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MR. IACOPINO: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. And, welcome to a public information session of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. We are here tonight in Docket Number 2015-05, the Joint Application of New England Power Company, doing business as National Grid, and Public Service Company of New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy, for a Certificate of Site and Facility.

My name is Michael Iacopino. I am Counsel to the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. Seated to my right is our Administrator, Pamela Monroe; seated in the second row is Counsel for the Public, Christopher Aslin.

This is a public information session. I'm going to first go over an introduction about what it's about, then give you some instructions on how we're going to hold this meeting tonight, and then we'll get into the presentations.

On August 5, 2015, the Applicants, that is New England Power Company and Eversource Energy, filed a Joint Application for a Certificate of Site and Facility. That Application asks the Site Evaluation Committee to issue a Certificate of Site and Facility,
it's like a permit, and in that certificate to approve the siting, construction, and operation of a new 345 kV electric transmission line. On September 23, 2015, the Site Evaluation Committee reviewed that Application, took advice from various state agencies, and determined that the Application contained sufficient information for a Subcommittee of the Site Evaluation Committee to carry out the purposes of RSA 162-H.

The proposed transmission line will be constructed in an existing developed transmission line corridor, between New England Power Company's Tewksbury 22A Substation, in Tewksbury, Massachusetts, and Public Service's Scobie Pond 345 kV Substation in Londonderry, New Hampshire. The Project will consist of approximately 18 miles of new 345 kV transmission line. The Project will also require the relocation of existing facilities along some sections of the corridor, including the existing 115 kV line, which is also referred to as a "Y151 Line", in order to accommodate the new line.

The Project will traverse the Towns of Pelham, Windham, Hudson, and Londonderry. The Project is in two counties. It's in Rockingham County and in Hillsborough County. The Site Evaluation Committee is required to hold public information sessions in each
county. Last week, we held the Rockingham County public information session over in Windham, and tonight is the Hillsborough County public information session.

The way that this meeting is going to go tonight is we are going to have me present, from the Committee's standpoint, information to the public about how the Committee operates, and a little bit about how the Committee will operate with respect to this particular Project. After I do that presentation, we're going to turn the floor over to representatives from Eversource and New England Power for them to make a presentation going into more of the specifics about the Project.

Once that's been done, we'll take questions from the audience. We ask that any member of the public who has a question, write your question out on this white sheet, and there are plenty of them back there at the table at the back of the room. If you write your questions out, bring them up to Ms. Monroe up here, we'll put them into categories, and we will present those questions either to us, as the Committee, if there are questions about the Committee process, or to the representatives from the Company, if there are questions about the Project themselves.

Once we've gone through all of those
questions and answered them, hopefully answered them all
to your satisfaction, the next step in the process will be
the time to make public comment. If anybody has a public
statement that they want to make about the Project, they
will be asked to come up -- well, first, they will be
asked to sign in on the yellow sheet in the back, so
please do that, especially if you wish to speak. But, if
you do wish to speak, we'll ask you to come up to the
microphone that's in front of the dais here and make your
statement.

And, we ask that, when you do that, you
do a couple of things. First, you identify yourself and
spell your last name. If you look to my right, your left,
you'll see that we have a court reporter here, Mr.
Patnaude, and he is taking down verbatim everything that
is said. So, it's important for him to get your correct
name and the correct spelling of your name before you make
your statement. Also, please speak slow and clearly, so
that he can take down what you have to say. After we
conclude with the public comment period, we will adjourn
the meeting.

So, let me begin and give you a brief
introduction to the Site Evaluation Committee and the
process that we'll go through with respect to this
particular Project. First of all, if you ever have any
questions about the Site Evaluation Committee, we have a
fairly extensive website. It is at www.nhsec.nh.gov.
And, I'll put that up at the end of the presentation as
well.

The purpose of -- the Site Evaluation
Committee is created by a statute, RSA 162-H. And, the
purpose of RSA 162-H is really a balancing act. It
creates the Site Evaluation Committee, and the Site
Evaluation Committee is charged with the obligation to
balance the benefits and impacts of site selection, and
that's energy siting selection; on the welfare of the
population; private property; the location and growth of
industry; economic growth; the environment; historic
sites; aesthetics; air and water quality; the natural
resources; and public health and safety.

Another purpose of the Site Evaluation
Committee is to avoid undue delay in the construction of
new facilities, and to provide full and complete
disclosure of everything about new energy facilities that
are proposed to be built for -- so that the public knows
what's going on.

And, finally, the Site Evaluation
Committee, through its process, ensures that the
construction and operation of energy facilities is treated as an aspect of land use planning, in which all environmental, economic, and technical issues are resolved in an integrated fashion. In essence, the Site Evaluation Committee is a statewide planning board for energy projects. It's designed to integrate all of the various permitting processes, as well as any environmental, economic, and technical issues that might come along with any particular project. And, when I say "designed to integrate" means that all of those issues will be decided at one place by one board, the Site Evaluation Committee.

The Site Evaluation Committee does preempt local authority and ordinances. In other words, the Site Evaluation Committee may approve the siting and construction of an energy facility, even if that energy facility has not gone before the town planning board or zoning board. In essence, the Site Evaluation Committee is the statewide planning board for energy projects.

It's based upon the "supermarket" theory or a "one-stop shopping" theory of permitting. Rather than requiring energy projects to go to numerous state agencies to obtain numerous permits, and then go to various town boards, the idea behind the Site Evaluation Committee is to allow that all to be done under the
umbrella of one agency that will coordinate everything and ultimately make the final decision on whether a Certificate for Site and Facility, a permit, should be granted or not granted.

Site Evaluation Committee's membership is made up of the three Public Utilities Commissioners, the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Services, the Commissioner of the Department of Transportation, the Commissioner of the Department of Resources and Economic Development, the Commissioner of Cultural Resources or the Director of the Division of Historical Resources. And, for the last five years or so, in fact, it's been the Director of the Division of Historical Resources that sits on the Site Evaluation Committee. There are two public members, one of whom must be an attorney, and both of whom must have expertise in the issues that surround energy projects. And, there is one alternate public member, who also must have expertise.

The Committee, as it exists today, consists of our PUC Chairman, Martin Honigberg, he also serves as the Chair of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. Our DES Commissioner is Thomas Burack, he serves as the Vice Chair. The PUC Commissioners on the Site Evaluation Committee are Robert Scott and Kate
Bailey. Our DOT Commissioner is Virginia Sheehan. Our DRED Commissioner is Jeffrey Rose. Elizabeth Muzzey sits as Director of the Division of Historic Resources. And, then, our public members are Roger Hawk and Patricia Weathersby. Patricia Weathersby is the attorney member. And, we have an alternate member, Rachel Whitaker. So, those are the people who populate our Committee today.

Those individuals who are state agency commissioners or division directors, they have the option of appointing a senior staff member from their agency to sit in their space on the Site Evaluation Committee. That senior person must be either a staff attorney or a senior administrator in the division, and some of our members have done that for this particular hearing.

The Subcommittee, which is going to make up the board that decides on this particular Project, is going to be chaired by Anne Ross, who is the General Counsel at the Public Utilities Commission. She's their top-dog lawyer. And, she will be sitting as a designee for Chairman Honigberg. Kate Bailey, a PUC Commissioner, will sit on this particular panel. Jeff Rose, a Commissioner of DRED, will sit on this panel. Michele Roberge, who is a senior administrator in the Department of Environmental Services, will sit for Commissioner
Thomas Burack. And, Richard Boisvert, our State Archeologist, will sit for Beth Muzzey. And, our two public members sitting on this particular Subcommittee are Roger Hawk and Patricia Weathersby. Those are the folks who will make the ultimate decision in this particular -- on this particular Application.

In every application for an energy facility or a transmission line that comes before the Site Evaluation Committee, we are required to notify the Attorney General, and the Attorney General appoints an Assistant Attorney General from his office to act as Counsel for the Public. Counsel for the Public is appointed by the Attorney General, and represents the public in seeking to protect the quality of the environment and in seeking to assure an adequate supply of energy. Counsel for the Public has every right and responsibility of any party that you would think of in a court proceeding or anywhere else. He has an obligation to represent his client, the public of New Hampshire, and he can use the full panoply of methods that are used to do that.

We are lucky tonight to have our Counsel for the Public who has been appointed in this case here today. And, I'd ask him to step up and introduce himself.
and say a few words to you, Chris Aslin.

MR. ASLIN: Thank you, Mike. As you can see, I'm Chris Aslin, Assistant Attorney General, in the New Hampshire Department of Justice. And, I've been appointed to be Counsel for the Public in this proceeding. My role, as you can see, is sort of two tasks, of look into the aspect of the Project that will affect the environment, as well as assuring adequate supply of energy.

To be clear, the role of Counsel for the Public is not to be the individual attorney for each member of the public, but for the public as a whole. So, if people have individualized interests that are affected by this Project, I can hear those interests, I will incorporate them into the public's interest at large, but individual members may want to be represented on their own behalf in the proceedings.

My role in this is to be an independent party that assesses the Project, and forms an opinion or not, and asks for information. There's no predetermination under the statute as whether I'd be in favor or against the Project, that's to be determined through the process.

But I am a resource for the public to
answer questions and to assist you in the docket, to the extent I can, without actually being your lawyer. So, if you have questions about anything and want to bring issues to my attention, I'd be happy to talk to you after the input session this evening. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Thanks, Chris. The Site Evaluation Committee has certain timeframes that it must comply with. And, as I go through the timeframes, this is really providing you the meat of sort of the process that the Site Evaluation Committee uses.

Before an application is even filed, the applicant, the people who seek to site and construct an energy facility or a transmission line, must hold pre-application public information sessions. Very similar to what we're doing here tonight, they were required to do that at least 30 days prior to their filing of the application.

Once they have filed the application, the Chairman, and in this particular case it was Chairman Honigberg, takes that application and forwards it to any state agencies that may have what we call "permitting authority or other regulatory authority". So, for instance, this application was sent over to the Department of Environmental Services' Wetlands Division, as one
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example. And, that's because, normally, if this was just
the construction of, say, a shopping mall, as opposed to
an energy project, that developer would have to go to the
Department of Environmental Services and get a Wetlands
Permit. We have the -- we have the application shipped
over to each agency that would have that type of
authority, and we ask them to respond to us, to tell us if
there's sufficient information in that particular part of
the application to satisfy their needs, what they would
use to assess the project in, for example, for a Wetlands
Permit.

