

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

December 9, 2015 - 6:09 p.m.

Londonderry High School
295 Mammoth Road
Londonderry, New Hampshire
(Rockingham County)

IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-05
SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:
Joint Application of New England
Power Company d/b/a National Grid
and Public Service Company of
New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource
Energy for a Certificate of
Site and Facility.
*(Public Hearing of the
Subcommittee members held pursuant
to RSA 162-H:10, I-c, for a
Presentation by Eversource Energy
and National Grid, followed by a
Question-and-Answer Session, and
comments received from the public.)*

PRESENT:

SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:

F. Anne Ross, Esq.
(Presiding as Presiding Officer)

Public Utilities Commission

Cmsr. Kathryn M. Bailey
Cmsr. Jeffrey Rose

Public Utilities Commission
Dept. of Resources &
Economic Development

Dr. Richard Boisvert

DCR-Div. of Historical Res.

Michele Roberge

Dept. of Environmental Serv.

Patricia Weathersby

Public Member

Roger Hawk

Public Member

Also Present: Michael J. Iacopino, Esq. (Brennan Lenehan..)
Pamela G. Monroe, SEC Administrator

COURT REPORTER: *Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52*

ALSO NOTED AS PRESENT:

FOR THE APPLICANTS:

Reptg. Eversource Energy: Barry Needleman, Esq.
Adam Dumville, Esq.
(McLane, Graf...)

Reptg. National Grid: Mark Rielly, Esq.

COUNSEL FOR THE PUBLIC: Christopher G. Aslin, Esq.
Asst. Atty. General
N.H. Department of Justice

**DEPT. OF ENVIRONMENTAL
SERVICES (DES) :** Collis Adams, Administrator
Wetlands Bureau
Dept. of Environmental Serv.

I N D E X

PAGE NO.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANTS BY:

Mr. Plante 10

QUESTIONS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE/SEC COUNSEL BY:

Presiding Officer Ross 15, 34, 35

Commissioner Bailey 17, 19, 29

Commissioner Rose 18, 39, 43

Ms. Weathersby 19, 28

Mr. Iacopino 21, 32, 35, 41

Ms. Roberge 30

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC AS SUBMITTED 45
(Read by Presiding Officer Ross)

PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY:

Mr. Barthelmes 49

P R O C E E D I N G

PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to a public meeting of the New Hampshire Energy Facility Site Evaluation Committee.

We have one docket for consideration on today's agenda, 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. This is Docket Number 2015-05.

Before turning to our agenda, I would like to ask the Subcommittee members to introduce themselves, and I will begin.

I'm Anne Ross. And, I'm Chairman of this Subcommittee.

MS. ROBERGE: Michelle Roberge. I'm with the Department of Environmental Services.

DR. BOISVERT: Richard Boisvert, with the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Kate Bailey, a Commissioner at the Public Utilities Commission.

COMMISSIONER ROSE: Good evening. Jeff Rose, Commissioner of the Department of Resources and Economic Development.

1 MS. WEATHERSBY: I'm Patricia
2 Weathersby, a public member.

3 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: And, I don't
4 know whether we have any representatives of departments,
5 if so, would you please introduce yourselves.

6 MR. ADAMS: Good evening. My name is
7 Collis Adams. I'm here on behalf of the Department of
8 Environmental Services, where I serve as the Wetlands
9 Bureau Administrator, and I also oversee the Shoreland
10 Protection Program.

11 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.
12 And, Chris, would you like to introduce yourself.

13 MR. ASLIN: Good evening. I am Chris
14 Aslin. I am an Assistant Attorney General, and I've been
15 designated in this proceeding as Counsel for the Public.
16 In that role, I represent the public's interest to review
17 the Application, make comments, hire experts, etcetera.

18 Public Counsel is a resource for
19 public -- members of the public, but I don't represent
20 individual members of the public. So, I want to make that
21 clear that, if an individual has an interest in the case,
22 on a personal level, they're free to talk to me, I'm open
23 to hearing their concerns and issues, but I can't
24 represent you individually in a legal matter. I can only

1 represent the public as a whole.

2 So, if you have individualized issues,
3 you should consider your own counsel. But, if you wish to
4 communicate to Counsel for the Public your concerns, I'm
5 very much open to hearing from you, and I will take all
6 that into consideration as I represent the public interest
7 in this proceeding.

8 Feel free to come see me afterwards if
9 you have things to tell me. Thank you.

10 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Any other
11 agencies represented?

12 *[No verbal response]*

13 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. This is
14 the Joint Application of New England Power Company, doing
15 business as National Grid, and Public Service Company of
16 New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy, for a
17 Certificate of Site and Facility.

18 On August 5th, 2015, New England Power
19 Company and Public Service Company collectively filed a
20 Joint Application for a Certificate of Site and Facility
21 with the Site Evaluation Committee. The Application seeks
22 the issuance of a Certificate of Site and Facility
23 approving the siting, construction, and operation of a new
24 345 kV electric transmission line, referred to as the

1 "Project".

2 The proposed transmission line will be
3 constructed in an existing developed transmission line
4 corridor between New England Power's Tewksbury 22A
5 Substation in Tewksbury, Massachusetts, and PSNH's Scobie
6 Pond 345 kV Substation in Londonderry, New Hampshire. The
7 preexisting transmission line corridor traverses the towns
8 of Pelham and Hudson, in Hillsborough County, and Windham
9 and Londonderry, in Rockingham County.

10 On August 12th, 2015, the Committee
11 designated a Subcommittee to review and address the
12 Application in this docket. On September 1st, 2015,
13 Attorney Christopher Aslin was designated to serve as
14 Counsel for the Public in this docket.

15 On October 5th, the Subcommittee found
16 that the Application was complete and accepted it. On
17 August [October?] 8th, a Procedural Order was issued in
18 this docket. In this Order, the Subcommittee ordered the
19 Applicant to conduct public information sessions in
20 Rockingham and Hillsborough Counties on October 29th and
21 November 4th. The Subcommittee also scheduled a
22 prehearing conference for December 3rd, 2015, and ordered
23 potential intervenors to file motions to intervene by
24 November 13th, 2015.

1 On October 16th, 2015, the Applicant
2 supplemented the Application by filing the Shoreland
3 Impact Permit that was issued by the Department of
4 Environmental Services on October 1st, 2015.

5 On October 29th and November 4th,
6 pursuant to the Subcommittee's Procedural Order, the
7 Applicant conducted public information sessions in
8 Rockingham and Hillsborough Counties.

