

**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**

March 18, 2016

ORDER ON PETITIONS TO INTERVENE

I. Background

On October 19, 2015, Northern Pass Transmission LLC and Public Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy (collectively Applicant) submitted an Application to the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee (Committee) for a Certificate of Site and Facility (Application) to construct a 192-mile transmission line. The transmission line, sometimes referred to herein as the Project, is proposed to have a capacity rating of up to 1,090 MW, and to run through New Hampshire from the Canadian border in Pittsburg to Deerfield.

On November 2, 2015, pursuant to RSA 162-H:4-a, the Chairman of the Committee appointed a Subcommittee (Subcommittee) to consider the Application.

The deadline for filing motions to intervene in this docket was February 5, 2016. The Subcommittee received over 160 petitions to intervene.

On February 26, 2016, the Applicant filed a Response and Objection to Certain Petitions to Intervene. The Applicant filed a revised Exhibit A to its Response and Objection on March 4, 2016. On February 26, 2016, the Applicant also filed a separate objection to New England Power Generators Association's Petition for Intervention.

The Subcommittee received numerous replies to the Applicant's Response and Objection to Certain Petitions to Intervene.

II. Intervention

A. Standard for Intervention

The New Hampshire Administrative Procedure Act provides that an administrative agency must allow intervention when:

- (a) The petition is submitted in writing to the presiding officer, with copies mailed to all parties named in the presiding officer's notice of the hearing, at least 3 days before the hearing;
- (b) The petition states facts demonstrating that the petitioner's rights, duties, immunities or other substantial interests may be affected by the proceeding or that the petitioner qualifies as an intervener under any provision of the law; and
- (c) The presiding officer determines that the interests of justice and the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceedings would not be impaired by allowing the intervention.

See RSA 541-A:32, I. The statute also permits the presiding officer to allow intervention "at any time upon determining that such intervention would be in the interests of justice and would not impair the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceedings." RSA 541-A:32, II. The Committee's rules contain similar provisions. *See* N.H. CODE ADMIN. R. ANN. Site 202.11 (b)-(c).

Pursuant to RSA 162-H:4, V, the presiding officer is authorized to rule on petitions for intervention. The Administrative Procedure Act and our procedural rules also allow the presiding officer to place limits on an intervenor's participation. *See* RSA 541-A:32, III; N.H. CODE ADMIN. R. ANN. Site 202.11(d). The presiding officer may limit the issues pertaining to a particular intervenor, limit the procedures in which a particular intervenor may participate, or combine intervenors and other parties for the purposes of the proceeding so long as the limitations placed on intervenors do not prevent the intervenor from protecting an interest that formed the basis of intervention. *See* N.H. CODE ADMIN. R. ANN. Site 202.11(d).

B. The Motions to Intervene

The Subcommittee received Petitions to Intervene from the following types of entities and individuals: (i) local governmental entities including towns, municipal sub-units, conservation commissions, county commissions, the Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee, and the Lafayette School Board; (ii) individuals and groups of individuals; (iii) non-governmental organizations; (iv) businesses and organizations with economic interests; and (v) government officials including state representatives and senators, as well as Grafton County Commissioner, Rick Samson; and (vi) New England Power Generators Association, Inc. This Order will address each petition within each identified group.

1. Local Government Entities

a. Towns, Municipal Sub-Units and Conservation Commissions

The Subcommittee received petitions to intervene from the following towns, and municipal sub-units:

- Town of Pittsburg (Pittsburg);
- Town of Clarksville (Clarksville);
- Town of Stewartstown (Stewartstown);
- Town of Colebrook (Colebrook);¹
- Town of Northumberland (Northumberland);
- Town of Whitefield – Board of Selectmen; Planning Board (Whitefield);
- Town of Dalton – Board of Selectmen; Conservation Commission (Dalton);

¹ Colebrook's Petition to Intervene was filed after the deadline set forth by the Procedural Order. However, the Applicant did not object to the Town's late filed Petition. In addition, acceptance of the late filed Petition is in the public interest and will not disrupt the orderly and efficient resolution of matters before the Subcommittee. *See* N.H. CODE ADMIN. R. ANN. Site 202.15. Therefore, the Town of Colebrook's Petition is accepted and considered in this docket.