At the same time, the Committee itself
undertakes a preliminary review, to determine whether or
not the application contains sufficient information for
the Committee to do its job. And, the Committee's
determination of whether an application is complete must
be made within 60 days after the filing. In this
particular case, that was done, I've already forgotten the
date, I believe it was October 2nd.

MS. MONROE: What day of what?

MR. IACOPINO: Acceptance? It was
October 2nd. And, that date then starts some new
timelines running. In virtually all of the cases that the
Site Evaluation Committee has, the Chairman will designate
a subcommittee, like he did for this particular case. When somebody is seeking an application to construct either a transmission line or an energy facility, that subcommittee must have seven members on it. So, that's part of the process as well.

Within 60 days of filing the -- of accepting the application, the Committee must hold two public information sessions. And, those -- I'm sorry, within 45 days. And, that's what we're doing tonight. We did one last week -- we have to do one in each county where the facility exists. We did one last week over in Rockingham County, in Windham. And, this meeting tonight is the Hillsborough County public information session.

Within 90 days after acceptance of the application, the Subcommittee must come to each county and hold what's called a "Joint Public Hearing". At the Joint Public Hearing, the Subcommittee itself will be joined by representatives from the various state agencies that have an interest in the project. And, at that point, that joint hearing will be very much like the hearing we're -- like the proceeding we're having tonight, except you'll have the whole Subcommittee there.

Within 150 days after acceptance of the application, the state agencies who have an interest
the application must present the Site Evaluation Committee with draft conditions or draft permits, or provide the Site Evaluation Committee with information letting them know that "we need more information, this is what we need."

After 240 days after acceptance of the application, the state agencies must provide their final conditions and final permits to the Site Evaluation Committee.

It's at that point that the Site Evaluation Committee undertakes what's called an "adjudicative hearing". Very much like a courtroom trial. The parties to the docket will come up to Concord, will meet in a courtroom type of room. There will be witnesses and cross-examination and arguments and motions and all the things that you see on TV, and the Subcommittee will hear all of those witnesses and the arguments of the parties, and then they have to issue a decision, a written decision within 365 days. So, between 240 days and 365 days is really the time when there's a lot of action going on in any given case before the Site Evaluation Committee.

If anybody has ever seen one of our decisions, they generally run around 100 pages, and then have numerous attachments. It is a comprehensive process.
It covers all types of issues, issues that come from virtually every state agency, and some things that most state agencies don't even deal with.

And, at the end of the presentation, I'll show you the types of things that the Committee must decide in determining whether to grant or deny an application.

That's the process. And, I've kind of gone through a lot of this already. But the state -- all the various state agencies have a role to play before the Site Evaluation Committee. They help us out in determining, first, whether or not the application is complete. They review those permit applications, and they make recommendations to the Committee. They can identify issues of concern with respect to any proposal that's within the application or with respect to any permit requests. They can designate witnesses to come up and testify at our hearings. And, it's very important to understand that, if a state agency, and let me pick one, let's say the Air Resources Division of the Department of Environmental Services, says to the Site Evaluation Committee "We could not" -- "An air permit is required in this, for this energy facility, and we cannot grant one because it does not meet our requirements." Then, the
Site Evaluation Committee cannot issue a certificate.

However, the Site Evaluation Committee can impose additional conditions above and beyond what a state agency wants on a committee. And, when determining whether or not the Site Evaluation Committee agrees with the state agency about the conditions, there's a process, where we note and listen to what the state agencies have to say, and they get to respond to the Committee.

Even before an application is filed, there is a lot that goes into the process. There are conferences with the -- between the applicants and Independent System Operator. The ISO-New England is the organization that runs our electric grid in New England. They have to be on board. There are environmental and resource studies that are undertaken, and actually become part of the application in most cases. There are early pre-permitting meetings with relevant state and federal agencies, including people like U.S. Forest & Wildlife, the Department of Environmental Services, Fish & Game, the PUC, the Department of Transportation.

There should be coordination with your regional planning commissions and with your municipalities. And, in some cases, since this is a transmission line project, so, they're seeking to build a
transmission line, so, conferring with a transmission company is not likely. But many of our applications are about generators, and they have to have a way to transmit the power that they're going to generate. Power purchase agreements, financing, eligibility for various tax credits, and, as I indicated before, there should be a pre-filing public information session held in each county.

What you have up before you is the actual application. After all of that is done, that's what this Application in this particular docket looks like. There's five volumes, although I don't know exactly how many pages it is, but it is voluminous. And, this is a relatively short transmission line.

The Application has to contain sufficient information to satisfy each state agency. And, it also has to describe the project in reasonable detail, identify the preferred choice and other choices for each site -- for the site of each major part of the facility. It has to describe in detail the impact of each part of the facility, describe in detail any proposals for the studying and solving of any environmental problems that may arise as a result of the siting or construction of the project. The application has to describe in detail the applicant's financial, technical, and managerial
capability to construct -- to site, construct and operate the facility. An application must document that written notification of the project has been given to the governing body in each community where it's going to exist.

And, it must describe the elements of -- the elements of and the financial assurances for decommissioning. Energy facilities don't last forever. They do eventually get decommissioned, and there has to be a process for that proposed in the application.

And, finally, they have to provide such additional information as the Committee may require. And, our Committee does require additional information. And, that information is contained in a separate set of regulations that the -- that the applicants, any applicant to build an energy facility or a transmission line must also file.

And, just for information sake, there is presently pending a docket before the Site Evaluation Committee where those rules and regulations are being revamped. And, that's actually gotten some press lately, and it's something that the public has participated in quite vigorously.

There are many opportunities for public
participation in our process. First, you heard from Mr. Aslin. You should feel free to get in touch with Counsel for the Public, if you have information that you would like the Committee to understand or if you have some -- or, if you need some understanding of his role or the role of the Committee, his number is up there. There are these pre-filing public information sessions that have already been held. I wasn't at the one in this particular county, but I assume it was very similar to tonight, where they have the information outside describing the project and showing you simulations.

There are the post-filing public information sessions, which we're undertaking tonight. There's that post-filing joint public hearing, at which the public will be able to participate in, and that will be held sometime within the next month and a half.

A city or town that is -- where the facility is located can ask the Site Evaluation Committee to come back to their town and to have additional informational meetings. And, we take written public comment from day one of any docket all the way through until we issue a final decision. And, that written public comment is required to be considered by the Site Evaluation Committee.
An interested party can seek to intervene and actually become a party before the Site Evaluation Committee. Anybody whose rights, duties, privileges, immunities, or other substantial interests might be affected by the proceeding has the right to file a motion for intervention. And, if they can demonstrate such an interest, and that their intervention would not impair the orderly conduct of the proceedings, they will be granted intervention status. If granted intervention status, they have the same role, if you will, in the proceedings as the applicant has, as the company has, as Counsel for the Public has; they're considered a party.

So, there are many, many ways that members of the public can participate. Our meeting here tonight being one of them, and then the other examples that I've talked about, right through participating as a party after moving to intervene.

What does the Committee do to make its decision? That's governed by statute. And, the statute says that the Committee must give due consideration to all of the relevant information regarding potential sites or potential routes. That means not only the route proposed, but other potential sites and routes. The Committee must also give due consideration to the significant impacts and
benefits of a project. And, the Committee must consider whether the issuance of a certificate will serve the objectives of RSA 162-H. That's that balancing test that was in the very first slide.

Having done that, there are certain findings that the Site Evaluation Committee must find in order to grant a certificate. First, it must find that the applicant has adequate financial, technical, and managerial capabilities to assure the construction and operation of the facility, in compliance with any terms and conditions which are contained in the certificate.

The Site Evaluation Committee, in order to grant the certificate, must find that the project will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region, with due consideration being given to views of municipal and regional planning commissions and municipal governing bodies. The Site Evaluation Committee, in order to grant a certificate, must find that the project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air and water quality, the natural environment, or the public health and safety. And, finally, the Committee must determine that the issuance of a certificate will serve the public interest. If it fails any of those standards, the Committee is duty-bound to deny the
Again, if you want information about the Site Evaluation Committee, the best place to get it is at our website, www.nhsec.nh.gov.

And, that's all I have. The next stage of this public information session will be a presentation from the developers, New England Power and Eversource Energy.

MR. HUDOCK: Okay. So, thank you, everyone, for your attention tonight. My name is Bryan Hudock, from National Grid. And, I'm here with Jim Jiottis, from Eversource. And, we're going to conduct a short presentation on the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project.

The first thing we wanted to express, before we really jumped into the Project itself, was our commitment to open communication on this Project. We greatly value the public's input. We want to make sure that they are educated and informed about what we're doing and when we're doing it. And, above all, we want to make sure that we're listening and addressing community and resident concerns and ideas.

So, one more thing before we jump into the Project is just an overall explanation of the electric
system. So, I'll kind of discuss how power comes from generating stations, where it's generated by coal, wind, and so on. From there, it will go to a substation, where it's converted to a high voltage that's carried on the transmission system, which you can think of as the highway, the backbone of the overall system. So, it's designed to carry large bulk power large distances.

At certain points in the transmission system, substations will tap in and convert that voltage to a distribution voltage. And, that's what you see for your -- the service to your homes and your businesses. This is the lower voltage that's going to be carrying the electricity through the local system.

So, the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project is designed to improve the reliability in the transmission system, that backbone of the system. It will not affect the distribution system or the distribution service.

So, where did this project come from? The Independent System Operator is the independent organization that's charged with maintaining the reliability of the transmission system. So, they have a very smart group of people that are constantly modeling and testing the system to understand where there might be
potential weaknesses or issues.

And, in a recent study, what they found is that southern New Hampshire and Greater Boston has some of the fastest and most concentrated growing electric demand in all of New England. And, additionally, beyond that, what they found was that, with the existing infrastructure, there's a number of potential overloads on transmission lines, given certain contingencies.

So, National Grid and Eversource have jointly proposed a solution, of which this Project, the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project, is a major part, in order to help meet these needs and ensure continued reliability for our transmission system for the future.

So, we'll zoom in a little bit on the Project itself. This is a new 345-kilowatt overhead line. It starts at Scobie Pond Substation, in Londonderry, New Hampshire, owned by Eversource. It proceeds south on an existing right-of-way, passing through Londonderry, Windham, Hudson, Pelham, and then, into Massachusetts, where it goes through the Towns of Dracut, Andover, and Tewksbury, where it ends at a National Grid substation in Tewksbury.