9 The Subcommittee received one Motion to
10 Intervene in this docket. That Motion was filed by
11 Margaret Huard on November 5th, 2015. Ms. Huard's Motion
12 to Intervene was granted on November 30, 2015.

13 A prehearing conference in this docket
14 was held on December 3rd, 2015. As a result of the
15 prehearing conference, a procedural schedule issued. A
16 final adjudicative hearing is scheduled for June 2016.

17 We are here today for a joint public
18 hearing in this docket. Under RSA 162-H:10, I-c, within
19 90 days after acceptance of an Application for a
20 Certificate, the Subcommittee is required to hold at least
21 one public hearing in each county in which the proposed
22 project is to be located. The public hearings are joint
23 hearings with representatives of the agencies that have
24 permitting or other regulatory authority over the subject

1 matter, and are deemed to satisfy all initial requirements
2 for public hearings under statutes requiring permits
3 relative to environmental impact. The hearings are also
4 joint hearings with the other state agencies and are
5 conducted in lieu of all hearings otherwise required by
6 any of the other state agencies.

7 Notice of this joint public hearing was
8 served upon the public by publication in the New Hampshire
9 Union Leader on November 16th, 2015.

10 In this docket we will proceed as
11 follows: We will first hear a presentation by the
12 Applicant. Following that presentation, Subcommittee
13 members, agency representatives, and Committee Staff will
14 have the opportunity to pose questions to the Applicant.
15 Thereafter, the public will be permitted to pose questions
16 to the Applicant. If you have a question for the
17 Applicant, we ask that you please write your question down
18 on a card, and hand it to Counsel for the Committee, Mike
19 Iacopino, who is sitting to my right, or the Committee's
20 Administrator, Pamela Monroe, who is down at the end, on
21 the left. We will try to organize all the questions by
22 subject matter and present them to the Applicant in an
23 organized fashion.

24 Once we have asked all of the questions

1 that the public may have, we will then take public
2 statements or comments on the Application. Please make
3 your public statements as succinct as possible, and try
4 not to be repetitive. You can sign up to make a public
5 statement on the sheets provided at the door.

6 And, now, we will hear the presentation
7 by the Applicant.

8 MR. PLANTE: Good evening, ladies and
9 gentlemen, madam Chairman, members of the board of the
10 Committee. My name is David Plante, and I'm the Manager
11 of Transmission Projects for Eversource in New Hampshire.
12 My colleague, Bryan Hudock, from National Grid, is with me
13 here tonight, as well as several key members of our
14 Project Team. We're here tonight to continue our
15 discussion about the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project
16 as part of our NH SEC process. As mentioned in the
17 opening remarks, this is the second of two
18 post-Application public hearings.

19 As part of this process, we'd like to
20 reiterate our commitment to provide an open communications
21 to the public regarding the details of our Project. We
22 recognize the importance of public participation in
23 projects of this nature and will continue to listen to and
24 address your concerns and ideas.

1 To ground everyone on what the Project
2 is and how it fits into the electric delivery system, this
3 is a transmission project, an electric transmission
4 project. On this diagram, there's an arrow pointing to
5 the three transmission towers, for lack of a better way to
6 describe what it looks like, I guess. We're not proposing
7 to build any towers that look like that.

8 But, to the left of that diagram,
9 there's a series of icons that represent the various types
10 of electricity generation facilities, and these are
11 located at a variety of places throughout the region.
12 From these generators, then pump electricity into the
13 transmission system, where it's then transported over
14 great distances to population centers, where it is then
15 reduced in voltage at a substation or a series of
16 substations to a lower voltage, where it is passed along
17 to roadside distribution lines for eventual delivery to
18 your homes and businesses.

19 Think of it as a superhighway of the
20 electric system. It has a few onramps, generating
21 stations, and a few offramps, transmission substations,
22 but moves large quantities of electric power.

23 Why do we need this Project? The
24 ISO-New England, the Independent System Operator for New

1 England, the body that's responsible for planning the
2 transmission system, has undertaken a study of the
3 northern Massachusetts and southern New Hampshire area,
4 which is the fastest growing demand in New England. And,
5 they have identified several potential overloads to the
6 transmission system at current and even prior to current
7 load levels.

8 National Grid and Eversource have
9 combined to develop a solution, which part of which is the
10 Merrimack Valley Reliability Project, that will meet the
11 demands that have been identified in this study.

12 So, what is MVRP? This is basically a,
13 as the Chairman had already described, it's a 24 and a
14 half mile long 345 kV transmission line between Tewksbury
15 Substation, in Tewksbury, Massachusetts, owned by National
16 Grid, and Scobie Pond Substation, in Londonderry, New
17 Hampshire, owned by Eversource. Eighteen (18) miles of
18 that line is in New Hampshire. And, you can see below the
19 breakdown of mileages in each of the four towns in New
20 Hampshire that are proposed for the line to be occupying.

21 As well, this Project represents a
22 \$123 million capital investment between Eversource and
23 National Grid; 82 million of that is in New Hampshire.
24 And, we also have a breakdown per community of that

1 investment. We are proposing a 2016, late 2016
2 construction start, followed by a late 2017 completion.

3 Benefits for this Project? MVRP will
4 improve the reliability of the electric system in this
5 region of New England, to address the issues that have
6 been identified by ISO-New England, to meet the growing
7 demands of the customers in this part of the region.

8 Other benefits of the Project include
9 significant tax revenues that will be realized by the four
10 communities proposing to host this Project, as well as a
11 significant number of direct and indirect jobs that will
12 be created by the Project.

13 Where are we today in the process? This
14 slide represents the four major steps in the New Hampshire
15 Site Evaluation process. In May of this year, we started
16 at Step 1. That's where the Site Evaluation process
17 started. Our Project Teams have been involved with this
18 Project for in excess of two years to get to this point.
19 So, we began with our pre-application public information
20 sessions in May, where we held two of those.

21 Step 2: After we filed our Application
22 in August, we followed that up with two post-Application
23 public information meetings; one in October and one in
24 early November.

1 And, we are today at Step 3, which is
2 the joint SEC/agency public hearings, which have to be
3 held within 90 days post-Application. So, we are in the
4 second of two of those meetings.

5 Step 4: As mentioned earlier will be
6 adjudicative hearings in June, followed by a decision by
7 the Site Evaluation Committee hopefully sometime in the
8 Summer of 2016.