- Town of Bethlehem – Board of Selectmen; Planning Board; Conservation Commission (Bethlehem);
- Town of Littleton (Littleton);
- Town of Sugar Hill (Sugar Hill);
- Town of Franconia – Board of Selectmen; Planning Board; Conservation Commission (Franconia);
- Town of Easton – Board of Selectmen; Planning Board; Conservation Commission (Easton);
- Town of Woodstock (Woodstock);
- Town of Holderness (Holderness);
- Town of Plymouth (Plymouth);
- Town of Ashland - Board of Selectmen; Conservation Commission; Water & Sewer Department (Ashland);
- Town of Bridgewater (Bridgewater);
- Town of New Hampton (New Hampton);
- Town of Bristol (Bristol);
- Town of Canterbury (Canterbury);
- City of Concord (Concord);
- Town of Pembroke - Board of Selectmen and Conservation Commission (Pembroke);
- Town of Deerfield - Board of Selectmen and Planning Board; Conservation Commission (Deerfield);
- City of Franklin (Franklin);
- City of Berlin (Berlin);
- City of Manchester (Manchester); and
- City of Nashua (Nashua).

Many of the local government entities have common concerns. Those concerns are best addressed on a geographic basis. Some of the local government entities that have moved to intervene will host a portion of the Project. Others will be in close proximity to the Project but the Project will not fall within town boundaries. This Order will address the motions to intervene filed by local government entities on a geographic basis.

i. Towns, Municipal Sub-Units and Conservation Commissions Crossed by the Project.

In general, the towns, planning boards, and conservation commissions along the northern portion of the Project where it will be constructed within new and previously existing rights-of-way are concerned about the effect of the Project on the environment, aesthetics, economy and tourism, community, historic sites, property values, and health of their residents.² The towns that are located within the middle portion of the Project are concerned about the effects of the underground construction on the Project and its effects on the natural environment, wetlands and rivers, wells and waste water facilities, and access to utilities structures constructed under roads. The towns that are located within the southerly overhead portion of the Project are concerned about the effects of the Project on wetlands, safety, tourism and the economy, land use, community character, property values, aesthetics, natural environment, and public health and

² This northern portion of the Project contains the following two underground sections: (i) Route 3 crossing between the towns of Pittsburg and Clarksville (0.7 miles), and (ii) a portion of the line from Clarksville to Stewartstown (7.5 miles). The interests and concerns raised by the towns of Pittsburg, Clarksville, and Stewartstown pertain to overhead sections of the Project. In addition, approximately 3.1 miles of underground line will be located in the Town of Bethlehem. The majority of the concerns raised by the Town of Bethlehem pertain to the 4.9 mile overhead portion of the line and transition station #5.

safety.³ Each of the local government entities are concerned with the orderly development of their regions and wish to present their views in this regard pursuant to RSA 612-H:16, IV (b).

Many towns have sought to intervene through their selectboards. However, some towns also seek intervention through their planning boards, conservation commissions, or other governmental sub-units.

The Applicant did not object to the motions to intervene filed by the various towns and town sub-units. The Applicant suggests, however, that all towns, cities, and planning boards should be combined in one group of intervenors and that all conservation commissions should be combined in another.

Under RSA 162-H:16, IV(b), the Subcommittee must give due consideration to the views of municipal and regional planning commissions and municipal governing bodies. *See* RSA 162-H:16, IV(b). RSA 541-A:39, I, further requires the Subcommittee to afford municipalities a reasonable opportunity to submit data, views, or comments with respect to the issuance of any permit, license or any other action within its boundaries. Keeping this statutory authority in mind, the petitions to intervene submitted by the governing bodies of the following towns and cities are granted: Pittsburg, Clarksville, Stewartstown, Colebrook, Northumberland, Whitefield, Dalton, Bethlehem, Sugar Hill, Franconia, Easton, Woodstock, Plymouth, Ashland, Bridgewater, New Hampton, Bristol, Canterbury, Concord, Pembroke, Deerfield, and Franklin.

The plain language of our enabling statute, RSA 162-H:16, IV (b), requires the Committee to consider the views of both local planning boards and municipal governing bodies.