So, overall, this Project is currently estimated to be a $123 million investment in the system.
Of that, over $80 million will be invested in New Hampshire. The line is approximately 24 and a half miles long, on the existing right-of-way. And, we put in the breakdowns for New Hampshire, the various towns, as far as the expected line length and asset investment for the overall Project.

And, as it currently stands today, we are scheduling around a 2016 construction start, with a goal to have the Project in service by 2017.

So, what are the benefits of this Project? Well, first and foremost, a reliable electric transmission system is something that benefits everyone in New England, you, me, all of the citizens in New England. We all depend upon a reliable electric grid and a reliable electric system. So, this Project will help to meet those reliability needs that have been identified by the Independent System Operator.

Beyond that, for New Hampshire, there will be significant local investment. So, as I said previously, over $80 million will be invested in New Hampshire. This will benefit the towns involved, in terms of tax revenues that will be realized, once the line is placed in service. There will also be direct benefits from the jobs that will be employed during construction,
and also the indirect benefits as well, from a sizable workforce that will be requiring hotels, restaurants, gas, all of those indirect expenditures will also benefit the local economy as well.

So, I won't totally recap this slide, but I think what we wanted to show is that, throughout this process, there will be a number of opportunities for community input. So, last week, we had our public information session, and we're here tonight. And, we'll have other opportunities for community input as well.

Beyond that, though, outside of the New Hampshire SEC process, we just wanted to make sure, you know, that we are open for communication. So, I have up here the website, as well as the toll-free number. And, you're welcome to discuss to any of the members that we have in the audience tonight any questions that you have. And, that idea of open communication is not just for tonight, but going forward throughout the Project. So, we want your feedback, we welcome your questions and comments, and want to make sure you have every opportunity to make your voice heard.

So, that being said, that concludes my presentation. I think I'll turn it back over to --

MR. IACOPINO: Normally, our next -- our
next phase of the meeting would be to go into the
question-and-answer period. Does anybody else, other than
the two folks who provided questions, does anybody else
have questions?

(No indication noted.)

MR. IACOPINO: I'm going to take us
out-of-order just a little bit then. I understand there's
a state representative here who would like to make a
public comment, but needs to leave. And, so, if that
state representative --

REP. SMITH: Well, that would be me. I
didn't fill out a form, because I didn't think I would --

MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry,
Representative, I didn't get your name.

(Inaudible.)

MR. IACOPINO: You can fill it out on
your way out. Here is the microphone right up here.

REP. SMITH: Sure.

MR. IACOPINO: Please tell us your name
and spell your last name, so that the court reporter can
get it.

REP. SMITH: Sure. Representative
Gregory Smith, last name S-m-i-t-h. So, I'm one of the
state representatives here for -- representing Pelham and
Hudson. I haven't formed an opinion about this. But, as you, I'm sure, are aware, Kinder Morgan is proposing to build a large natural gas pipeline. I'd like to understand exactly how that's going to work and how -- what the impact is. Because I can certainly see how you guys are putting up your transmission line, but, in conjunction with a parallel construction of a pipeline, that seems problematic.

So, I guess my questions are, number one, have you been talking to Kinder, in terms of how this is going to work?

Number two, what is the impact going to be, because Kinder is certainly talking about needing some very large construction buffer zones when they do this?

And, then, from a permit perspective, is this process completely decoupled, their permit is independent of your permit, or are they somehow just joined, because, again, they're happening at the same time?

And, I think that's everything. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Why don't I let the Company answer first, with respect to the specifics about the two projects.
MR. HUDOCK: Okay. So, thank you for that.

REP. SMITH: Do you want me to sit down now or, I mean, --

MR. IACOPINO: You're welcome to --

REP. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Go ahead.

REP. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: There's plenty of chairs.

REP. SMITH: Yes.

MR. HUDOCK: So, thank you for those questions. And, we definitely understand the concern in regards to the Kinder Morgan pipeline.

What we can say is that these projects are independent projects. This is an electric transmission project, designed to strengthen the reliability of the transmission grid. Kinder Morgan's pipeline is proposed for a whole separate need related to the gas system and energy resources.

In terms of the overall coordination of the projects, you know, with where we are today, you know, we have the -- you know, the mandate from ISO to proceed forward our projects, sorry, Independent System Operator. And, that's the way we're proceeding, is to be open and
transparent about what we plan to do and when we plan to do it.

In terms of coordination with Kinder Morgan, they are still in their preliminary stages where they're planning and designing. And, so, you know, we have had communications to let them know where we plan to move lines within the right-of-way, where proposed structures will be located.

But, ultimately, you know, they have, you know, control of their own project as well. And, so, you know, we will require safety reviews, to make sure that whatever is put in is safe in accordance to what we have planned in the right-of-way.

But, in terms of the actual design, their construction plans and everything else, you know, we're always open to coordinate, but, ultimately, they're independent projects. And, so, you know, we'll do our best to minimize our impacts and continue those open communications.

REP. SMITH: All right. Thank you. Mike, if you could indulge me with two more quick questions. The first is, there was a previous discussion, six months ago maybe, I don't recall exactly, at the time it was stated that there would be no new -- no eminent
domain, no new rights-of-way, that the entire Project will be contained within the existing right-of-way. Is that still accurate, "yes" or "no"?

MR HUDOCK: Yes. That is accurate. We will not be using eminent domain or any other land acquisition. We have -- this is all within the existing right-of-way.

REP. SMITH: Okay. And, then, the last question is, obviously, well, I would expect you put together a preliminary engineering design, and at some point that becomes final. When would a final engineering design be completed, meaning you know exactly where each pylon is going, locked and loaded, there are no changes? When do you expect that to happen?

MR. JIOTTIS: I'll get that. Actually, as part of the Application, there is just what you talked about, with the caveat that, during the application process, we're still working with abutters or landowners, we can shift structures a little bit to satisfy someone, you know, to get out of a viewshed or something.

So, what's filed in the application is pretty much where the structures are going to be, but there's a chance for some minor movements. Also, the Committee itself could ask us to modify our design.
REP. SMITH: Okay. All right. Thank you. Part of the reason I ask it here is, again, I'm challenging how Kinder Morgan, again, understand completely independent projects, and encompass how they are going to finalize their application, if your design is not finalized, because you're operating in roughly the same area.

So, I thank you for answering my questions. And, that's it. I will --

MR. IACOPINO: I was just going to answer your question from the permitting and the state side.

REP. SMITH: Yes, please.

MR. IACOPINO: Is that there is, in the Application, numerous maps that do indicate where all the major parts of the facility are going to be located, I think even to GPS coordinates. And, that is all available on our website, the entire Application, including those maps, is variable for the public to see.

Secondly, everybody should know, I'll stand up and say this, the Site Evaluation Committee does not have authority to take property by eminent domain. Whether it's in this particular docket, or any application that Kinder Morgan or any other pipeline company may file
with the Site Evaluation Committee. The Site Evaluation Committee does not have the authority to do that.

Right now, there is no application pending before the Site Evaluation Committee from Kinder Morgan.

REP. SMITH: Okay. I want to thank you, gentlemen, and I want to thank the Site Evaluation Committee and the public. I have my son with me, and I have to get him somewhere. So, again, I thank you for letting me jump the queue here, all right? Thank you very much.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. I'm now going to go to the next question, which is somewhat similar to the Representative's, but a little bit different. And, this is for the Company.

Do you know if there is a law that allows the Kinder Morgan pipeline to traverse the 90 year-old right-of-way? And, I assume this questioner means the right-of-way you're constructing the transmission line in.

MR HUDOCK: Okay. Well, I am not a lawyer. So, I'll just say that up front. But, in terms of, I will say, on a general basis, that transmission lines and gas pipelines have and are, can be in the same
right-of-way. So, as far as a legal basis for that not being allowed, that's not something that we're aware of.

MR. IACOPINO: The next question is very close to that as well. What are the safety hazards involved in collocating a gas pipeline across a power line right-of-way or adjacent to it?

MR. HUDOCK: Okay. So, that's, again, a very good question. You know, the one thing I want to express is that National Grid and Eversource take the idea of safety very seriously. So, regardless of what we are talking about, and there's a variety of cases that may happen in terms of things other than transmission lines being mixed within the right-of-way, our first priority is to make sure that whatever it is that it's safe. That it's safe for us to operate and it's safe for our customers.

So, regardless of whether it's Kinder Morgan or some other complete -- you know, completely different concept, we're going to do our due diligence to make sure that whatever it is, before they have permission from us, for whatever permissions they need, is that it's going to be built and maintained safely for what we have out there.

MR. IACOPINO: And, the third question
is about the same thing, but from a different aspect. What are the environmental impacts of two consecutive years of construction on electric lines and gas pipelines on wildlife and threatened/endangered species? I assume this questioner means assuming that both the pipeline -- that the transmission line is approved and the pipeline is approved, and there's two consecutive years of construction.

MR. HUDOCK: So, again, I think that's another great question. And, you know, what I can say, from our perspective, is that we take very seriously the idea of minimizing our impacts when it comes to construction in the right-of-way and establishing this new line. So, we're going to do our best within to balance all the factors that we have, in terms of our mandate on providing this Project at an efficient cost. But, also, too, to be able to respect the environment and try to minimize impacts there, and the impacts to abutting residents as well. So, we'll do our best to minimize those impacts.

MR. IACOPINO: I think I have one question. Ms. Huard, --

MS. HUARD: Yes.

MR. IACOPINO: -- did you mean for these
to be provided as questions?

MS. HUARD: Yes.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.

MS. HUARD: Because I did want some answers tonight.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.

MS. HUARD: Last time I presented them as comments and didn't get answers. So, --

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

Okay. So, the next question is, please describe the alleged constraints on our electric grid, where they are, and how adding a transmission line from one substation to another substation will alleviate the constraints?

MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. I'll take that.

Good question. As far as constraints? I guess the easiest way to think about this, there's a fixed number of lines that go from Massachusetts to New Hampshire, or, essentially, southern New England to northern New England. If you think about each line is going to have some kind of rating, it's going to be able to carry a certain amount of power. What we look at is, when he start taking those lines away, for whatever reason, you know, we assume that
there's a tornado, we assume that there's an operation or routine maintenance, we have to still keep the lights on when we lose some of those lines.

