

**Douglas and Martha Evelyn
53 Post Road
Sugar Hill, NH 03586**

March 27, 2016

Re: Request for Review of Out of Time Petition to Intervene

New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee, Docket No. 2015-06 Northern Pass

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

Dear Ms. Monroe,

My wife and I respectfully request to intervene in the SEC's proceedings under Docket No. 2015-06 relating to the proposed Northern Pass transmission line. In accordance with the SEC's regulations, we are directing this electronic request to you, with copies to the SEC's distribution list for this proceeding as noted in the "cc" below.

We are filing this petition to intervene after the February 5, 2016 deadline and request your review at this time because the Applicants did not indicate until February 26, 2016 that they would file their former preferred overhead project, which passes near our property, as the Alternate Route.

As indicated below, we seek intervention to protect our personal property rights and interests. Mindful of the SEC's concern for efficiency, it would be our intention to group with others along the proposed Alternate Route with like interests to advise the SEC on the impact of the use of the proposed Alternate Route, in the event that possibility becomes an issue.

Attachment 1 to "Application Updates re: New Rules," filed with the SEC on February 26, 2016, is titled "NPT Project Maps – Alternate Route. Preliminary Design. February 2016. Additional Information." It is posted at Tab 261 on the SEC website page for the Northern Pass docket. Attachment 1 contains an updated map (dated February 2016) of the Alternate Route near our property.

The Applicants state that they are submitting these updated, February 2016 maps as additional information on "the one alternate route that [they] considered technically available, although not preferred, but that is in reality not a viable alternative" (Cover letter, February 26, 2016, also at Tab 261). Given the ambiguity of this statement and lacking a legal guarantee that this route, which was the preferred route for five years, will not be revived as the preferred route at some

point in this proceeding, we are petitioning to intervene in order to protect our affected property interests, as is our statutory right.

Our particular rights, duties, privileges, immunities or other substantial interests that may be adversely affected by the Alternate Route relate to the property that we own at 53 Post Road, Sugar Hill, NH 03586.

Although we are non-abutters to the proposed overhead project on the Alternate Route, the project is within a ½ mile of our home and stretches across our view shed of the Kinsman range for approximately 3 miles (**including proposed towers and lines from approximately DC 751 to DC 768, on the project maps mentioned above**). Our family has owned property at this location since the 1920s. We are the third generation to live here, and we invested significantly to acquire and upgrade the residence when we retired here in 2006. This investment is threatened by the severe impact the towers would have on the views and our enjoyment of the landscape. Our property's value for potential sale or rental, if circumstances should ever force that, is diminished. We are aware that an immediate neighbor has held a residence off the market for nearly two years because buyers have been discouraged by the possibility of construction of the towers. We continue to be fearful that the value and use of our property will be severely compromised if the Alternate Route were to be chosen. Our life savings are at stake.

The towers and cables will intersect our driving routes daily, be visible from our home and recreational locations throughout our neighborhood and be a constant industrial presence in our lives.

Our property interests are unique and substantial. To combine our interests with those of others would limit our procedural rights and would hinder our ability to protect our property effectively, as is our statutory right. As indicated above we would specifically consider aligning with Alternate Route abutters and non-abutters with like interests should that become necessary during the SEC Docket No. 2015-06 process.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Douglas E. Evelyn (and Martha Evelyn)
53 Post Road
Sugar Hill, NH 03586

Cc: SEC distribution list for Docket No. 2015-06 as of March 27, 2016