³ Although approximately 2,100 feet of the Project in the Town of Bridgewater will be underground, the majority of the line within the town (2 miles) will be overhead. Bridgewater's stated concerns pertain mainly to the overhead portion of the line.

Petitions to intervene submitted by the planning boards of the following Towns are granted:
Whitefield, Bethlehem, Franconia, Easton, and Deerfield.

Pursuant to RSA 36-A:2, a city or town may choose to create a conservation commission "for the proper utilization and protection of the natural resources and for the protection of the watershed resources" of the municipality. The statutory authority of municipal conservation commissions includes: research of local land and water areas; coordination of unofficial bodies organized for similar purposes; the publication of books, maps and charts relevant to its work; maintain an index of open space, natural aesthetic and ecological areas within the town; obtaining information concerning the proper utilization of such areas. *See* RSA 36-A:2. In addition a conservation commission is charged with recommending a program for the protection, development and better utilization of such natural, aesthetic and ecological areas. *Id.* The statutory obligations of a municipal conservation commission include planning functions pertaining to the protection of the natural environment and watershed resources. *Id.* Pursuant to RSA 162-H:16, IV(b), the Subcommittee is required to give due consideration to the views of such commissions when determining whether the Project will interfere with the orderly development of the region. In addition, the conservation commissions that filed requests to intervene in this docket possess knowledge about the conservation lands and environment surrounding the Site. Such knowledge may assist the Subcommittee with making its determination. Therefore, the petitions to intervene filed by the conservation commissions of the following Towns are granted: Dalton, Bethlehem, Franconia, Easton, Ashland, Pembroke and Deerfield.

The Subcommittee also received a petition to intervene from the Water & Sewer Department of the Town of Ashland. The department demonstrated that the Project may affect

well fields and the wastewater treatment facility. This municipal sub-unit has particular knowledge that may assist the Subcommittee in understanding the effect of the Project on Ashland's well fields and wastewater treatment facility. The department's intervention is in the interests of justice and it will not impair the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceedings. The petition to intervene filed by the Water & Sewer Department of the Town of Ashland is granted.

In order to avoid duplicative arguments and ineffective process, it is necessary to combine the intervenors into logical groups with similar interests and positions. While every intervenor has some characteristics that make it unique, there are common interests and positions expressed by each. That is true from municipality to municipality, and also within municipalities, where Select Boards, Planning Boards, and Conservation Commissions appear to agree with each other. Accordingly, the following intervenors shall be consolidated in this proceeding:

- **Municipal Group 1, (Northern Section)** – Pittsburg, Clarksville, Stewartstown, Colebrook, Northumberland, Whitefield (Board of Selectmen and Planning Board), Dalton (Board of Selectmen and Conservation Commission), Bethlehem (Board of Selectmen, Planning Board and Conservation Commission), and Littleton;
- **Municipal Group 2, (Middle Section)** – Sugar Hill, Franconia (Board of Selectmen, Planning Board, and Conservation Commission), Easton (Board of Selectmen, Planning Board, and Conservation Commission), Woodstock, and Plymouth;
- **Municipal Group 3, (Southern Section)** – Holderness (Board of Selectmen), Ashland (Board of Selectmen, Conservation Commission and Water & Sewer Department), Bridgewater, New Hampton, Bristol, Canterbury, Concord, Pembroke (board of Selectmen and Conservation Commission), and Deerfield (Board of Selectmen, Planning Board and Conservation Commission).

Each municipal group is consolidated as a single party. Each of the governmental entities in each group may file separate testimony (if they choose). Each municipal group, however, must designate a single spokesperson for the purposes of filing pleadings, conducting discovery, and

for examining witnesses at evidentiary hearings. This will assure the prompt and orderly conduct of the proceedings.