So, the constraints are, at some point, when you take away enough of those lines, we can't supply the existing load. And, that's what happens in this case. There's a certain number of lines going north to south. When we take out two or more lines, we don't have enough capacity left to serve the load in either New Hampshire or Massachusetts. So, that's why this extra line is being put in, to make up for that loss of what's there today.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. The next question, I'm going to let you guys take a shot at it, then I'll answer it from the Site Evaluation Committee's standpoint.

Are you familiar with the California electricity crisis that was deliberately and fraudulently created in 2001? It's actually a series of questions. Have you contemplated whether the energy/electricity crisis in New England is also being deliberately and fraudulently manipulated for profit and greed and not for a genuine need?

MR. JIOTTIS: I can comment that we are familiar with what happened in California. I think everybody, you know, knew what happened there. And, I
don't think -- from a utility person, it was pretty sick
to see somebody do that. But I really can't comment to
the other side of that.

MR. IACOPINO: Well, I can, from the
Site Evaluation Committee standpoint. And, that's part of
the reason why we're here. That's part of the reason why
we do what we do. That's part of the reason why we go
through the process that we go through. If the evidence
in this process demonstrates that somebody is acting
fraudulently, or that they're presenting false evidence,
or otherwise trying to manipulate either the market or the
Committee, the Committee will deal with that
appropriately. So, that's the way the Site Evaluation
Committee deals with issues like that.

And, in addition, we also have a Public
Utilities Commission in the State of New Hampshire, which
has a similar charge on a broader basis, because the
Public Utilities Commission regulates not just the
construction of energy facilities or transmission lines,
but also the energy market. So, there are two state
agencies in the State of New Hampshire that deals
specifically with things like that. And, if it's
determined that that is, in fact, what is occurring, there
will be appropriate action taken by each agency.
The next question you guys are going to have to answer. It's pretty specific. What are the actual sizes of the transmission towers proposed closest to the road on both sides of David Drive? And, I assume that's in Hudson.

MS. HUARD: I did get that question actually answered already by someone. So, you can skip over that.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay.

MS. HUARD: To make it easier.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. So, we'll skip that question. The next question is, are you aware that trees provide a natural barrier that weakens the strength of electric fields? Have you contemplated the dangerous and negative effects, the removal of this beneficial barrier of trees, combined with the new and existing electric fields, will have on the public health of numerous individuals?

MR HUDOCK: Okay. So, that's a great question. And, I'll answer that one. In terms of the question about EMF, electromagnetic fields, National Grid and Eversource have followed that subject very closely, as it's been, you know, a concern in the public and elsewhere over the last several decades. So, we try to do our best
to stay up-to-date on the latest literature and the latest science as new information comes to light.

And, so, what we can say is, you know, one, that there has been no positive link between EMF and adverse health effects when it comes to transmission lines. And, two, we have done studies to model the electromagnetic levels that will be here before and after the Project. And, what we found is that, for this Project, in the right-of-way, the electromagnetic fields will either go down or will go up insignificantly.

MR. IACOPINO: And, is that, that modeling, is that contained within your Application?

MR. HUDOCK: Yes.

MR. IACOPINO: The next question is, are you aware of the many benefits that trees naturally provide the environment? They absorb carbon dioxide and remove it from the environment. This process is vital to mitigate the effects of climate change. They also produce beneficial oxygen for people to breathe. In a time when our country and government is so concerned about reducing the carbon footprint contributing to the drastic climate change, how can you be so negligent with this Project in removing such a large volume of trees?

MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. We are aware of the
benefits of trees. We take tree management very
seriously. We look at it in, primarily, from a safety
perspective, we have to keep the trees from our lines, so
they don't cause outages and they don't cause any injury.

As far as the impact to carbon on this,
I guess you could say that removing some trees will have
an effect. But, at the same time, there can be positive
effects on the environmental from the construction of this
line. In other words, not running a power plant somewhere
else. So, it is a trade-off, but it is a necessary item
to trim those trees.

MR. IACOPINO: And, then, the final
question that I have here, despite the other alternatives
that you evaluated, you chose this one due to cost. Is
cost a valid reason to endanger the public health of so
many?

And, before your answer, you know, if
you disagree with the premise of the question, you should
feel free to tell the public that you disagree with the
premise of it. I'm not -- we're not here to put anybody
on the spot. We're here to get information.

MR. HUDOCK: Sure. So, again, a valid
question from the standpoint that, you know, any time you
see a large project of this nature, you know, will it be
constructed safely? Will it be maintained safely? And, the answer is, for Eversource and National Grid, that's one of our highest priorities, is to make sure that it's safe for the public and it's safe for our workers, and it's safe going forward in the future.

So, certainly, safety is going to be a consideration, and the top consideration, when it comes to selecting and designing this Project.

MR. IACOPINO: Could you address the "cost" part of the question?

MR. JIOTTIS: Sure.

MR. IACOPINO: I'll read the question again. Despite the other alternatives you evaluated, you chose this one due to cost. Is cost a valid reason to endanger the public health of so many?

MR. JIOTTIS: Obviously, just to, you know, restate what Bryan mentioned, you know, we don't build things to endanger the public. We feel that what we build is safe, we design around safety.

As far as cost, cost is one consideration. But we do look at other issues. In this case, as we've mentioned, it's being constructed in an existing right-of-way. So, that was one of the items, one of the selection criteria, is we're not going to create a
new transmission path. We're going to use an existing location.

Excuse me. We also look at things, siting it with other existing infrastructure. In other words, not creating new paths, new transmission right-of-ways. We look at our ability to construct the project. Can we build it in the timeframe that it's needed? I mean, you can come up with some ideas, if you're not going to be able to construct it for 10 years, that doesn't do anybody any good. So, when we do look at a project, we look at something we can build in the timeframe that's needed.

So, the cost is a factor, but it's not the only factor.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I don't think we have -- are there any other questions? Oh, I see somebody raising her hand in the back.

MS. DELEHANTY: Thanks. Should I go up?

MR. IACOPINO: Sure. It's probably better if you just come up and speak your question. Just please identify yourself and spell your last name for us.

MS. DELEHANTY: My name is Louise Delehanty. I'm a member of the Pelham Conservation Commission.
MR. IACOPINO: Spell your last name.

MS. DELEHANTY: Delehanty,

D-e-l-e-h-a-n-t-y.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

MS. DELEHANTY: I'm a little nervous being at the microphone. But there was a question regarding wildlife. And, I don't know if you're aware of the threatened and endangered species that are along the route of the ROW. We have the northern black --

[Court reporter interruption.]

MS. DELEHANTY: We have the northern black racer, we have the New England cottontail, and we have Blandings turtle, they're endangered. We also have threatened species. And, Pelham has quite the habitats for all three. More so, they seem to be concentrated in southern New Hampshire, southeastern, in the Pelham area. And, these can be confirmed with New Hampshire Fish & Game.

When you mentioned that the Project would probably begin in 2016, I was reading that the habitats for these endangered species, you would wait till the spring to see where you were going to identify exactly where the habitats were for all three threatened species. So, if you start your construction, it would be in early
2016, in the winter, that way you won't really know where
the habitats are, where the concentration of these three
endangered species are.

And, I also read some information
regarding the Project, that you, just for example, for the
northern black racer, that they were going to be captured,
those that were found along the ROW, and microchips
inserted into the northern black racers. They were going
to be taken to a veterinarian to see if they tolerate it.
It seems like it's trivial to some people. But, in the
great picture, it's kind of like I even think myself that
it's really silly to trap them, microchip them, release
them. Wouldn't it be much better if you just didn't come
through any of the sites where the habitats are right now?

And, like I said, you can find out where
all of the -- they have been located, spotted, they have
been documented, photographs taken, all the information
sent to New Hampshire Fish & Game.

So, if you're starting your Project in
the winter, what's to happen to all of these three
endangered species? I don't know think you can just come
in and just do an upheaval of their sites. There are many
other -- there are lots of threatened species I won't go
into right now.
And, my other comment is, I live in a
55+ senior community. And, if you have maps, I would like
to see them, to where the existing center pole will be
moved to the western edge. And, if it's moved to the
western edge, it's moving ever closer to the boundary of
our common land. And, if the boundary -- if that pole is
moved there, then that means Kinder Morgan, should they
get the okay, they move even closer to us. So, we have 38
residents, who are -- some are in the 80s and 90s, and
quite concerned about Kinder Morgan.

Can you do anything about not locating,
not just for, I don't want to be selfish about just where
I live, but can you do something about not moving the
center pole right across from where to, you know, to the
wooden one that you're going to be constructing on the
western edge? Is there any way you can manipulate that a
little bit, so that there's more, I know they're still
going to be within the ROW, but, if it's not within the
ROW, if it's not even to abutters, then maybe there's more
wiggle-room should Kinder Morgan, you know, get approval.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I've counted three
questions out of that, okay?

MS. DELEHANTY: Okay.

MR. IACOPINO: The first one I believe
deals with construction in the winter and the effect on endangered and threatened species. The second deals with microchipping of some of those species that may have been suggested as a method.

MS. DELEHANTY: You can't capture them to microchip them.

MR. IACOPINO: I just want to inventory the questions, so that they know what to respond to. And, the third is the collocation of the transmission line being moved to the -- to the west side of the right-of-way, and how that's going to collocate with the Kinder Morgan pipeline, if it's ever constructed, --

MS. DELEHANTY: Uh-huh.

MR. IACOPINO: -- and affect the 38 residents of your 55 and over.

MS. DELEHANTY: Oh, and also any of the homes. Because the western side is the side that's going to accommodate the center power line, isn't it?

MR. IACOPINO: Well, they'll answer that for you. But those were your three questions, right?

MS. DELEHANTY: Right.

MR. IACOPINO: Let's give them a chance to answer them. And, if they're not answered to your satisfaction, I'll give you a chance to ask another
question, okay?

MS. DELEHANTY: Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Go ahead.

MR. HUDOCK: Okay. Great. So, those are great questions. So, thank you for asking all of those. And, I'll do my best to remember and answer all of them, but I might miss one or two. So, if I miss anything, just maybe key [sic?] me in and I'll do my best to get back to it.

So, in terms of the location of the Project, you know, as was mentioned, we have posted our Project plans within the Application, and that's available. I'd also encourage you to, if you have some questions about your specific situation, about where you live in relation to the Project, that you find someone that's in the audience from the team, a lot of them are standing in the back here, and they can come help you, to talk to you about exactly your specific location and the Project.