9 And, lastly, we want to again emphasize
10 our commitment to free and open communication, and call to
11 your attention the website that the Project has. This is
12 a website that addresses several projects that are part of
13 the Greater Boston/Southern New Hampshire Study.
14 Merrimack Valley Reliability Project has its own tab or
15 slide within that website.

16 We also have a toll-free number. We
17 have a dedicated team of outreach and community relations
18 professionals who are at the ready to address and respond
19 to any questions or concerns that you may bring up.

20 Thank you very much.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Any questions
22 from any members of the Subcommittee?

23 *[No verbal response]*

24 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I have a

1 couple. I know you're in an existing right-of-way, but I
2 believe there are some areas of the right-of-way that
3 currently have trees on them and will need to be trimmed
4 back. And, I wonder if you could explain sort of how much
5 of the right-of-way is actually going to have to be
6 widened, and perhaps in what areas?

7 MR. PLANTE: Sure. I'll take that. You
8 know, basically, there are no areas of the right-of-way,
9 from a real estate perspective, that require any widening.
10 All of the easement rights are in place and have been in
11 place for decades. However, essentially every section of
12 the right-of-way will require some degree of vegetation
13 management, be it a small amount of side trimming, which
14 is basically on the more southerly portions of the
15 Project, to a more significant tree-clearing effort, which
16 would be taking place in the section of the Project
17 basically between David Drive, in Hudson, moving up toward
18 Wiley Hill Road, in Londonderry. This is about a 4-mile
19 long piece of the Project, where we're proposing to clear
20 approximately 80 to 85 feet of additional wooded area to
21 create a -- to create space for our proposed Project.

22 The remaining 6 miles of the Project,
23 from that point north towards Scobie Pond, will also
24 require some tree removal, as our Project is proposing to

1 occupy a position in more or less the center of the
2 existing corridor, however, that center has a narrow strip
3 of trees that has never been removed. So, our Project
4 would require removal of those trees as well.

5 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I have another
6 question.

7 Your new towers and support structures,
8 can you indicate what height they will be, and how they
9 compare with the heights of the existing support
10 structures that are in the right-of-way?

11 MR. PLANTE: Sure. I can get that one,
12 too.

13 In the existing right-of-way, our
14 average structure heights for Londonderry and Hudson are
15 approximately 78 to 79 feet above grade. And, the
16 proposed structure heights are 86 to 90 feet. So,
17 basically, you know, 8, 9, 10 feet higher than the average
18 structure heights that are there now.

19 And, for the National Grid piece of the
20 Project, which is David Drive, in Hudson, and south, the
21 average heights, because there's a much greater variety of
22 voltages in the National Grid part of the right-of-way
23 there, their heights are averaging from 55, up to about
24 80 feet, or -- yes, 55, up to about 80 feet. Our proposed

1 heights will be 75 to 80 and -- yes, 75 to 80. So,
2 they're somewhat greater than the average -- there's a
3 greater difference between proposed and average in that
4 section of the right-of-way, because there is an existing,
5 fairly short transmission line in that section.

6 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.
7 Other Committee members?

8 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Can you talk a
9 little bit about what mean by a "reliability project"? Do
10 you have -- do you have to build this Project?

11 MR. HUDOCK: Sure, I'll take that one.

12 MR. PLANTE: I'll go to the backup.

13 MR. HUDOCK: So, I'll answer that
14 question.

15 In terms of the need for the Project,
16 this was identified in a study undertaken by the
17 Independent System Operator of New England. And, what
18 they do is evaluate the transmission system under current
19 and projected load, and also to stress the system, in
20 terms of analyzing the impacts if various components were
21 to be taken out-of-service, whether they're lines or
22 station components.

23 And, what they found was that, under
24 certain conditions, at today's load levels, and in future

1 load levels, there are a number of potential overloads on
2 the system, if certain of these contingencies were to take
3 effect.

4 So, in terms of reliability, what this
5 Project will do is to strengthen the system such that it
6 will -- the overall solution will mitigate those effects
7 of the contingencies so that they no longer cause
8 potential overloads on the transmission system.

9 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Just a follow-up
10 along those lines then.

11 Is there currently constraints within
12 the system or risks within the system, if this Project
13 were not to move forward?

14 MR. HUDOCK: So, as I said earlier, some
15 of these contingencies take place at existing load levels.
16 But I would say that it requires certain contingencies to
17 take effect.

18 So, there is, I would say, a small risk
19 there of issues happening the longer that this Project is
20 not put in service. However, in terms of constraints, the
21 system is maintained by the Independent System Operator to
22 work around their existing system. And, so, the reason
23 why we haven't seen any impacts, because they're
24 constantly taking, you know, the system conditions into

1 account when managing the system such that they can
2 minimize the risk of this happening.

3 MS. WEATHERSBY: Will this then allow
4 more development in the area or is this more for the
5 existing level of development?

6 MR. HUDOCK: So, the study takes into
7 account a number of factors. Some of which is the load
8 growth in the overall area. So, as was mentioned in the
9 presentation, the overall demand on the system is some of
10 the highest in the overall New England area, and has been
11 growing.

12 Additionally, taking into account things
13 such as generator retirements, that also potentially
14 require the need for newer and different ways to move
15 power from one area of the region to another.

16 And, so, in terms of enhancing the
17 reliability of the system, it kind of ensures continued
18 reliability for the entire area. I wouldn't necessarily
19 look at it as a capacity issue, in terms of adding more
20 capacity to the system, but more to enhance the
21 reliability of the system.

22 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: So, the
23 transmission system is interconnected throughout New
24 England, correct?

1 MR. HUDOCK: That's correct.

2 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: So, improving the
3 reliability here in New Hampshire will improve the
4 reliability throughout New England, is that true?

5 MR. HUDOCK: Yes, that's correct. You
6 know, the difference between an issue with the
7 distribution system, which is going to be more localized,
8 you imagine a tree falls on a wire at your house, it's
9 going to affect a very small local area.

10 Transmission issues or outages are going
11 to affect a much broader and potentially regional area
12 when they happen, which is why it's important to ensure
13 that we minimize that risk that they would not occur.

14 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: So, do New
15 Hampshire ratepayers have to pay the whole bill?

16 MR. HUDOCK: No. Transmission upgrades
17 are funded by all New England ratepayers through a line
18 item on their bill.