The City of Franklin is in a unique position with respect to the above listed municipalities and government sub-units. The overhead portion of the Project crosses the City of Franklin, the Applicant seeks to construct a converter terminal within Franklin, and Franklin is generally supportive of the Project. Municipal Groups 1, 2, and 3, in contrast, generally oppose some or all of the entire Project. Franklin thus cannot be combined with the other municipalities in this docket. The City of Franklin is allowed to intervene separately, as full party in these proceedings.

ii. Abutting Towns

The Subcommittee also received petitions to intervene from the Towns of Littleton and Holderness. These two towns acknowledge that the Project will not cross their borders. They state, however, that the Project will be constructed in close proximity and will be visible in various places in town. The towns assert that the Project may have an adverse effect on tourism and on each towns' character, aesthetics, land use, employment, and property values.

Littleton and Holderness have demonstrated sufficient interests, privileges, and rights that may be affected by construction and operation of the Project. The Town of Littleton, the Town of Holderness, and the Holderness Conservation Commission petitions to intervene are granted. As with the municipalities discussed above, the Holderness Conservation Commission's position is consistent with that of the Town of Holderness. In addition, the interests of Littleton and Holderness are similar to the towns which they abut. Therefore, Littleton and Holderness shall be consolidated with these towns.

To ensure orderly development of these proceedings and considering that concerns raised by Littleton relate to an overhead transmission line in the northern part of the Project, Littleton

shall be consolidated with Municipal Group 1 (Northern Section) intervenors. Holderness (including the Conservation Commission) shall be consolidated with the Municipal Group 3 (Southern Section) intervenors.

iii. Non-Abutting Municipalities

The Cities of Nashua, Manchester, and Berlin request permission to intervene in these proceedings. Nashua asserts that it would like to intervene to ensure that \$200 million of the Forward New Hampshire Fund promised by the Applicant will be directly distributed to municipalities as opposed to the state. Manchester also asserts its interests in the fund, and claims that its businesses and residents have a direct interest in reducing the costs of electricity and in other benefits promised by the Applicant. Berlin claims the following rights, interests, and privileges that will be affected by the Project: (i) the upgrades of the Coos Loop will directly affect Berlin; (ii) residents of Berlin will directly benefit from the proposed job creation in the North Country; and (iii) Berlin residents will benefit from the anticipated increases in property tax revenues flowing from the Project.

Apart from stating that their direct economic interest in the money that will be granted by the Forward New Hampshire Fund and other general benefits that may be associated with the Project, Nashua and Manchester fail to demonstrate that they have a right, interest, or privilege that will be affected by these proceedings. Interest in an economic stimulus plan and other indirect benefits of the Project is not specific enough to warrant intervention in this docket. Those interests are general in nature and would pertain to every city and town in the State of New Hampshire. The motions to intervene filed by Nashua and Manchester are denied.

In contrast, Berlin has demonstrated that its direct interests, privileges, and rights may be affected by construction and operation of the Project. The Project may directly affect the

economy of Berlin by upgrading the Coos Loop and providing opportunities for the entry of new businesses and industries in the region. Berlin’s petition to intervene is granted subject to the conditions set forth in section II B 4 b below.

b. Grafton County Commissioners and Coos County Commissioner Rick Samson

The Grafton County Commissioners point out that 63 miles of the Project will lie within Grafton County.⁴ The Grafton County Commissioners further note many that towns within the county will be crossed by the Project and they assert those towns will suffer the following negative effects: (i) lower property values and the consequent effect on the tax base ; (ii) health and safety issues due to the electro-magnetic field; (iii) destruction and disturbance of private land and property; (iv) loss of style of life; (v) impacts on view sheds and aesthetics; (vi) noise; (viii) dangers associated with the fall radius of the towers; (ix) effect on economy; and (x) expansion of a PSNH easement use beyond what was originally intended. Finally, the Commissioners assert that there will be “major destruction” in the Main Street areas in Franconia, Woodstock, and Plymouth. They seek intervention so that they can represent and address these concerns.

Rick Samson is Coos County Commissioner, District Three. He asserts that the following towns will be affected by the Project in his district: Pittsburg, Clarksville, Stewartstown, Dummer, Stark, and Northumberland. He also asserts that the Project will affect the unincorporated places of Dixville and Millsfield that are located in his district.

⁴ 11 of those miles will be overhead lines in the following towns: (i) Bethlehem – 4.9 miles; (ii) Bridgewater – 2 miles; (iii) Ashland – 1.6 miles; and (iv) Bristol – 2.5 miles.