In terms of the locations of the lines, you know, we did a very large amount of due diligence, as far as how the right-of-way was going to be configured. We looked at, you know, as many options as we could within the confines of that right-of-way. And, ultimately, the
design we came up with was the one that best balanced, you
know, the constraints that we have, in terms of cost, in
terms of environmental impact, and abutter impact.

And, so, I can tell you that a lot of
work went into selecting the position and the locations of
the lines that we have currently designed today.

MR. IACOPINO: Seasonal construction.

MR. HUDOCK: Seasonal construction. So,
our current intention is to start construction in late
2016. I would say that, in terms of your concerns over
endangered species, whether they're animals or plants, we
are and will be and continue to be in consultation with
Natural Heritage, New Hampshire Natural Heritage, and
other state agencies that have jurisdiction over
endangered species. And, you know, we've done things,
such as surveys and everything else, to make sure that our
Project will minimize any impacts to any rare or
threatened species. Because, obviously, that's of very
high importance to us to make sure we do that. So, we
have a number of, you know, ways to work around that, but
it's very important to us to minimize that impact.

MR. IACOPINO: Microchipping.

MR. HUDOCK: So, microchipping. So, I'm
not a ecologist or a wildlife biologist. I will say that
I did work on a project, not necessarily the exact same
project, but we built a substation in Massachusetts. And,
we actually ended up putting RF antennas on rare species
of turtles that was in the area, and we had a dedicated
turtle tracker, that would go out with his gear, it's like
a giant TV antenna, to go out and direction find the
turtles. And, you know, I think -- I see some people
chuckling, and it does sound kind of funny. But, in all
seriousness, the reason why we do that is because animals
move around. And, some of them are small and hard to
find, and, especially out there, you're in the woods, in
the brush. And, the last thing we want to do is have a
truck go out there and run over a rare species because he
didn't know it was there.

So, the idea of the tracker is for the
animals, okay, you want to be able to, you know, when
possible, know where they are and be able to keep them
clear of the construction area.

So, I can't really speak to the
specifics of the RF placement on the species. But I can
just give you an example of projects I worked on of why we
have tracking of the rare species, and it was for their
own protection.

MR. IACOPINO: And, her final question,
I think, dealt with the movement of the transmission line
to the western edge of the -- I don't know if it's to the
dege, but to the western side of the right-of-way, and the
collocation of any eventual Kinder Morgan pipeline. The
questioner was concerned that the pipeline would wind up,
I believe, between the transmission line and the edge of
the right-of-way, --

MR. HUDOCK: Sure.

MR. IACOPINO: -- and, obviously, where
she lives.

MR. HUDOCK: Right. So, you know, the
main statement I'm going to have about that is to kind of
repeat back what I started with. Is I know that our
engineering team spent a lot of time weighing all the
options that we had, because it's a complex project, and a
lot of considerations to balance, in terms of costs and
impacts and everything else. So, in the end, you know,
I'm really confident that the solution we came up with,
where one of our existing transmission lines will be
relocated to the west is the best solution in terms of
balancing the costs. Because, ultimately, that's what
we're here to do. So, we're looking to find the best way
that's going to balance all those constraints.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. I think
that's all the questions we had. Did you have a question
or did you want to make a statement?

    MS. JONES: No, I want to make ask a
question.

    MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Why don't you come
up to the microphone, ma'am. Is there anybody else who is
going to want to ask a question, I would ask that you
write it down, and then we can ask it, so we can avoid
some of the movement, because we will have public
statements afterwards.

    MS. JONES: Sometimes you don't know if
you have a question until you hear what they say.

    MR. IACOPINO: I know. And, next time,
I'll recommend at the beginning that people -- that
everybody grab a piece of paper on their way in. But go
ahead, ma'am, why don't you ask your question.

    MS. JONES: I live in the same
condominium complex as Louise. I just wondered how --

    MR. IACOPINO: Tell us your name and
spell your last name.

    MS. JONES: Oh. Susan Jones, Pelham,
J-o-n-e-s.

    MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

    MS. JONES: I just wanted to know about
your heavy-duty equipment that you have to bring in. I went with one of the other girls around some of the neighborhoods in Pelham, and they're quite lovely. And, these power lines that you have up there I imagine were built quite a while ago, and there wasn't as much homes -- as many homes as there are now. How much -- how are you going to get your heavy-duty equipment in there without taking down more trees? You know, there's no roads where we live. There's one road. And, what trees we have there now are gone.

MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. Good questions, good concerns. Typically, with our Application, we're going to lay out how we're going to get to structures. We have to tell people how we're going to do it. And, if it involves crossing any kind of environmentally sensitive areas, we're going to have to -- those are going to have to be permitted. Typically, we'll move our equipment up and down the right-of-way, rather than coming in through someone's backyard.

MS. JONES: You can't, really. There's not much room. I went through a lot of neighborhoods, there's not much room. You're going to stick your hand out in the kitchen, out your kitchen window, and you're going to be hanging on to a power line.
MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Let's let them answer the question.

MS. JONES: Sorry.

MR. IACOPINO: And, if you want to make a statement, you'll be permitted to do so. Go ahead, sir. I'm sorry.

MR. JIOTTIS: We do -- we do look at those types of items for --

[Court reporter interruption.]

MR. JIOTTIS: Sorry. Okay. We do look at that type of stuff to make sure we can get to our equipment. We don't build stuff we can't get to. Even what's there today, we had to get to there for one reason or another. So, we know our equipment can move up and down. We make a lot of provisions, matting of sensitive areas, so we don't do damage around there. We won't come across folk's backyards, unless we get their permission to go into it. So, we do look at access very seriously, and it is part of our application.

MS. JONES: All right. What --

[Court reporter interruption.]

MR. IACOPINO: Ma'am, why don't you -- is there another question? I see --

MS. JONES: That's all right.
MR. IACOPINO: I see the gentleman right here, did you have a question, too?

MR. LYNDE: Yes, I do have a question.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. And, how about you, sir, do you have questions over here, too?

FROM THE FLOOR: I do.

MR. IACOPINO: All right. Why don't you, while he's writing, why don't you --

MR. LYNDE: Thank you. I actually signed up to speak, but it was actually for questions, so --

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. Why don't you tell us your name, spell your last name, and then ask your questions.

MR. LYNDE: My name is Hal Lynde, that's L-y-n-d-e, 114 Jeremy Hill Road. I'm also the Chairman of the Pelham Board of Selectmen.

I wanted to deal with Kinder Morgan first, all right. One of the things that we've talked, when we first -- Kinder Morgan came in, and they said they're going to locate in the right-of-way. And, so, I want your honest assessment of whether they can indeed locate within the right-of-way that you have?

MR. HUDOCK: Okay. So, that's a very
good question.

MR. LYNDE: They're all good questions. So, you don't have to tell me that anymore.

MR. HUDOCK: Okay. But still, for you, though, it still is a good question, and I will say that. So, in terms of, what I can say is, is that transmission lines and gas pipelines have coexisted on right-of-ways that exist today in our systems, and it will exist in the future. So, is it possible to safely site a pipeline within a right-of-way that has transmission infrastructure? Yes, under the right circumstances.

For this one in particular, I can't comment on the specific designs that Kinder Morgan has. You know, but, when they do provide us with the design and we do a full review, we'll ensure that it is safe.

MR. IACOPINO: And, from the Site Evaluation Committee's view, when and if Kinder Morgan files an application to build their pipeline, that's one of the things that will be considered. The public health and safety of that pipeline along the entire route will be considered by the Site Evaluation Committee in the process of that particular application, of issuing or denying that particular application.
MR. LYNDE: All right. Thank you. Is there a specified separation between a transmission line and a pipeline? Because, obviously, you have a magnetic field that could conceivably induce electricity into a metal pipe. So, there must be some guidelines or some, hopefully, some regulations or something. Is that the case?

MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. The answer -- the short answer is "yes". There's quite a few guidelines. They cover things from as far as the distance, but they also cover, when the pipeline is put in there, they have to take certain actions to mitigate that induce a voltage on their pipeline. So, there's a whole series of regulations to cover just what you're talking about.

MR. LYNDE: So, how would I -- where would I go to find those regulations? Are they a simple set or something that just you have to dig through it?

MR. JIOTTIS: No. It's not going to be simple. You would find them, there's things under some of the IEEE standards, the electrical standards. You have to also look at some of the pipeline standards that they use to build them. So, they're going to be in a couple different places.

MR. LYNDE: Okay. Thank you.
[inaudible]. What is the power rating of the proposed pipeline? How much power do you intend to bring down on that? What's -- a thousand megawatts? What's the number?

MR. JIOTTIS: The pipeline? I'm sorry --

MR. LYNDE: No, I'm sorry. I said "pipeline", it's the transmission line. I'll switch out of Kinder Morgan mode and into the National Grid/Eversource mode, okay.

MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. The line itself is going to be 345,000 volts. Megawatt-wise, maybe 2,000 megawatts, in that range, 1,200 to 2,000 megawatts in there.

MR. LYNDE: Okay. The other three lines, there were two 245s, I'm not sure it's the right number, and 110 kV, is it something like that?

MR. HUDOCK: 115. 115, sorry.

MR. LYNDE: 115. What is the power rating -- how much power does that thing deliver in the area, that small line?

MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. The small one itself, it's really, I'm not so sure you can say it "delivers power into the area". It's really just connecting a couple local -- what we would consider "local
substations". But that might be in terms of a couple hundred megawatts. So, it's significantly less than that we're building with this line.

MR. LYNDE: Okay.

MR. JIOTTIS: And, the object of this line is to move a large amount of power from Point A to Point B.

MR. LYNDE: Okay. But is that small line going from Point A to Point B?

MR. JIOTTIS: It's -- yes. But I'm trying to use an analogy, it's not -- it's not designed to move a lot of power from one point to another.

MR. LYNDE: No, I understand. So, my question is, and this of interest, I think, to Pelham, and is why not get rid of it? You have ten times the amount of power coming down the 345. You're going to locate it in the center, where the smaller line is. Save yourself some money, don't relocate it, and save the neighbors having to clear the right-of-way. Have you looked at a cost/benefit trade-off of doing that?