19 The way that's calculated, it's a
20 regional pool, where the costs of that pool are funded by
21 state load levels. And, so, currently, New Hampshire
22 residents pay 9 percent of the regional transmission pool.
23 So, for this Project, they will be paying, you know,
24 approximately 9 percent of the overall Project costs.

1 And, we calculated that for the typical New Hampshire
2 residential customer, that factors into a difference on
3 their bill of one to two dollars a year.

4 And, the other thing I would emphasize
5 is that this funding would be regardless of where the
6 Project is located. So, whether it was entirely in
7 Massachusetts or entirely in New Hampshire or, you know,
8 in Rhode Island, that same funding mechanism would still
9 be in place for this Project.

10 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: And, does the
11 FERC, Federal Regulatory Commission, review that, those
12 rates?

13 MR. PLANTE: I'm not sure how that
14 works.

15 MR. HUDOCK: Yes. I'm not exactly sure.
16 You know, I know that ISO-New England is related to the
17 Federal Energy Regulatory Committee, FERC. But, in terms
18 of exactly who sets the state rates, I would have to get
19 back to you on that one.

20 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I'm pretty sure
21 it's FERC.

22 MR. IACOPINO: I have a question. You
23 mentioned "contingencies" on the system, and then you gave
24 us an example of something that would harm the

1 distribution system, a tree falling on a distribution wire
2 at your house.

3 Can you give us some examples of the
4 contingencies that ISO is concerned about that might
5 happen to cause problems on the transmission system?

6 MR. HUDOCK: So, generally,
7 contingencies are revolving around elements of the system
8 being out-of-service. And, so, those include elements of
9 lines, individual towers, or, you know, components of a
10 substation. And, so, they don't necessarily look at
11 causes, in terms of how it would happen, but more modeling
12 the fact that it does happen.

13 So, in general, they look through
14 thousands and thousands of possible combinations of
15 contingency cases to determine system weaknesses.

16 MR. IACOPINO: But it's not -- it's not
17 the wire being down, when you're talking about the
18 transmission system, generally?

19 MR. HUDOCK: Well, I wouldn't say --
20 yes, generally, no. But they do model -- part of the
21 modeling is having a line out-of-service. So, there could
22 be a number of reasons for that. It could be that the
23 line is out-of-service for a maintenance activity or other
24 issue. But that is -- part of the modeling does include

1 the potential for a line being out-of-service, as far as
2 modeling what impact that would have on the system.

3 MR. IACOPINO: I have a question about
4 electric and magnetic fields. We know that they exist
5 within these types of projects. And, we know that there's
6 an existing corridor with existing lines. Will this
7 Project increase the electric and magnetic fields along
8 the route of this corridor?

9 MR. BAILEY: In some sections, the
10 addition of a new transmission line will increase the
11 levels of electric and magnetic fields to a small extent
12 at the edge of the right-of-way.

13 However, because of the Project design,
14 those are limited by two factors. One is that the
15 proposed new line would be, in most locations, located
16 towards the center of the right-of-way, giving it a
17 greater distance from the edge of the right-of-way, and
18 therefore having less of an influence than it would
19 otherwise. And, second of all, that the electric and
20 magnetic fields, not only from the new line, but from the
21 existing lines, have a magnitude, as well as direction.
22 And, when placed close together, and if the timing of the
23 phasing of the line is optimized, can -- the magnetic
24 fields and the electric fields from the lines can mutually

1 cancel one another. So, the closer they are together and
2 the better the optimization, the lower the fields will be
3 at the edge of the right-of-way.

4 MR. IACOPINO: So, if I understand then,
5 generally, there will be some slight increase in the
6 electric and magnetic fields?

7 MR. BAILEY: Yes. Today, the highest
8 level at the edge of the right-of-way, if I recall, is
9 about 28 milligauss, and that's before the Project. And,
10 after the Project, that will decrease by about 5
11 milligauss. So, in that location, where the fields are
12 highest, the Project will result in a decrease in the
13 magnetic field.

14 MR. IACOPINO: But there are places
15 where there is an increase along the corridor?

16 MR. BAILEY: Yes. The increases are of
17 the same magnitude as the decrease people saw before, on
18 the order of, you know, a few milligauss, to maybe a
19 dozen.

20 MR. IACOPINO: And, how can we be sure
21 that those increases in the electric and magnetic fields
22 won't have an impact on the health of -- health and safety
23 of the people who either reside or use the power line
24 corridors, live near the power line corridors?

1 MR. BAILEY: Well, scientists have been
2 looking into this question for more than 30 years. One
3 thing to recognize is that the Project will meet standards
4 set by two international organizations. One standard is
5 set by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing
6 Radiation Protection, which is affiliated with the World
7 Health Organization. Another organization is the
8 International Committee for Electromagnetic Safety, that
9 also has standards. And, the field levels on the
10 right-of-way and at the edge of the right-of-way will be a
11 very small fraction of their guidelines.

12 So, for instance, the 28 milligauss that
13 I mentioned is a value at the edge of the right-of-way
14 under the existing conditions, is very much smaller than
15 the 2,000 milligauss or 9,040 milligauss recommendations
16 set by these standards.

17 In addition, we've had decades of
18 research conducted to determine whether exposure to
19 electric and magnetic fields to people, animals, and other
20 organisms have adverse biological effects or produce
21 outright harm. Like everything else, we know that very
22 high levels of electric and magnetic fields can produce
23 stimulation effects. We know that, you know, if you press
24 very gently against the table, there's no pain. But, if

1 you ram your hand into the table, it's painful. The same
2 thing is true with electric and magnetic fields. At very
3 high levels, there can be adverse stimulation of the
4 nervous system. But the guidelines are set so that the
5 exposures, even of workers at the electric utilities, who
6 are in close vicinity to energized conductors at high
7 voltages, that their exposures are multiple factors below
8 the levels at which adverse biological effects might be
9 expected.

10 In addition, there has been decades of
11 research that have been looking at whether exposures at
12 very low levels, such as we might have in our own homes
13 from appliances or from wiring, might have some adverse
14 effects. And, despite all the research, no health agency
15 has determined that these exposures pose a health risk to
16 the public.

17 MR. IACOPINO: The same question I asked
18 you last night, about clusters, cancer clusters and things
19 like that, does the scientific literature contain any
20 indications of those sorts of phenomenon in the vicinity
21 of high voltage wires like these?

22 MR. BAILEY: No -- well, the health
23 departments investigate clusters of many types of health
24 conditions. I know of no report by a public health agency

1 or a publication in a journal that has shown that there is
2 a clustering of disease around transmission lines.

