intervenors and opponents would likely have taken a very different position. There is a lesson here for the Seacoast Reliability Project, namely, bury the lines along the full land route. And elevate them over the Bay - the exact opposite of the present plan. Of course, the initial expense for Eversource is likely higher with line burial. But over the long term it is not higher at all. The economic development cost of highly visible and, I'm sure all would agree, ugly wires and their

even uglier support infrastructure poses a greater expense over the long term, in both the Northern Pass and Seacoast Reliability Project, for it permanently destroys our region's great natural beauty, threatens our heritage values, and reduces the value of our property and, as well, the economic value of our tourism. All of that is long-term cost and a much greater cost than the cost of burying the lines. And, while high wires over the bay are not the prettiest sight, this "over the bay" alternative does fully protect the now threatened ecosystem of the Great Bay itself.

3. Since your responsibility is to the people of New Hampshire and not to the people of southern New England, you need to determine and then to tell New Hampshire residents how this is a project to protect New Hampshire electric reliability and how we might better understand how our own state's electrical supply or reliability is threatened if the project does not go forward. If this is a reliability project for southern New England, it should not be done at our expense. Can it be demonstrated that there is an actual need for this electricity in New Hampshire? That is, or should be, a critical part of the SEC decision. Can such a need be clearly demonstrated - or not? New Hampshire should not be just a pass-through state, not in Northern Pass and likewise not in Seacoast Reliability.

Thank you.

John E. Carroll
Professor Emeritus of Environmental Conservation
University of New Hampshire