MR. JIOTTIS: The short answer is "not getting rid of it, we haven't looked at it." That smaller line that you talk about, it's still needed, because that serves the substation to serve the local load. The line
that we're building is, again, it's moving a lot of power south to north, north to south, you know, across it.

The smaller lines you're talking about bring power from, say, Pelham, up to Hudson, New Hampshire, they're tied together. So, they go very short distances, but they move a little bit of power, and they get it closer to people's homes. Not to your house, but it's that next step, from the larger line that you see, simply goes from there down to the smaller line, and then down to the lines on the road.

MR. LYNDE: So, are you -- you're not going to look at that, I assume, are you? Or, could you look at it?

I mean, I guess I'll turn to the Site Evaluation Committee. I think it's a fair question to ask, because of the impact on Pelham. Because what they're doing now is going to have four power -- four transmission lines, the small one's going to get relocated to the edge of the right-of-way, probably 15 feet from the edge, I think is the numbers I remember. So, it's going to require clearing of a lot of trees and opening up a significant area.

If it was feasible, why couldn't -- I like to have a question as to why that couldn't be done?
So, fair enough?

MR. IACOPINO: The answer from the Site Evaluation Committee is that, if that is a feasible alternative, and I think what I hear them saying is that that's not, because it serves a different load or a different usage. But, if that is an alternative, there is going to be an evidentiary process. And, one of the things that was in my PowerPoint is that the Site Evaluation Committee will consider what other alternatives there are. And, if they find those alternatives to be better, in their balancing test, as I explained before, they may very well require something like that.

Although, I suspect, based upon the answer that I heard the gentleman give, is that that's probably not considered to be a feasible alternative, to remove that 115 kV line, because it serves a different purpose than the 345 kV. That's what I thought I heard.

MR. HUDOCK: One thing I could add onto that, this one line we're talking about, the 151, we're actually, when we are relocating it, actually rebuilding at a higher capacity. So, that kind of gives you an idea as far as the need for it. It isn't just that it's needed as existed, it's actually needed in a higher capacity form.
MR. LYNDE: So, it's going to be a
different size tower?

MR. HUDOCK: The towers that exist
today, it will be different from the towers that exist
today, where it is today, yes.

MR. LYNDE: I guess, where's all the
power coming from? Where's this extra 2,000 megawatts
coming from?

MR. JIOTTIS: Sure. I'll take that.
The very short answer is "it's coming from everywhere."
Our system is tied together, so the power flows, it's a
free-flowing system. The electricity that you have in
your house today could have come from Canada, it could
have come from Connecticut, it could have come from
anywhere. It's all tied together and just flowing across
the system. So, you really can't say, in this case, with
our AC transmission system, that power just moves from one
place to the other, it really just goes where the load is.

MR. LYNDE: I guess I'm struggling a
little bit with that comment, because I assume, coming
into Scobie Pond, I guess where that's the terminus of
this, you're telling me there's 2,000 megawatts of
capacity coming into that that's not being used right now?

MR. JIOTTIS: No. It's -- that where it
starts at is another substation with another five lines that come into that from different parts of New England. Some come from Maine, some come from New Hampshire, some come from Vermont, they all tie together. So, it's not as if there's extra capacity. We're just giving it another route to flow down here, if we were to lose an existing line. It's not really new capacity. It's just another route to get power in the same place.

MR. LYNDE: Okay. So, then, if that's the case, why do you feel the need to upgrade the 110 kV line for higher power?

MR. HUDOCK: Right. So, in general, for this entire Project, including this reconductoring, the Independent System Operator is the one making the evaluations of the power grid. So, they're taking into consideration the load that's going to -- the load growth, they're taking into consideration the condition of the system as it stands today. And, they're the ones that make the determination that a line needs to be replaced or upgraded, or a new line needs to be installed. And, so, they're the ones after, you know, these are very, very smart people, with a high degree of technology at their disposal, studying the system constantly to decide, you know, what needs to be done in order to ensure
reliability.

MR. LYNDE: I understand. Obviously, this thing is costing 180 million or something like that -- I'm sorry, 125 million I think is the number you used. And, is that going to show up in rate base somewhere?

MR. HUDOCK: So, the answer is "yes". The cost for upgrades like this, new lines like this, is actually borne through all of New England. So, it's a pooled regional cost is the way it works. So, if -- it doesn't matter the location of the transmission line. So, if this transmission line was magically in Connecticut, those costs would still be borne by the ratepayers in New Hampshire.

And, the way that cost is calculated, it's allocated to the states on a formula based on load. So, I think, as it stands, New Hampshire ratepayers pay approximately 9 percent of the pool. And, so, that is -- the transmission costs are an element on your bill. This Project, all of the transmission projects in the system is the transmission costs. And, what we've done is we've calculated what this Project impact would have on a bill. And, the numbers we came back with, it would be, you know, under $2.00 a year for the average ratepayer.
MR. LYNDE: How much?

MR. HUDOCK: Under $2.00.

MR. LYNDE: All right. So, that's probably assuming that there's increase in load growth also, because, if the load today was static, what would be the impact then?

MR. HUDOCK: Well, in terms of the study, what they look at, and as you mentioned, there's load growth, the needs exist because of -- what they do is a contingency analysis. So, they look and see, if this line happened to go down, can we maintain a reliable system? And, so, some of these needs exist at today's levels.

MR. LYNDE: So, there's a couple things in play here. The issue is reliability. So, we're adding this 345 kV line to add reliability. But it's more than that, because, obviously, it's much more power than what you've got there now. So, somebody's got to pay for that reliability, I guess that's my point. And, if their projections are off, if people start generating more electricity on their own, which may happen, of course, I realize there's going to be a tug-of-war going on now between people trying to get solar credits versus generation. But, if you're wrong, then our rates are
going to go -- people using electricity, their rates are
going to go up, because that transmission line is going to
be in rate base. Is that a fair statement to make?

MR. HUDOCK: I think, in terms of when
you look at this project, yes. Will it cost the
ratepayers a marginal amount? Yes. But I will say that
the Independent System Operator does look at things like
load growth, like energy efficiency, new generation, they
take all of that into account. Because, ultimately,
they're -- they do not want to have a system that is
overcharging customers for unneeded infrastructure.

So, all that being said, in terms of
whether that's been analyzed for potential of new
generation? Yes. The short answer is "it has been", as
far as, you know, that's what their job is to do to make
sure they're accurately forecasting what's expected.

But the other thing I would just add is,
you look at the direct costs of this Project, like I said,
very marginal, you know, under $2.00 for the average
ratepayer a year. But, you know, having a reliability
issue with the transmission system, that's going to be
felt by everybody. Transmission outages can have a
significant impact for everybody, just because of the
large regional effect that it's going to have. And, so,
that's why, you know, you're being proactive to construct something to avoid significant negative consequences. So, I mean, those could be catastrophic or huge, if the wrong thing were to happen, which is why this Project is needed.

   MR. LYNDE: Okay.
   
   MR. IACOPINO: Sir, how many more questions do you have?

   MR. LYNDE: I think I'm all set. So, I'm going to -- thank you.

   MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Okay. The next question that I have, I'll read: Two weeks ago, and this is from a member of the Windham Conservation Commission, two weeks ago, at our town conservation meeting, there was talk about permanent water crossings and access roads. My concern is in reference to the many wetlands and conservation properties along the proposed path. What is the plan for more permanent crossings?

   MR. HUDOCK: Okay. So, I'll address that question. I would just say that, overall, you know, as I think I mentioned a few different times, that, in terms of construction of our Project, cost is certainly an important issue, but also to minimize the impacts to the environment. So, we want to plan and construct the Project in a way that's going to minimize our constraints,
minimize those impacts, including wetlands. So, we have a very robust plan that we have been constantly developing and refining, in order to mitigate our wetland impacts. And, in terms of permanent crossings, you know, I think that part of the overall plan, where there might be opportunities to avoid future impacts, we might be implementing upgrades within the right-of-ways for access and otherwise, that we would see an opportunity to potentially avoid future impacts.

But, overall, when it comes to the wetland impacts, again, this is something that we've spent a lot of time and resources to develop a plan, but that plan is ultimately going to be reviewed by the relevant regulators to make sure that they agree that we're really doing this in a way that minimizes the impacts.

MR. IACOPINO: But, with respect to the plan that you have proposed, are the number of permanent crossings and the increase in permanent crossings and their locations all contained within the Application?

MR. HUDOCK: Yes. I mean, we show our access within the right-of-way to our structures. So, as far as that --

MR. IACOPINO: And, could you tell the folks in the audience where in the Application they might
be able to find that information?

    MR. HUDOCK: Well, we do have environmental plans that is included within our Application. So, I guess I would say, if there are questions as far as crossings or other information about our access, we would be happy to answer that.

    MR. IACOPINO: And, from the Committee's standpoint, as I've said before, the Application, and all of its appendices, are on the website that I gave you the address for before. I suspect that it's -- the volume of the Application that contains the wetlands application -- applications that will contain that information about permanent crossings.

    Of course, the Site Evaluation Committee could modify that as part of their process, if they deemed it appropriate to do so. And, of course, the Division of -- I'm sorry, the Department of Environmental Services would have the opportunity to weigh in on that.

    The next question is, can Kinder Morgan move their pipe under the power line or move it at an angle to the other side?

    MR. HALLISEY: I have some other questions. Can I use the microphone?

    MR. IACOPINO: Sure. Come on up. Why
don't you start with that one, and then -- if you want to explain it, that would be --

MR. HALLISEY: Yes.

MR. IACOPINO: Can you give us your name please?

MR. HALLISEY: George Hallisey.

MR. IACOPINO: And, spell your last name.

MR. HALLISEY: H-a-l-l-i-s-e-y.

MR. IACOPINO: I'm going to ask you to speak slow, so he can take it down.

MR. HALLISEY: And, I'm the president of that association that they said was people 80s and 90s, they're exaggerating. It's not that high.

But my first question is, okay, can Kinder Morgan go underneath your power line, if they wanted to divert the pipeline from one side to the other?

MR. HUDOCK: So, the main -- and, I think, really what the question is is, you know, what detailed constraints are we going to allow Kinder Morgan? And, honestly, you know, the best I could say to that is that we will take their plans, study them, whether it's crossings, whether it's crossing a series of lines, whatever they do, we're going to study that thoroughly,
and verify it's safe, before we would give our okay on
that.