3 MR. IACOPINO: What about noise? Do
4 these wires make noise?

5 MR. BAILEY: Transmission lines are
6 designed to minimize the production of noise, and are
7 quite quiet during fair weather conditions. In wet
8 weather conditions, when there are hanging drops of
9 moisture on the conductors, that drop of moisture can form
10 a basis for the small discharge of energy we call
11 "corona". And, under those circumstances, there can be a
12 small crackling sound.

13 Generally, the same conditions that lead
14 to this type of corona noise from the transmission line
15 are also conditions that produce noise themselves. So,
16 wind blowing through trees, rain and so on. And, so, the
17 increased noise under foul weather conditions may well be
18 screened by noise from the environmental factors
19 themselves.

20 MR. IACOPINO: And, will the addition of
21 this particular Project into this corridor increase that
22 noise or decrease it?

23 MR. BAILEY: There will be a slight
24 increase in the levels of audible noise, but these levels

1 are quite small. And, even under the foul weather
2 conditions, at the highest levels, the audible noise
3 levels are below the EPA guidelines.

4 MR. IACOPINO: And, it's my
5 understanding that your company has prepared a report,
6 based upon models that you've developed, for both
7 electromagnetic fields, as well as noise. And, it's
8 contained in the Application, is that correct?

9 MR. BAILEY: That's correct.

10 MS. WEATHERSBY: As a follow-up to the
11 health question, the 2,000 milligauss standard, is that
12 based on a certain distance from the lines or a certain
13 duration of exposure? I'm thinking of an abutter to the
14 line that is subject to it, you know, pretty much
15 constantly.

16 MR. BAILEY: The standard is not
17 based -- the standard is not set for transmission lines
18 specifically. It's set for exposure to electric and
19 magnetic fields from any source, whether it be a
20 transmission line, distribution line, appliance, and so
21 on. And, it is not time-limited.

22 So, the actual standard is a
23 biologically-based standard. That the electric and
24 magnetic fields will not induce a certain level of voltage

1 within tissues in the body. So, if you are below, let's
2 say, 2,000 milligauss, you are guarantied that the levels
3 of electric fields produced within the body will comply
4 with the standard.

5 You can go to much higher levels than
6 2,000 milligauss, if you can show, through biological
7 modeling, that you do not exceed this electric field
8 within the body. But these standards have quite a bit of
9 what we call a "safety" or "uncertainty" factor. So that
10 any person in our environment that is exposed to a field
11 is very unlikely to encounter an exposure that would
12 exceed this 2,000 milligauss limit.

13 Offhand, the only kind of exposure that
14 I know of that would possibly exceed that that the general
15 public could encounter were some fields from hair dryers
16 that we measure, which can go into, in a few cases, to a
17 few thousands, or even the highest recorded is 15,000
18 milligauss, which would exceed the standard.

19 But, other than that example, I don't
20 know of any situation where that standard would be
21 exceeded.

22 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: You mentioned
23 that, in the location today, under the existing
24 transmission lines, the highest EMF recording is 28 -- or,

1 will be 28 milligauss, but -- and that's because the
2 magnitude offsets the existing milligauss. And, you said
3 that, in other areas, the -- what's the term? It's not
4 "milligauss", the EMF will increase slightly.

5 MR. BAILEY: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: But is there any
7 place along the route that's higher -- that will be higher
8 than 28 milligauss when the new line is in service or is
9 that the highest?

10 MR. BAILEY: Twenty-eight (28)
11 milligauss is the value that was calculated for the
12 existing transmission line as it is today, before the
13 Project. And, that is the highest field level we
14 calculated at the edge of the right-of-way.

15 After the Project, the field levels
16 will, in that particular situation I quoted, will be
17 reduced by 5 milligauss. And, all of the other levels at
18 the edge of the right-of-way, before or after the Project,
19 will be below that 28 milligauss level.

20 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.

21 MS. ROBERGE: When you -- can you hear
22 me? When you speak about the levels along the route for
23 EMFs, are you using a model to predict that? And, if so,
24 can you speak to the accuracy of the model and just give

1 some background on that?

2 MR. BAILEY: Certainly. The way that
3 electric and magnetic fields are calculated involves
4 applying the laws of physics. And, if you take the
5 position of the current-carrying wires, and you know the
6 voltage applied to those wires, you know the current
7 flowing through them, you know how the wires are arranged
8 in space, one can calculate exactly through the laws of
9 physics what the electric or magnetic field will be at
10 locations around the transmission line or any source.

11 The model, the way that we do these
12 calculations, we use a program that was developed by a
13 division of the Department of Energy, that has been
14 applied throughout the country, tested many times, and is
15 specified by several states as the model to be used in
16 calculating compliance with their standards.

17 Generally, these, for the input values,
18 can be quite accurate. When we go out in the field and
19 measure the electric or magnetic fields from a
20 transmission line and compare them to calculations, except
21 for variations due to the terrain not being flat or
22 shielding by vegetation and so on, we find that there's
23 quite a good agreement between the calculated and measured
24 values.

1 MS. ROBERGE: And, would you say that
2 these models are site-specific? Do they take into account
3 the terrain of the area or the specifics related to this
4 Project?

5 MR. BAILEY: Yes. The Project is
6 divided -- the Project route is divided into sections in
7 which the characteristics of the transmission lines
8 differ. And, so, within those sections, for the length of
9 those, each of those sections, the particular combination
10 of transmission lines and the loading on those lines is
11 stable. So that, when we do the calculations, they will
12 apply to most of that entire section.

13 However, if you go five miles further,
14 one way or another way down the line, the conditions may
15 be different, in that the transmission lines that are on
16 the right-of-way may not be the same. There may have been
17 intervening lines which have added or joined the
18 right-of-way, which affect the calculations, or that the
19 loading on the lines may change from another section.

20 So, for that reason, we have, in our
21 report, calculated the site-specific values for each of
22 these sections of the right-of-way.

23 MR. IACOPINO: I have some environmental
24 questions. We know that there are access areas to the

1 existing right-of-way, and I understand that there will be
2 some additional permanent access areas to the
3 right-of-way, once this Project, if it's allowed, is
4 completed.

5 And, I'd like you to please address what
6 impacts can be expected as a result of having those
7 additional -- additional permanent access points to the
8 right-of-way?

