

Kris Pastoriza
294 Gibson Rd.
Easton, NH 03580
krispastoriza@gmail.com

January 7, 2016

Petition to Intervene
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 Northern Pass

Dear Ms. Monroe:

I respectfully request to intervene in the SEC's proceedings under Docket No. 2015-06 Northern Pass.

I have a substantial interest in the Ham Branch watershed in Easton and its associated terrain and historic resources, which are vulnerable to damage by the proposed Northern Pass HVDC transmission line burial under NH Route 116 and by the original proposed overland route.

1.) I live and own property in Easton, NH and am the author of the Nomination of the Ham Branch Watershed in Easton to the New Hampshire Rivers Management and Protection Program.

<http://xml2.des.state.nh.us/blogs/rmac/wp-content/uploads/Ham-Branch-River-Nomination-Application.pdf>

The application was recommended for approval by Mr. Burack as head of the DES. In his letter of approval he wrote; "While only 23.1 miles of the Ham Branch River and its tributaries are part of this nomination, the river and the corridor resources received 418 points out of a maximum of 595 under the point system evaluation for river-related resources outlined in Env-Wq 1800 (Administrative Rules of the RMPP.)" In addition, I wrote a supplement to the application expanding on the watershed and local historical resources. http://xml2.des.state.nh.us/blogs/rmac/wp-content/uploads/Appendix_C-River-Narrative.pdf

I am also co-author, with Susan Schibanoff, of two submissions to the Section 106 historical review, which are available on request.

The proposed burial of Northern Pass HVDC lines under NH Route 116 would transect this watershed at eight locations, leaving the watershed highly vulnerable to contamination and damage. There are several historic resources along Route 116 that are also vulnerable to damage by burial of the line. Having spent many hours on the river and in research for the nomination, nomination supplement, Section 106 submissions and Easton history, I have an uncommon and specific knowledge of, and duty toward, the watershed and its associated environmental and historic resources.

2.) In addition, for four years Northern Pass actively planned to site its line on land owned by my

family, on which I live. This 300 acre parcel abuts 100 acres of land above it, which I own. My property has a view of the initial proposed route that extends far up the Reel Brook valley. The lower parcel contains 19 acres of highly visible ROW. Both parcels are under a conservation easement with the Society of Protection of New Hampshire Forests. This original route, still not legally removed from consideration, would be sited in the headwaters of the extensive Reel Brook watershed, crossing it three times before crossing the Ham Branch on my family's land, on a pole and foundation planned within feet of its banks. It would then traverse extensive wetlands, crossing an unnamed tributary to the Ham Branch, and crossing Noyes Brook between two beaver ponds. This above ground route has a high potential for damage to the river and associated extensive wetlands, which include the ROW itself because of the regular clearing to which it is subjected. The fact that Eversource only this year was required to remove (with helicopters) creosote and pentachlorophol treated poles that had been discarded by PSNH 30 years ago in the ROW in North Woodstock, Lincoln and Easton indicates the vigilance and on-the-ground dedication to the watershed required to protect local resources from Eversource's inadequate standards and monitoring. These poles were discarded in White Mountain National Forest in wetlands and, in several locations, the watershed, in violation of PSNH/Eversource's Special Use Permit with WMNF. Their removal was a direct result of my involvement with the NH Rivers Management and Protection Program.

Construction along this initially proposed route would damage the watershed.

Construction along this proposed route would destroy the properties aforementioned, due the towers' aesthetic, social, psychological and environmental impact. The erection of highly visible industrial symbols of corporate amorality and abuse of power would be grossly oppressive and psychologically damaging.

My interest as a property owner and guardian of the watershed are direct and substantial and distinct from the interests of the public at large.

Sincerely,

Kris Pastoriza,

cc: SEC distribution list for Docket No. 2015-06