    MR. HALLISEY: Under the basis of what
you're putting in with these power lines, okay, is there a
conflict anywhere bringing in that natural gas pipeline
underneath your power lines?

    MR. HUDOCK: There are locations where
gas pipelines cross through a right-of-way. That
definitely exists today in other right-of-ways, and --

    MR. HALLISEY: So, there's no -- so,
what you're saying, there is no problem with putting it
underneath. So, if we ask to have the pipeline -- the
pipeline coming down, and come off at about a 30 degree
angle, underneath your power lines, to go to the opposite
side, this would be not a problem with Eversource or
Liberty?

    MR. JIOTTIS: I guess, and maybe to just
kind of restate that, we would have to look at where
they're going to cross. To say "there's no problem", it's
very dependent on what they're going to do, how close
they're going to be to structures. There's a lot of
things to make it so it's safe for everybody. But they
could present that. They could say they want to cross
here, and, as Bryan mentioned, we would look at it to
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determine it's safe. Without seeing exactly where they want to go, I can't tell you that it's a "yes" or "no".

MR. HALLISEY: Let me ask you this question. What would make it not safe for them to go underneath?

MR. JIOTTIS: A few items. You could be too close to a structure. So, in other words, if we ever had to dig and replace a structure too close to their pipeline. There could be other similar constraints, physical constraints that would prevent us from working. So, we wouldn't want the line there.

By the same token with them, they need a certain amount of space to do work around their lines. So, they probably couldn't put it right next to our structure, because they need to be able to dig in their trench. So, it's really a lot of physical constraints. And, then, they've got to design it so electrically it's protected, whether that's through some type of cathodic protection or protecting for induced currents.

MR. HALLISEY: So, I guess my final question on this one, would be then what you're saying is that there would be no possibility of the electric -- of the power up in the electricity coming down, going into the ground where that pipeline would be underneath? Is
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there a possibility something could happen there?

MR. JIOTTIS: There's always a possibility of something. But, as part of their design, though, they have to include the --

[Court reporter interruption.]

MR. JIOTTIS: -- include the safeguards to prevent that from happening.

MR. HALLISEY: Okay. Next question.

The right-of-way that you're going to need to bring your equipment down, do you know what the width of that easement is that you're in now?

MR. HUDOCK: Which --

MR. HALLISEY: The easement that you already -- that you have the power lines coming down?

MR. HUDOCK: It varies. There's a number of different dimensions throughout the National Grid and Eversource right-of-way. Within our Application, we do show cross-sections that show our right-of-way width. So, I think that's probably the best place to refer, because it's also specific to locations of right-of-ways.

MR. HALLISEY: But you don't know the actual footage right now, --

MR. JIOTTIS: We do --
MR. HALLISEY: -- from one side to the other?

MR. JIOTTIS: I'm sorry. Yes, we do. But it would be specific, so, you would have to tell me which location you're talking about. You know, for example, where we start in Londonderry, we start at 600 feet. We eventually drop down to 350 feet. So, depending on where -- specifically where you are and where you're looking at, we --

MR. HALLISEY: Well, I'm looking at where we are now, on the maps we have in the town, is 350 feet. Now, what you're saying for the actual right-of-way, how much from the edge of that 350 feet over are you going to need to be able to bring down your equipment?

MR. HUDOCK: In general, you know, I'll say, speak for National Grid, in general, our access is actually through -- through the right-of-way. So, when we're coming parallel to the right-of-way, the access usually is inside of the right-of-way. So, we'll have an access point from outside of the right-of-way, transition into the right-of-way, and then are on --

MR. HALLISEY: Do you know what the right-of-way is now, what the width of that right-of-way
is now?

MR. HUDOCK: Again, I would have to refer back to the actual figures. Because, like I said, it varies. We have about eight different sections involved there. So, --

MR. HALLISEY: So, for my information, what's the maximum that you need for that right-of-way? From that -- from your easement? How much would you need? Fifteen feet? Twenty? Twenty-five feet?

MR. JIOTTIS: I guess, for the location of the line or to drive down?

MR. HALLISEY: To drive down, to bring your trucks down, you have to bring down some heavy equipment, okay, some cranes to get up to the top there. So, how much space would you need there?

MR. JIOTTIS: It might be as little as 15 to 25 feet. It's not a lot.

MR. HALLISEY: Okay.

MR. JIOTTIS: But, again, as Bryan mentioned, we don't necessarily have to drive down the edge of the right-of-way. We can drive down the center of the right-of-way, between the existing structures that are there today, there's space in those.

The easiest -- the easiest way maybe to
answer is to, if you catch up with us afterwards, we can
go over some of the posters you saw outside, where we have
the specific right-of-way cross-sections, we can show you
the distances of where the structures are today, maybe you
can talk about that, as opposed to just kind of throwing
out an approximation.

MR. HALLISEY: Okay. Well, I'm happy to
have all the answers here. I appreciate that. I guess my
last question would be is, for the Site Evaluation down in
here, has anybody looked into the easement that was
granted for the power line that you're on right now, when
that was granted? And, who owned the land and who -- who
owned the land and granted it to a power company? Does
anybody know that?

MR. IACOPINO: That's part of, I mean,
to the extent that it becomes relevant to an issue in the
docket, the Site Evaluation Committee may look at that.
But I don't know exactly -- put it this way, nobody from
the Site Evaluation Committee, at this point in time, has
gone to the Registry of Deeds and researched the --

MR. HALLISEY: I have. It's tough to
find. But there was an easement granted by the Richardson
family in Pelham, okay, from that site line, way back, way
up into northern New Hampshire, to the original power
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company, and they gave them that lifetime easement, to
only do nothing else but to put power lines up in that
area. So, I don't know myself if there's any other -- if
there's any other questions or hooks on that easement that
says "you can" or "can't do something", I think you need
to check into that.

MR. IACOPINO: Well, this is a power
line, though.

MR. HALLISEY: This is power lines.
Just power lines, not Kinder Morgan.

MR. IACOPINO: I know, but --
understood. And, maybe, in the Kinder Morgan docket, that
might become an issue.

But, from what you're saying is, a power
line, a transmission line, such as the Merrimack Valley
Reliability Project, would be within that particular
easement.

MR. HALLISEY: Well, has anybody
questioned about the abutters' rights, okay, to that
easement, that power line that you want take down and make
bigger?

MR. IACOPINO: Well, that's something
that, if the abutters want to participate in the
proceedings, there are many avenues to do that. Tonight,
expressing your opinion, as you have, is one of them.

MR. HALLISEY: Okay.

MR. IACOPINO: Providing written comment to the Site Evaluation Committee is part of what the public can do, and that is considered by the Site Evaluation Committee. You're also free to speak with Counsel for the Public, and Counsel for the Public can determine, from his perspective, if that is an issue that may be -- that he may want to have adjudicated in the case.

And, finally, any individual who is an abutter or has another -- some other right, title, claim or interest that is affected by this Project, can file a motion to intervene. And, the Site Evaluation Committee will, if it's not going to impair the orderly development of -- the orderly conduct of the proceedings, --

MR. HALLISEY: Right.

MR. IACOPINO: -- will grant that intervention. There's a process for doing that. There is a procedural order on the Site Evaluation Committee website that has a deadline for the filing of petitions to intervene. And, I think it's November 13th, but you should double check that on the Site Evaluation Committee's website.
MR. HALLISEY: Will do.

MR. IACOPINO: So, if you or your condo association chose to participate, you would file a motion to intervene. I'll give you an example. We're doing an adjudicatory hearing tomorrow, it's not on an application, but there are -- there is a pro se, when I say "pro se", self-represented environmental agency representing itself, as well as a group of abutters who have intervened, they've hired counsel in that particular case, and they're proceeding in an evidentiary hearing tomorrow and Friday out in Newington. So, there is avenues that are available for the public to participate, and to bring issues, like the one that you raise, to the attention of the Committee.

MR. HALLISEY: Okay. Is there somebody here at the end that I can talk further about this legally that would know more about this?

MR. IACOPINO: You can talk to me about participation. I think you might want to talk to them about your questions about the cross-sections and where near your condo association --

MR. HALLISEY: Yes. Unfortunately, we have -- one of our owners, okay, is a lawyer, and he couldn't be here tonight. So, he wanted to find that out.

MR. IACOPINO: Who is it?
MR. HALLISEY: Huh?

MR. IACOPINO: Who is it?

MR. HALLISEY: His name is Kevin Shanahan.

MR. IACOPINO: Have him give me a call?

MR. HALLISEY: Okay.

MR. IACOPINO: I have a card here.

MR. HALLISEY: You have a card. I'll get that right now. That's good.

All right. I'm done. I thank you for your time and questions, okay. And, just so we can get it on the record down in here, okay, we, 24 units, townhomes, contribute $120,000 a year in the taxes to the town, we are totally against the pipeline, as you can well imagine. All right. And, anything we can do, in any which way at all, okay, to throw a log in front of the train, we're going to try and do that. And, I thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: And, let me just remind people, because we're coming up to the public statements, this is not a hearing about the Kinder Morgan pipeline.

MR. HALLISEY: I understand.

MR. IACOPINO: This is a hearing about the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project.

And, at this point -- at this we're
going to -- you're raising your hand, sir. What can I do for you?

MR. LYNDE: Could I ask one more question?

MR. IACOPINO: How long of a question is it?

MR. LYNDE: It's straightforward.

MR. IACOPINO: All right.

[Court reporter interruption.]

MR. LYNDE: Okay. It's Hal, actually, it's Harold, H-a-r-o-l-d, I go by "Hal", and the last name is Lynde, L-y-n-d-e. You want the address? 114 -- okay. I'm sorry.

MR. IACOPINO: We've got it. He's fine.

MR. LYNDE: Okay. On the 110 kV line, you said it's an "upgrade". Does it -- could you -- is it an upgrade in power capacity, and the size of the wires, how much current you can push through them, etcetera? Could you explain that for me please?

MR. HUDOCK: Sure. Yes, I can do that. So, first, just a small correction. It's 115 kilovolts.

MR. LYNDE: Oh, 115. I'm sorry.

MR. HUDOCK: But, in terms of upgrading it, those lines will stay at the same voltage it is today.
So, it will be 115 kilovolts. But we will be installing a higher capacity conductor on it. So, a different type of conductor that has a higher capacity.

MR. LYNDE: So, what's the power rating before and after?