The Applicant objected to the petitions to intervene filed by Rick Samson and the Grafton County Commissioners. If they are granted intervenor status, the Applicant suggests that the Subcommittee combine their participation with representatives of New Hampshire legislature.

County commissions act as the executive officers of county government. Among other responsibilities, they are charged with the governing, planning, and land use in unincorporated areas. *See* RSA 28:7-a and RSA 28:7-b. As executive officers, county commissioners are involved in country-wide economic development issues and issues pertaining to recreation and the environment.

Under RSA 162-H:16, IV(b), the Subcommittee must give due consideration to the views of municipal and regional planning commissions and municipal governing bodies. County commissions and commissioners play a role similar to that of a municipal or regional planning agency. Therefore, the Petitions to intervene filed by the Grafton County Commissioners and Commissioner Samson are granted. To ensure the prompt and orderly development of the proceedings, their participation shall be consolidated as one group of intervenors.

c. Lafayette School Board

The Lafayette School Board asserts that it is concerned about the safety of its students, access to the school during the construction period, and possible deviation from normal bus routes.

The Applicant objected to the petition to intervene filed by Lafayette School Board. In the alternative, the Applicant suggested that the Subcommittee should combine the School Board's participation with municipalities that filed petitions to intervene in this docket.

The petition filed by the Lafayette School Board is denied. The concerns asserted by the Board are essentially concerns arising from potential changes in traffic routes during

construction of the Project. This concern is not unique to the Lafayette School Board. It is a common concern to the public at large and is too general to warrant intervention.

2. Individual Parties

The interests, rights and duties asserted by individual parties in this docket vary depending on where the parties reside in relation to the Project. Generally, the individuals that reside in close proximity to the overhead portion of the Project raise different concerns from the individuals that reside in close proximity to the underground portion of the Project. Similarly, individuals that reside or own real estate that abuts the Project raise different concerns compared to the parties that own real estate some distance from the Project. The individuals seeking intervenor status can be separated into six general categories: (i) abutting property owners residing⁵ along the route from Clarksville through Dalton⁶; (ii) non-abutting property owners residing in the area of Clarksville to Bethlehem;⁷ (iii) abutting property owners residing along the route in Bethlehem through Plymouth;⁸ (iv) non-abutting property owners residing in the area from Littleton to Plymouth;⁹ (v) abutting property owners residing along the route from Ashland to Deerfield;¹⁰ (vi) non-abutting property owners residing in the area from Ashland to Deerfield.¹¹

⁵ The term “residing,” as used in this section, includes individuals who own real estate or businesses in identified towns and cities.

⁶ Clarksville, Stewartstown, Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, Whitefield, and Dalton.

⁷ Clarksville, Stewartstown, Stark, Lancaster, Whitefield, Dalton, and Bethlehem.

⁸ Bethlehem, Franconia, Easton, and Plymouth.

⁹ Easton and Sugar Hill.

¹⁰ Ashland, Northfield, Canterbury, Concord, Allenstown, and Deerfield.

¹¹ Holderness, New Hampton, Bridgewater, Canterbury, and Deerfield.