9 MS. TREFRY: Sherrie Trefry, with VHB,
10 responding to that question. We do have some permanent
11 proposed access ways within the National Grid portion of
12 the Project, particularly in the area of the Pelham
13 Substation, where that substation needs to be accessed for
14 maintenance, as well as to access switching equipment.
15 So, we've proposed permanent access in that area, which
16 also includes four permanent wetland crossings in that
17 area.

18 MR. IACOPINO: And, what's the impact on
19 those wetlands or those crossings? And, how is it
20 mitigated, if there is an impact?

21 MS. TREFRY: The impact for permanent
22 area for the entire Project is 4,428 square feet, which
23 includes structures and permanent crossings. I don't have
24 the exact permanent crossing figures -- numbers to give

1 you at the moment.

2 We've proposed stone ford crossings in
3 those locations at the recommendation of the Army Corps.
4 They are recommending that in order to basically reinforce
5 those wetland crossings, but still allow hydrology to
6 continue to move through those wetland areas, as well as
7 vegetation to grow up between the rocks. So, it still
8 maintains a wetland-type function, and allows for travel.
9 So, that's what we've proposed in those areas to minimize
10 the impacts to the wetlands.

11 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Could you just
12 describe what a "stone ford crossing" actually looks like?

13 MS. TREFRY: Yes. So, a stone ford
14 crossing tries to mimic the existing topographic area.
15 And, we put in stone, New Hampshire Fish & Game has asked
16 us to put in round stone.

17 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. How big
18 would the stone be?

19 MS. TREFRY: I don't know exactly how
20 big the stone would be. New Hampshire Fish & Game will
21 dictate to us exactly what they're looking for. I think
22 it's going to be around 3- to 5-inch stone. They ask for
23 smooth stone, in order for animals, such as turtles, to be
24 able to easily move over the stone. And, National Grid

1 agreed to that.

2 MR. IACOPINO: And, last night, we heard
3 some concern from some members of the public about I think
4 it's the Robinson Pond area. Could you explain what
5 impact, if any, that this Project will have on that pond
6 and its tributaries?

7 MS. TREFRY: Yes. VHB looked at and
8 evaluated all the wetlands and surface waters within the
9 right-of-way, and calculated the impacts as a result of
10 this Project. The majority of the impacts are temporary,
11 related to construction aspects to get into the
12 right-of-way and down the corridor.

13 The wetland impacts will be temporary,
14 as I said. So, it shouldn't have an impact on the
15 Robinson Pond watershed as a whole. Those areas will be
16 restored.

17 We'll also have proposed sediment
18 erosion controls that are depicted on the wetland
19 permitting plans that will address water quality concerns,
20 such as sedimentation during the construction process.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I have some
22 questions just about construction and actually how it's
23 staged and managed.

24 Assuming that this went to hearing in

1 June, and that there were some type of approval in the
2 summertime, what would the construction activity be?
3 Would it be one section at a time or would there be
4 construction along the whole route? And, would there be
5 heavy dirt-moving equipment? And, if so, what kind of
6 schedule of operation?

7 I'm just trying to get a feel for how
8 disruptive the actual construction might be on some of
9 these local communities, who are, you know, abutters or
10 people who are near the right-of-way.

11 MR. PLANTE: Yes. As far as
12 construction sequencing is concerned, and how it affects
13 the overall Project, transmission line construction, by
14 its very nature, is a bit of a serial effort. You know,
15 initially, we would need to engage in forestry activities
16 to get the right-of-way cleared to allow the other
17 construction activities then to take place.

18 So, that begins, and proceeds for, you
19 know, a period of time, to create enough space for the
20 subsequent activities to begin. Those activities include
21 installation of all the erosion and sediment control
22 measures that are part of our Application, would be,
23 obviously, conditions of any approvals. And, following
24 that is the installation of any specific construction

1 access improvements that could include some grading of
2 existing access roads within the right-of-way.
3 Installation of rock trap areas at intersections of our
4 right-of-way with public roads, to ensure that we don't
5 track mud and whatnot from the right-of-way onto the
6 roads.

7 Then, once the accesses are established,
8 we would begin with civil construction-type activities
9 that would facilitate foundation installations, because
10 there are some -- some structures on the Project will
11 require foundations. The great many of the structures are
12 actually directly embedded pole-type structures. They
13 don't really require a foundation, *per se*. But they do
14 require civil construction activities to establish the
15 hole and prepare for structure installation.

16 So, that activity begins, and then
17 follows the forestry, which follow the construction access
18 and erosion control stuff. And, then, following that is
19 the onset of actual line construction activity, which
20 would involve mobilizing of the materials to each
21 construction site. So, each, in our Application, the
22 construction plans show work areas for each construction
23 site.

24 So, we first mobilize our material to

1 those sites, a small crew complement of line workers would
2 then engage in any pre-erection framing of the materials
3 on the ground, to make sure that they can maximize the
4 on-the-ground work, because it's much more efficient than
5 doing certain activities in the air.

6 So, that crew then passes along,
7 followed by the structure erection crew, which actually
8 goes pretty quick, once all the ground work is done, so
9 they would erect the structure, backfill it, and then
10 engage in whatever restoration activities would be
11 required at that structure location. Get it graded,
12 loamed, seeded, mulched, to make sure that we can
13 establish -- reestablish growth as quickly as possible.

14 And, then, lastly, the wire installation
15 process follows that. And, wire installation requires
16 longer segments of the Project to actually have structures
17 installed before you start your wire work. Because wire
18 runs generally are in -- measured in miles, rather than
19 each structure. So, the wire is last, by its nature, and
20 generally doesn't take quite as long, because it goes in
21 such large chunks.

22 Once the wire installation is done, we
23 engage in the demobilization activities in the
24 right-of-way, restoration and whatnot.

1 So, it's likely that large portions of
2 the Project length will be engaged in construction
3 activities at once.

4 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: And, roughly
5 how long would construction take?

6 MR. PLANTE: We're envisioning an
7 overall construction timeframe of about a year. We figure
8 we'd start forestry activities late 2016, and into the
9 Winter of '17, and then follow that with all of our line
10 construction activities. So, all portions of the
11 right-of-way won't be engaged for year.

12 COMMISSIONER ROSE: I was wondering if
13 you could speak to your analysis on impacts to wildlife,
14 if there's any endangered or threatened species along the
15 corridor, and your review for any threatened or endangered
16 plant life?