MR. HUDOCK: I'd have to get back to you afterwards, as far as the before and after power rating. I don't have that off the top of my head.

MR. LYNDE: Are you doubling the current that goes through there or something like that?

MR. HUDOCK: I don't think it's something like that, no. But, as I said, I can give you the exact number.

MR. LYNDE: All right. So, how would I -- how will I get the answer?

MR. HUDOCK: If you want, we have people back there, including our engineer, who might be able to give you a better answer.

MR. LYNDE: That would be good. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. We're now at the point in the public information session where we're going to move into public comments. I think we have four folks who have signed up to speak.
So, we'll start with Mr. David Hennessey, if you could come up to the microphone, followed by Mr. Lynde.

MR. LYNDE: I'm all set.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. And, so, we'll follow Mr. Hennessey with Ms. Huard. And, actually, we've got Mr. Hennessey on here twice. So, you get just one.

MR. HENNESSEY: Just once, I promise.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

MR. HENNESSEY: David Hennessey, H-e-n-n-e-s-s-e-y. I'm Chairman of Zoning here in Pelham, and also Chairman of Nashua Regional Planning Commission. But I want to stipulate that I'm speaking just for myself, as a homeowner and landowner, whose land is being traversed by this, by the power lines.

That's a 1922 easement, by the way, for that right-of-way across my land, that was issued over 90 years ago, and now you're filling it out. But that's okay. What you might not hear often in these hearings is I'm not opposed to the power lines.

I am asking the SEC to ask for a six-month delay in this whole process. And, the reason I think ought to be obvious by now that the 800-pound gorilla in the room is the pipeline. Now, our
understanding at NRPC is that Kinder is making its application to the FERC this month. The lines have changed several times here in Pelham as to the proposed line where that pipeline is going. So, I don't blame you guys for not knowing and how to answer the effect on your system.

So, my response is, let's wait to see that final application to FERC, and see where the pipeline is going, to see how it will affect the power lines. And, then, maybe we can kind of work together through the SEC to do the kind of due diligence that you have promised and fulfilled. And, I'll give you guys credit. You've addressed many of the issues that I've brought up and has been brought up since January.

But you can't answer a lot of the questions here, because you don't know what's going to happen with the pipeline. As recently as three weeks ago, Kinder changed its route here in Pelham, to go from the west side of your power lines, to the east side, with a straight line right across under your power lines, right into my easement. And, weeks ago, my wife and some of your representatives went out there and looked at birds-foot violets —

[Court reporter interruption.]
MR. HENNESSEY: Birds-foot violet, which is a -- something, I don't know, it's not an endangered species, --

FROM THE FLOOR: Threatened.

MR. HENNESSEY: -- a threatened species. And, you folks, you know, took that information and put it out there. My concern is, the timeline that we're looking at, according to your records, you mentioned today this construction might go in late 2016. What I had seen before was it would be built in 2016 with construction ending January 2017, would be done.

Kinder is -- reports saying that's when they're going to start. Now, under your filings, you're saying that you're going to fix all the -- all the dirt, earth, and all disturbed areas. So, I'm envisioning this thing, with you folks all neatly tamping down all of the work. Patting all the endangered species on the back saying "come on back, folks". And, here come the dozers from Kinder on the very same month.

So, to me, it is pretty self-evident that we need some coordination, some discussion between at least your experts and Kinder's with SEC. Not approval, we all understand, Kinder is not -- does not need your approval. However, they have stated to Nashua Regional,
and they have stated in public forums, that they do intend
to appear before you as a promise.

So, my answer, and here's the question, but this is my statement, it's my request. Let's push this back until we can look at the Kinder filing, know what we're dealing with, so that we can get this thing done correctly the first time, and not come back weeks and days, after you guys are all done, and deal with these same issues all over again. Over and over again tonight we've heard the same problem and the same answers, "we don't know".

Let's wait till we do know, and then address them. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. Next person who signed up for a public comment is Peggy Huard.

MS. HUARD: Hi. I'm Peggy Huard, H-u-a-r-d. I am actually from Hudson, New Hampshire. I'd like to speak to a few of the responses to the questions and comments that the people from Eversource and National Grid have made.

First and foremost, there are two reports in their Application that talk about the effects of both electric and magnetic energy, the health effects, one being nerve and muscle damage. There are two
extensive reports, so, I beg you and I urge you to read them carefully, as well as do your own independent study. I have great concerns about this. There are already four transmission lines, with four towers, four sets of towers. The four sets of towers run perpendicular to our road, and two of those come behind my house and several other homes on David Drive.

I do, in the last year, do feel what is outlined in some of these reports, and just write them off to normal health conditions. But, now, reading the report saying "this is why it's happening." So, I urge you to consider that. Because, if it's already happening, a fifth line is going to completely devastate the people in that area.

The environment. The consecutive construction, there are also reports on that that I have read. And, the dates have been given to you. And, as the previous speaker spoke, one will be cleaning up, and the other will be destroying it again, leaving them to clean up.

My road, David Drive, where the power lines are, is a watershed for our pond. They do have this outlined in the maps. There's also aquifers there. One of the poles that are proposed to go along the road are
right -- is right at the edge of the aquifer. Is that sufficient? The activity of drilling that pole, is that going to affect that aquifer that feed our wells. There are two streams, one on David Drive and one on Lenny, that feed down to our pond. I know they have been limited on what they can do with the existing poles, because of the water in that area.

We have deer that run along the power lines, we have birds that run along the power lines. The birds, the turkeys, all of those, if the electromagnetic energy fields affected humans, what is it going to do to these animals?

One report I had read talked about the consecutive construction and what could happen. Is that all of this will leave and not come back, and that would drastically change, not only our neighborhood, but the neighboring -- the very local ponds, and this is one of our most precious natural resources in Hudson.

I also wanted to speak to a comment that was made, and I'm not sure if I understood it correctly. I've studied the power lines intensely on the GIS mapping. I'm actually sat there and traced the power lines from destination to destination. So, I know that we have a long transmission power line going from Comerford, New
Hampshire, which is fed off the Hydro-Quebec, all the way down to Sandy Pond, in Groton. And, that Sandy Pond is a station that reduces the voltage. So, as it comes through at a high voltage, I thought I heard them say that some of these substations tap off that transmission line. Which, if I'm hearing that correctly, they're coming -- that power is coming off at a high voltage, before it was even intended on being used. So, maybe I heard that wrong, and that can be clarified.

Because if you're tapping off as it's going down, something that lowers the voltage to get it ready for use, then it's coming to our houses at a very high -- a higher voltage than was intended.

I could go on and on forever, because I have intimately looked at this more than probably most of citizens. I've looked at the Application, I've looked at the drawings. I'm actually disgusted by -- I'm actually disgusted that you would even contemplate putting a fifth set of power -- transmission lines and towers on any of our property. We are already inconvenienced. We are already being harmed. And, for you to even consider this, and to have to go this process, and not have a process that says "this is an absurd proposal", it's just unforgivable to me.
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I beg you to come out to the site and look at it for yourselves. Stand under the power lines for a little bit. Bring a fluorescent light bulb, I don't know, but come and hear the fizzling, hear the crackling, hear the noise, and then consider what you would be doing to all of these people by approving it. Thank you.

MR. IACOPINO: Okay. I think that exhausts those speakers who have signed up. Is there anybody left who would wish to make a statement?

[No verbal response]

MR. IACOPINO: All right. Just -- okay. Why don't you tell us your name and spell your last name?

MR. COWAN: Rich Cowan, C-o-w-a-n, from Dracut, Massachusetts.

MR. IACOPINO: From where, I'm sorry?

MR. COWAN: Dracut, Massachusetts.

Since this is a project that crosses state lanes, I had the opportunity to file a comment in the Merrimack Reliability Project, you know, at the Massachusetts DEP process, the Massachusetts -- it was filed in the Environmental Reporter. The environmental impact statement that I received, it's a 1,000 page document, it was not placed online for anyone to see it. It's kind of difficult to share it with people. I wish it was placed
online.

But the questions I had about this regarding the insufficient answers received from the power company, when I asked a question "what is the increase in capacity provided by this line?" If you're taking -- taking a corridor with four transmission lines and adding another one, but you're getting one, and then replacing the older model with a newer model, a higher capacity one, then you are, in effect, you know, adding more than two lines' worth of capacity to this line.

But, you know, unlike the pipeline projects, where the capacity is clearly stated, the capacity of the line hasn't been stated. And, it's very clear that the volts times the amperage is the power. And you know, when you talk about transmission lines, like proposed from Canada, you talk about transmission lines that have a wattage of a certain amount. For example, they're talking about -- I believe they're -- I believe they're talking about transmission lines with, is it 1.2 gigawatt capacity, for example. So, if someone could answer that question, it would be useful.

And, if someone could explain why, when we're having a decrease in power consumption in New England, it needs to go up that much. Maybe it does need
to go up. Maybe they do need to replace some of the older circuits with newer circuits to modernize them. But it just seems to me that the increased capacity, not only is it very suspect, but it hasn't been explained. If you reduce the increased capacity of the line, instead of increasing it by, you know, 30-40 percent, which is what it seems like you're doing, but you just increase it by 10 percent, it would probably meet the energy needs that we have, without requiring additional 15 to 20 feet of easement, we talked about requiring a fifth line in that corridor. So, that question, you know, they didn't answer it when I asked it. You could look at the responses by Eversource to my comments, Rich Cowan and Larry Cantrill, in the Massachusetts environmental impact report. We also asked questions about electromagnetic radiation as well and the pipeline proximity. But, you know, it would be important, especially considering that they are -- now there's -- the pipeline route in Dracut actually are in flux right now as well.

So, that's my comment. And, my request for you to get them to publish this stuff online and reveal what's the old capacity, what's the new capacity, because that's, you know, nowhere is that explained. Thank you.
MR. IACOPINO: Thank you. All right. I think I have no other folks signed up to speak or make comments.

One thing that I will say, I forget which speaker mentioned it, it is common for the Site Evaluation Committee to do a site visit in all of our cases where there's a proposed new transmission line or a new energy facility. It is likely that that will happen in this case. And, of course, all of the public comments and the questions and the answers that were given here have been recorded verbatim, and they will be reviewed by the members of the Subcommittee, who will make the ultimate determination on this Application.

With that, I'd like to thank you all. We're going to adjourn this public information session. Thank you.

(Whereupon the public information session was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.)