a. Abutting Property Owners: Clarksville through Dalton

The Subcommittee received petitions to intervene from the following abutting property owners residing in the Towns of Clarksville, Stewartstown, Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, Whitefield, and Dalton: (i) Charles and Donna Jordan (owners of six acres of land along the Old County Road in Clarksville); (ii) Sally A. Zankowski (owner of an early 1800th farmhouse at 147 Route 145 in Clarksville); (iii) Jon and Lori Levesque (1459 Bear Rock Road, Whitefield); (iv) Roderick and Donna McAllaster (Bear Rock Road, Whitefield); (v) Lynne Placey (Bear Rock Road, Whitefield); (vi) Arlene Placey (Bear Rock Road, Whitefield); (vii) Brad and Daryl Thompson (Bear Rock Road, Whitefield); (viii) David Schrier (owner of real estate 200 yards south of the Clarksville town line that abuts Old County Road); (ix) Nancy L. Dodge (157 Creampoke Road, Whitefield); (x) Elaine V. Olson, Eric M. Olson, Joshua Olson, Elaine V. Olson individually and as trustees of the Eric M. Olson Revocable Trust and Elaine V. Olson Revocable Trust (Dummer); (xi) Kevin Spencer (338 Percy Road, Stark); (xii) Rodrigue J. and Tammy L. Beland (Route 110, Stark); (xiii) Susan E. Percy for Percy Summer Club (Stark); (xiv) Mark Lagasse and Kevin Spencer for Lagaspence Realty, LLC (338 Percy Road, Stark); (xv) Robert Heath (76 Potter Road¹², Stark); (xvi) R. Eric Jones and Margaret J. Jones (John Silver Road, Northumberland); (xvii) Elmer C. Lupton and Claire C. Lupton (75 Newell Lane, Whitefield); (xviii) Charles and Cynthia Hatfield (41 Hartfield Drive, Whitefield); (xix) Mary Boone Wellington (Whitefield); (xx) Bruce and Sondra Brekke (99 Ramble On Road, Whitefield); (xxi) Donald and Betty Gooden (76 Lancaster Road, Whitefield); (xxii) Tim and

¹² Mr. Heath did not state in his petition to intervene that his property abuts the Project. The Applicant, however, identified him as abutting property owner.

Brigitte White (76 Lancaster Road, Whitefield); and (xxii) James and Judy Ramsdell (1049 Whitefield Road, Dalton).

The Applicant did not object to petitions to intervene filed by abutting property owners in the Towns of Clarksville, Stewartstown, Dummer, Northumberland, Whitefield, and Dalton. The Applicant suggested, however, that all abutting property owners should be combined. As to the residents of the Town of Stark, the Applicant did not object to the petition filed by Mr. Heath. The Applicant did not address the petition to intervene filed by Kevin Spencer. It identified Susan Percy as a non-abutting property owner. Ms. Percy responded by clarifying that she represents the interests of Percy Summer Club, which owns real estate that is encumbered by the right-of-way the Applicant seeks to utilize for the construction of the Project. The Applicant did not rebut Ms. Percy's allegations.

Concerns raised by the abutting property owners residing in these towns vary, however, based on whether their property abuts the underground or overhead portion of the Project. Property owners whose property abuts underground portions of the Project assert that they are concerned about the effect of the construction of the Project on their properties. Those concerns include disruption of the historic character of some of the properties, integrity of water supplies, and the value of real estate. Many of the individuals in this category challenge the Applicant's right to construct the Project under the public road right-of-way.

The property owners whose property abuts the overhead portion of the Project are concerned about the effect of the Project on aesthetics, views from their properties, value of their properties, public health and safety, and the general enjoyment of their lives. Many of the individuals in this category also challenge the Applicant's rights within the existing deeded rights-of-way.

As residential abutters, these parties have a profound and substantial interest in the outcome of these proceedings. There is no issue that any residential abutter should be prohibited from addressing. Their ownership and residence on land abutting the proposed Project requires that they be permitted to fully participate. However, as indicated above, concerns raised by these parties varies depending on where their properties abut underground or overhead portions of the Project. Therefore, they cannot be combined in one group of intervenors. Therefore, petitions to intervene filed by the following residents are granted and they are combined into the following groups of intervenors to ensure the prompt orderly conduct of these proceedings:

- **Group 1 - Clarksville-Stewartstown Abutting Property Intervenors (underground portion of the Project):**

Clarksville - Charles and Donna Jordan; and Sally A. Zankowski;

Whitefield - Jon and Lori Levesque; Roderick and Donna McAllaster; Lynne Placey; Arlene Placey; Brad and Daryl Thompson; David Schrier; and Nancy L. Dodge.

- **Group 2 - Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, Whitefield, and Dalton Abutting Property Intervenors (overhead portion of the Project):**

Dummer - Elaine V. Olson, Eric M. Olson, Joshua Olson, Elaine V. Olson individually and as trustees of the Eric M. Olson Revocable Trust and Elaine V. Olson Revocable Trust;

Stark - Kevin Spencer; Rodrigue J. and Tammy L. Beland; Susan E. Percy for Percy Summer Club; Mark Lagasse and Kevin Spencer for Lagaspence Realty, LLC; and Robert Heath;

Northumberland - R. Eric Jones and Margaret J. Jones;

Whitefield - Elmer C. Lupton and Claire C. Lupton; Charles and Cynthia Hatfield; Mary Boone Wellington; Bruce and Sondra Brekke; Donald and Betty Gooden; and Tim and Brigitte White.

