

March 7, 2016

SENT VIA U.S. MAIL AND EMAIL

Pamela G. Monroe, Administrator
New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee
21 South Fruit Street, Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301-2429

RE: New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee Docket No. 2015-06
Joint Application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC and Public Service
Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy for a Certificate of Site
and Facility for Construction of a New High Voltage Transmission Line in New
Hampshire

Dear Ms. Monroe:

Enclosed for filing in the above-captioned matter with the New Hampshire Site Evaluation
Committee is the Reply of Appalachian Mountain Club to Applicants' Response and Objection
to Certain Petitions to Intervene.

Copies of this letter and its enclosure have this date been forwarded via email to all parties on the
Distribution List.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,



William L. Plouffe

Enclosure

cc: Distribution List (Rev. 3/1/2016) via email
Client

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Docket No. 2015-06

Joint Application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC
and Public Service Company of New Hampshire
d/b/a Eversource Energy for a Certificate of Site and Facility

**REPLY OF APPALACHIAN MOUNTAIN CLUB TO APPLICANTS' RESPONSE
AND OBJECTION TO CERTAIN PETITIONS TO INTERVENE**

The Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC) hereby replies to the Applicants' Response and Objection to Certain Petitions to Intervene (the "Intervention Objection"), dated February 26, 2016, as follows:

1. The Applicants do not object to AMC's intervention in these proceedings. Intervention Objection "Obj." at para. 53. The Applicants do attempt to limit the AMC's participation in these proceedings by requesting the Committee to order that the AMC be combined with four other petitioning interveners, viz: Society for Protection of New Hampshire Forests (SPNHF), Conservation Law Foundation (CLF), New Hampshire Sierra Club (Sierra Club) and Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust (Trust) for purposes of discovery, presentation of evidence, examination of witnesses and argument. Obj. at para. 55.¹

2. The Applicants' stated reason for limiting the AMC's participation is to foster the orderly conduct of the proceedings and the timely processing of the application. Obj. at para. 55.

¹ The Applicants have advocated for the combining of interveners as part of their Intervention Objection. It is not clear whether the Applicants are stating that a) they conditionally agree to the intervention of these groups or b) agree to the interventions but suggest that a procedural order be issued combining these interveners. The title of the Applicants' pleading does not inform us but if the intent is to request a procedural order then AMC suggests that Applicants should have filed a separate motion to that effect and, before doing so, should have contacted the named organizations to seek agreement or compromise on the proposal. See Site 202.14. The AMC was not contacted by the Applicants prior to filing of the Intervention Objection.

3. The Applicants' basis for limiting the AMC's participation is that the AMC's Petition to Intervene asserted interests in these proceedings which are the same as the interests asserted by the other named interveners, notwithstanding that the Intervention Objection itself calls out certain interests of SPNHF and CLF which are not shared by AMC in these proceedings. Obj. at para. 64 (SPNHF's property interests) and para. 65 (CLF's concerns about Canadian hydro power).

4. A close examination of AMC's Petition to Intervene reveals that, in fact, the interests which AMC seeks to protect are not identical to the interests asserted by the other groups. For example, the AMC has a long standing role and interest in outdoor education and recreation, especially in the White Mountains region, which is not equally shared by the other groups. In addition, AMC's long history of working to protect New Hampshire's natural resources and character from inappropriate development, be it preventing a multi-lane interstate highway through Franconia Notch, to our more recent involvement in SEC rulemaking and interventions before the SEC on various industrial-scale wind power projects, means we bring experience, credibility, and expertise on specific issues that the Project engages which are distinct from those of the other groups. Also, the AMC contributes close to \$18 million annually (73% of which benefits businesses other than AMC)² to NH's economy from out-of-state visitors to our huts and lodges in the White Mountains and the Lakes Region who come to experience the state's landscape. Finally, the AMC and its Chapters run numerous organized recreational trips in the regions which will be impacted by this Project.

² Lee, D.S. 2015. Economic Impact of the Appalachian Mountain Club's Huts and Lodges in New Hampshire - June 2014 to May 2015. Report of The Center for Rural Partnerships, Plymouth State University. <http://www.outdoors.org/publications/outdoors/2016/fieldnotes/amcs-economic-support-for-nh-18-million.cfm>.

5. AMC is sensitive to the Committee's interest in the orderly conduct of these proceedings and the timely processing of the application. AMC has demonstrated by its participation in other proceedings before the Committee that it can and will present its case in a manner which will not interfere with the orderly conduct of the Committee's business or unduly delay the processing of the application.

6. With respect to the instant proceedings, AMC and SPNHF anticipate jointly presenting expert testimony to the Committee on the issue of adverse effects on aesthetics, thereby avoiding duplication and saving the Committee's time. Further, AMC intends to cooperate closely with other groups in presenting evidence on issues of common concern.

7. AMC has a one hundred-forty year history of advocating for the protection of the natural resources and beauty of New Hampshire and has unique insights and expertise on the issues that will be critical to the Committee's review of this application. Further, AMC has already devoted significant resources to preparing for full participation as an intervener in these proceedings.

8. AMC believes strongly that the consolidation of AMC with other interveners will unjustly and prejudicially limit its participation in discovery, examination of witnesses, presentation of evidence and argument and will prevent AMC from protecting the interests that formed the basis for its intervention. AMC further believes that such is unnecessary to the orderly and timely processing of this application.³

WHEREFORE, the AMC respectfully requests that:

1. Its Petition to Intervene be granted; and


³ As an example of prejudice, AMC would not have the independent ability to seek discovery pursuant to SEC 202.12(d).

2. The Applicants' request that AMC be combined with other interveners be denied.

Date: March 7, 2016.

Respectfully Submitted,

APPALACHIAN MOUNTAIN CLUB

By: 
William L. Plouffe, Esq. (ME Bar #2480)
Drummond Woodsum & MacMahon
84 Marginal Way, Suite 600
Portland, ME 04101-2480
(207) 772-1941
wplouffe@dwmlaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day, March 7, 2016, a copy of the foregoing Reply of Appalachian Mountain Club to Applicants' Response and Objection to Certain Petitions to Intervene was sent by electronic mail to all persons named on the Service List in this docket.


William L. Plouffe, Esq.