

New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee
21 South Fruit Street
Suite 10
Concord, MA 03305

Merrimack Valley Reliability Project
SEC Docket # 2015-05

REBUTTAL TO APPLICANTS' OBJECTION TO INTERVENE HUARD'S MOTION FOR REHEARING

On this 27th day of October, 2016, we the effected parties as undersigned on the MOTION for REHEARING dated October 19, 2016, reaffirm this motion as a legally sufficient and valid motion in accordance with the NH SEC Rule 202.29 and NH RSA 541:3.

The argument made in the OBJECTION TO MOTION FOR REHEARING claiming the signers on the Motion for Rehearing fail to demonstrate standing pursuant to RSA 541:3 is false. Addresses were provided and many are clearly marked as abutters. Each signer will forward separate statements indicating why they believe they are a person DIRECTLY affected, giving them the right to file a MOTION for REHEARING under NH RSA 541:3. NH RSA 541:3 does not provide a definition nor guidance as to what directly affected is. The cases that are quoted throughout the OBJECTION TO MOTION FOR REHEARING are irrelevant to the docket at hand. None of the cases noted involved dangerous high voltage transmission lines or major construction that required trespassing on, destruction and theft of private property. None of these cases involved MAJOR alterations of the surrounding aesthetics and environment. These cases should be disregarded and the MVRP should be considered separately, against the statute in its own merit.

The statement that the decision was well reasoned and thoroughly supported by comprehensive record is false. There are many instances that are presented in the motion for rehearing that point out incomplete and unclear arguments and deliberations that show gross errors in judgment and reasoning and errors in applying applicable laws. Please consider them and give them the weight and respect that the people affected deserve. To do otherwise will result in future legal repercussions and ramification to the NH SEC.

The statement that the MOTION merely rehashes previous arguments made is false. Argument made in the MOTION for REHEARING emphasizes competent relevant evidence that was unjustifiably and unlawfully disregarded by the NH SEC subcommittee in making their decision.

The statement that the applicant had met their burden of proof pursuant to NH SEC Rule 202.19 is false. Mere statements were often supplied as the sole means of evidence and often competent, reliable evidence in conflict with the applicants' statements was disregarded. Many statements made were mere opinion and do not PROVE anything. Please consider specific points made in MOTION for REHEARING, specifically but not limited to exhibit 50 which has been completely disregarded.

The continued argument that the applicants do not have to acquire any private property to construct this project because it is on an existing right of way is false. Please consider the argument made in the original Motion for Rehearing.

The continued disregard for the personal property that the applicant thinks they are going to trespass on, destroy and steal personal property from (timber) is criminal and will be pursued as such.

We respectfully reaffirm our MOTION for REHEARING and our desire to have the NH SEC subcommittee reconsider the specific points and concerns discussed in the Motion for Rehearing.

Margaret Huard, Intervener and other affected parties as signed in the original Motion for Rehearing.

Certificate of Service

We hereby certify that on the 27th day of October, electronic copies have been served upon the SEC Distribution List.

Margaret Huard, Intervener and other affected parties as signed in the original Motion for Rehearing.