Dalton - James and Judy Ramsdell.

Each individual abutter is permitted to file pre-filed testimony. However, each group must designate a single spokesperson for the purposes of filing pleadings, conducting discovery and for examination at evidentiary hearings.

b. Non-Abutting Property Owners: Clarksville through Bethlehem

The Subcommittee received petitions to intervene from the following non-abutting property owners residing in Clarksville, Stewartstown, Stark, Lancaster, Whitefield, Dalton, and Bethlehem: (i) Robert R. Martin (14 Tower Road, Clarksville); (ii) Roderick C. Moore, Jr., Joseph John Dunlap, Shawn Patrick Brady, and Christopher Thompson (Heath Road, Stewartstown); (iii) E. Martin Kaufman, Bradley J. Thompson, and John Petrofsky on behalf of 44 residents of Stewartstown and East Colebrook (Dixville Notch-Harvey Swell Location residents); (iv) Mark W. Orzek and Susan Orzek (Stark); (v) John W. Davidge for Prospect Farm-Lancaster, LLC (Lancaster); (vi) Linda Upham-Bornstein, PhD (Lancaster); (vii) Rebecca Weeks Sherrill More, PhD for the Weeks Lancaster Trust (Lancaster); and (viii) Richard M. McGinnis (Lancaster); (ix) Frederic P. Fitts (22 Knothole Road, Whitefield); (x) Gerald and Vivian Roy (178 Forest Lake Road, Whitefield); (xi) Edward A. Piatek (129 Elm Street, Whitefield); (xii) Frank and Kate Lombardi (101 Elm Street, Whitefield); (xiii) Marsha J. Lombardi (111 Elm Street, Whitefield); (xiv) Wendy Doran (91 Twin Mountain Road, Whitefield); (xv) Alexandra M. Dannis and James G. Dannis (Dalton); (xvi) David Van Houten (649 Cherry Valley Road, Bethlehem)¹³; (xvii) Andrew D. Dodge (233 South Road, Bethlehem).

Although the distance between the Project and real estate owned by individuals who filed petitions to intervene in this docket varies, all of the parties asserted that they will have a view of

¹³ Mr. Van Houten asserts that he was going to purchase a 44-acre lot that will be crossed by the Project. The Subcommittee did not receive any information that would indicate that Mr. Houten indeed purchased said lot. Therefore, Mr. Houten is not considered as an abutting property owner in this docket.

the Project from their properties. They also assert that they are concerned about the impact of the Project on health, aesthetics, views, property values, and their style of life. They also challenge the Applicant's right to construct the Project within the existing rights-of-way.

The Applicant does not object to petitions to intervene filed by Robert Martin and Gerald Roy. The Applicant asserts, however, that petitions filed by other people residing in this region should be denied. In the alternative, the Applicant requests that their participation be combined with that of other non-abutting property owners.

These non-abutting property owners have expressed a combination of interests that may be affected by the outcome of these proceedings. Their petitions to intervene are granted. In order to assure the orderly conduct of these proceedings and to avoid duplication of arguments, however, it is necessary to combine the following non-abutters as a single intervenor group in this proceeding:

- Robert Martin;
- Roderick C. Moore, Jr., Joseph John Dunlap, Shawn Patrick Brady, and Christopher Thompson;
- E. Martin Kaufman, Bradley J. Thompson, and John Petrofsky on behalf of 44 residents of Stewartstown and East Colebrook (Dixville Notch-Harvey Swell Location residents);
- Mark W. Orzek and Susan Orzek;
- John W. Davidge for Prospect Farm-Lancaster, LLC;
- Linda Upham-Bornstein;
- Rebecca Weeks Sherrill More, PhD for the Weeks Lancaster Trust;
- Richard M. McGinnis;
- Frederic P. Fitts;
- Gerald and Vivian Roy;
- Edward A. Piatek;
- Frank and Kate Lombardi;
- Marsha J. Lombardi;
- Alexandra M. Dannis and James G. Dannis;
- David Van Houten;
- Wendy Doran; and
- Andrew D. Dodge.