17 MS. TREFRY: Sherrie Trefry, from VHB.
18 We reviewed the Project with the Natural Heritage Bureau
19 database, and came out with a number of rare plants and
20 animal species. We met with the Natural Heritage Bureau,
21 as well as New Hampshire Fish & Game, to establish
22 protocols for surveys for certain species. And, we
23 engaged in survey activities in the Summer of 2015, and
24 will continue to survey into 2016.

1 The species, animal species that we
2 surveyed for included the black racer snake in the
3 springtime. We did not locate any black racers when we
4 went out there. So, Fish & Game has asked us to go out
5 again in the Spring of 2016, which we will do. We did
6 turtle nesting surveys to identify turtle nesting areas
7 within the right-of-way. And, we will do pre-construction
8 sweeps if the construction is occurring in those turtle
9 nesting areas to avoid any impacts to turtle nests. We
10 will also do New England cottontail surveys this winter,
11 once the snow falls. That's the appropriate time to go
12 out there.

13 Last year, because of the depth of snow,
14 it was impossible to do it last year. So, we'll do it
15 this year, after the first snow, to identify whether the
16 New England cottontail is present or not.

17 And, we also did rare plant species
18 surveys, and identified three different rare plants that
19 occur within the right-of-way area. And, we've been
20 working with the Natural Heritage Bureau, as well as New
21 Hampshire Fish & Game, to come up with strategies to avoid
22 those rare plant species. We've relocated structures,
23 access ways, temporary work areas, to avoid any impacts to
24 rare species. And, we'll continue to do surveys right up

1 through construction, and then have an environmental
2 monitor present during construction to make sure we avoid
3 any impacts to rare plants.

4 We also did a northern long-eared bat
5 acoustic survey, because of suitable summer habitat to the
6 northern long-eared bat. The results of our survey did
7 not have any positive identification of any northern
8 long-eared bat. We submitted that report to the U.S. Army
9 Corps, who made a determination of no effects for the
10 Project, and submitted that to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife
11 Service for their concurrence, which they did concur. So,
12 we do not expect any impacts to the northern long-eared
13 bat.

14 MR. IACOPINO: I have a question about
15 wildlife. Are some of the towers that you're going to use
16 the lattice-style of towers? And, do they pose -- do
17 those towers pose any issues for roosting or anything like
18 that for any of the avian species you might find on this
19 corridor?

20 MS. TREFRY: I don't, in terms of the
21 structure --

22 MR. PLANTE: I'll talk about the
23 structure, and then you can take the rest of it.

24 MS. TREFRY: Okay.

1 MR. PLANTE: None of the structures that
2 are proposed for the Project are lattice-type structures.
3 They're all round steel structures, basically, pole-type.

4 MR. IACOPINO: I assume that poses no
5 roosting problems then?

6 MS. TREFRY: Correct.

7 MR. IACOPINO: Then, I'd just like to
8 switch a little bit and talk about historic resources. In
9 September, we received a report from the Division of
10 Historic Resources indicating that all the Phase IA
11 archaeological surveying had been completed, and I think
12 it was about 40 percent of the Phase 1B testing was
13 completed.

14 Has there been any progress on
15 completing that Phase 1B since September?

16 MS. TREFRY: Sherrie Trefry. I am not
17 the historical resources expert, but I can speak to the
18 progress that has been made.

19 The consultant has completed the Phase
20 1B survey, and did not identify any significant
21 archeological resources. They submitted that report to
22 the Division of Historical Resources for comment. And,
23 we're still waiting for their response, in terms of their
24 concurrence with that report.

1 MR. IACOPINO: Thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER ROSE: In the presentation,
3 it was referenced that there would be increase in tax
4 revenue to the host communities. And, I was wondering if
5 you could quantify that?

6 MR. HUDOCK: We can quantify it. I
7 think we had it up there on one of our slides. So, if you
8 give me a second, I can --

9 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Oh, sorry. I may
10 have missed it, because my back is to the slides.

11 MR. HUDOCK: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER ROSE: But I did catch that
13 part, so --

14 MR. HUDOCK: Okay. I can either look it
15 up for you, or I think we're also going to be providing
16 this presentation electronically and making it available.
17 Oh, it's right here in front of me.

18 So, what we're currently -- that's the
19 current investment. So, you know, we will get those
20 numbers, though. We do have the actual estimated tax
21 revenues.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: We're just
23 checking to see if we have any written questions from the
24 public. If you have some, and you haven't handed them in,

1 please do so now.

2 MR. IACOPINO: Does anybody have any
3 questions they wanted to ask of the audience that they
4 have written down on a piece of paper? I will pick it up
5 for you. Are you still writing?

6 FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

7 MR. IACOPINO: Yes. Anybody else?

8 (Short pause).

9 MR. PLANTE: I have an answer to your
10 tax question.

11 COMMISSIONER ROSE: Please.

12 MR. PLANTE: Per our expert on economic
13 studies, Lisa Shapiro, in her testimony, she notes that,
14 in the first year of operation, the Project will pay
15 approximately \$760,000 to \$1.1 million in total property
16 taxes. And, this is broken down in the following
17 categories: And, it's 491,000 and 796,000 to the two
18 local communities, and this would be the -- this is just
19 the Eversource piece at the moment, so that would be
20 Londonderry and Hudson; 28,500 to 42,200 to the two
21 counties; and 240 to 250 to the State for redistribution
22 to local school districts through state aid. That's for
23 the Eversource piece.

24 And, I'll find the -- you don't have

1 that in front of you? We'll see if we can find it before
2 we're done today. If not, we'll have to get back to you.

3 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: All right. The
4 first question is from David Barthelmes.

5 MR. BARTHELMES: Very good.

6 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I try.

7 During construction will abutters need
8 to be available? And, will there be much lead time in
9 finding out that the construction is going to be in your
10 area?

11 MR. PLANTE: I would say that the
12 abutters don't need to be available. I don't believe
13 there's, in most cases, there's no need for our
14 construction activities to venture onto or off of our
15 right-of-way.

16 However, if there is a desire to have
17 any specific amount of advance notice of the process and
18 progress of our activity, we are absolutely more than
19 happy to give you whatever information you want, in
20 however far in advance is convenient for you.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: And, there's a
22 follow-up question. And, that is, what would the property
23 value impact of the Project be?

24 MR. PLANTE: Okay. I don't think I can

1 take that. But I have Bob Varney here, who's -- there you
2 go, Bob.

3 MR. VARNEY: Make a few statements here,
4 stepping in. Thank you. For the record, my name is Bob
5 Varney, from Normandeau Associates.

6 I prepared prefilled testimony on the
7 issue of land-use and orderly development. And, in the
8 course of preparing my report and testimony, I reviewed
9 the report prepared by Dr. James Chalmers, who is an
10 economist and licensed appraiser.

11 He prepared a report that is in the
12 Application in Appendix AK, and provided detailed prefilled
13 testimony, which concluded that there's no basis in the
14 published literature or in the New Hampshire-specific
15 research initiatives that are described in his report to
16 expect that the Project would have a discernible effect on
17 property values or marketing times for property for sale
18 in local or regional real estate markets.

19 His report covered four topics in
20 reaching his conclusion. He conducted a literature
21 review, and reviewed approximately 25 related studies,
22 looking specifically at the issue of transmission lines
23 and their relationship to property values. He conducted
24 New Hampshire case-specific studies, looking at

1 approximately 58 properties. He conducted subdivision
2 studies, I believe about 13 or so subdivisions. And, as
3 well as market activity research, which is looking at the
4 MLS.

5 And, based on these four elements of
6 review, he reached the conclusion that I just described.

7 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.

8 This question is from Doug Thomas. How
9 will the new SEC rules affect application -- the
10 Application? And, will they be used during evaluation and
11 Project --

12 MR. THOMAS: Adjudication process.

13 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Adjudication
14 process. Sorry. I was having trouble with the writing.

15 MR. THOMAS: That's okay.

16 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Thank you.

17 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I'm sorry.

18 MR. NEEDLEMAN: Hi. I'm Barry
19 Needleman, counsel for the Applicants, from McLane
20 Middleton.

21 The short answer to that question is
22 that the final rules have not yet been adopted. I think
23 the expectation is that they will be sometime shortly.
24 And, there is a provision in the revised statute that

1 contemplates what will happen if rules are adopted while
2 projects are pending in front of the Committee at that
3 time. And, it's our understanding that it will be up to
4 the Committee, based on the statute, to determine whether
5 or not those new rules apply when they're adopted.

6 MR. IACOPINO: Actually, I'm going to
7 address that issue from the Committee's standpoint. Our
8 view of the statute is that, once -- once new rules have
9 come into effect, if this Project, or any other project,
10 for that matter, has not yet advanced to an adjudicative
11 hearing, it will be subject to the new rules. However, we
12 do have to provide an opportunity for the Applicant to
13 provide any information that might be -- might be required
14 under the new rules that was not required under the old
15 rules.

16 I don't know if there's anything like
17 that in this particular case, whether this particular
18 Project at this point would require such a delay in order
19 to get the new information. That assessment hasn't been
20 made yet. But that's our view of what the statute
21 requires.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. That
23 completes our written questions. We don't have any people
24 indicating that they are interested in making comments.

1 But, before we close, I would invite people to make
2 comments from the public, if you wish to?

3 I'm sorry. Go ahead.

4 MR. HUDOCK: If I may, I just wanted to
5 report back on the question regarding the first year
6 property tax estimates for the National Grid portion of
7 the Project.

8 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.

9 MR. HUDOCK: This was included in our
10 prefiled testimony from our in-house economist. But he
11 estimated that, for the first year after construction,
12 this Project would result in tax payments of \$571,700 for
13 Pelham, New Hampshire, \$71,200 for Hudson, New Hampshire,
14 and \$235,800 to Windham, New Hampshire.

15 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you.

16 Were there any people wishing to comment?

17 Go ahead, sir. If you could just state
18 your name, yes, and come to the mike.

19 MR. BARTHELMES: My name is David
20 Barthelmes. I live at 10 Jason Drive. I'm one of the
21 direct abutters.

22 I had a question about the date of the
23 study about property impact. Because, obviously, since I
24 learned about this, this is a subject that's near and dear

1 to my heart. And, I have found a lot of information that
2 studies done before 2009 tended to use demographic areas
3 where the median income or the median value of the
4 property was significantly less than the average home
5 value in Londonderry. So, I was just wondering if we
6 could find out what towns were looked at, and what was the
7 median income?

8 Because studies that I've looked at have
9 indicated that homes in the 300,000 to 500,000 suffer as
10 much as a 6 percent as a result of visible power lines.
11 And, the issue comes down to "visible". Personally, for
12 the record, I don't put much into this EMF. I'm an
13 engineer and I've worked with this.

14 But perception is everything. So, I'd
15 be very interested to know when was the study done? And,
16 if you could get back to us here now, or at some point,
17 that would be great.

18 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: I don't know if
19 the Applicant is able to answer tonight, are you?

20 MR. VARNEY: Bob Varney, Normandeau
21 Associates.

22 My recollection of Appendix AK is that
23 the report was -- I have it in my car, actually, if you'd
24 like to look at it after the meeting. It's, I believe,

1 June 30th, 2015, and covers the four elements that I
2 described a few moments ago.

3 MR. BARTHELMES: And, does that have the
4 towns? Will that list what towns were used as part of
5 that study?

6 MR. VARNEY: The report explains his
7 methodology for the four elements that he reviewed, as
8 well as his conclusions about the fact that there are no
9 discernible effects on local and regional property values
10 and marketing times associated with the Project. There --
11 associated with electric transmission lines.

12 There are site-specific situations that
13 are associated with proximity and visibility. So, and
14 there are multiple characteristics associated with each
15 property, as you know, that come into play when you're
16 considering property value and marketability of a
17 property.

18 And, I would encourage you to read that
19 report. Thank you.

20 MR. IACOPINO: You can find that report
21 on the Site Evaluation Committee's website, which is
22 www.nhsec.nh.gov. And, it's in the Application section
23 for this Project. And, it's at Appendix AK, alpha-kilo.

24 MR. BARTHELMES: Thank you.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Thank you. Are
2 there any other people who wish to make a comment tonight,
3 before we close the hearing?

4 *[No verbal response]*

5 PRESIDING OFFICER ROSS: Okay. And,
6 just to follow up on what Attorney Iacopino just
7 mentioned. The filing can be found on our website. And,
8 this is a fairly transparent process. The transcript of
9 tonight's hearing will also eventually be available, once
10 it's completed, it will be available in electronic form on
11 the website, as will the transcript of other public
12 proceedings in the docket. So, feel free to access it on
13 line.

14 And, thank you very much for coming out
15 tonight and for sharing your views.

16 **(Whereupon the joint public information**
17 **session was adjourned at 7:23 p.m.)**

18
19
20
21
22
23
24