Each non-abutter may submit testimony. However, the non-abutters shall designate a single spokesperson for the purposes of filing pleadings, conducting discovery and for examination at evidentiary hearings.

c. *Abutting Property Owners: Bethlehem – Plymouth.*

The Subcommittee received petitions to intervene from the following abutting property owners residing in the Towns of Bethlehem, Franconia, Easton, and Plymouth: (i) Nigel Manley and Judy Ratzel (Route 18, Bethlehem); (ii) Russel and Lydia Cumbee (1719 Easton Road, Franconia); (iii) Walter Palmer and Kathryn Ting (1900 Easton Road, Apartment 5, Franconia); (iv) G. Peter and Mary S. Grote (1437/1375 Easton Road, Franconia); (v) Paul and Dana O’Hara (68 Church Street, Franconia); (vi) Virginia Jeffryes (92 Church Street, Franconia); (vii) Carol Dwyer (100 Church Street, Franconia); (viii) Gregory and Lucille Wolf (214 Church Street, Franconia); (ix) Susan Schibanoff (25 Academy Street, Franconia); (x) Frank Pinter (32 Academy Street, Unit 4, Franconia); (xi) Ken and Linda Ford (257 Main Street (Route 18), Franconia); (xii) Campbell McLaren, M.D. (50 Gibson Road, Easton); (xiii) Eric and Barbara Meyer (Route 116, Easton); (xiv) Robert W. Thibault (Route 116, Easton); (xv) Dennis Ford (1544/1549 Easton Valley Road, Easton); (xvi) Carl Lakes and Barbara Lakes (18 Loop Road, Easton); and (xvii) Bruce D. Ahern (503 Daniel Webster Highway, Plymouth).

Some of these individuals expressed some concerns specific to the character of their property. In general, however, these property owners all express similar concerns about the effect of the Project and construction of the Project on the integrity of their homes, wells, property values, access to their property, noise, road integrity, health and safety, and enjoyment of life. They also challenge the Applicant’s right to construct the Project under the public rights-of-way abutting their properties.

The Applicant did not object to the petitions to intervene filed by the abutting property owners residing in the Towns of Bethlehem, Franconia, Easton, and Plymouth. The Applicant objected, however, to the petition filed by Frank Pinter on the grounds that Mr. Pinter does not reside within 100 feet of the Project.

The owners of the property that abuts the Project have a specific and substantial interest in the outcome of these proceedings. These proceedings directly affect their interests, rights and privileges. The petitions to intervene filed by the following individuals are granted:

- Nigel Manley and Judy Ratzel;
- Russel and Lydia Cumbee;
- Walter Palmer and Kathryn Ting;
- G. Peter and Mary S. Grote;
- Paul and Dana O'Hara;
- Virginia Jeffryes;
- Carol Dwyer;
- Gregory and Lucille Wolf;
- Susan Schibanoff;
- Ken and Linda Ford;
- Campbell McLaren, M.D.;
- Eric and Barbara Meyer;
- Robert W. Thibault;
- Dennis Ford;
- Carl Lakes and Barbara Lakes; and
- Bruce D. Ahern.

As to the petition filed by Frank Pinter, it is unclear whether his property, in fact, abuts the Project. Neither Mr. Pinter nor the Applicant submitted documentation explaining the location of Mr. Pinter's property as it relates to the Project. It is clear from Mr. Pinter's petition, however, that he is concerned about the same effects of the Project on his property as the other abutting property owners. Taking into consideration his statement that his property abuts the Project and the lack of evidence demonstrating otherwise, Mr. Pinter's petition to intervene is granted. In order to ensure the orderly development of proceedings in this docket, these parties,

including Mr. Pinter, are combined into a single group of intervenors. Each of these abutters may submit testimony. However, the intervenor group shall designate a single spokesperson for the purposes of filing pleadings, conducting discovery and for examination of witnesses at evidentiary hearings.

d. Non-Abutting Property Owners: Bethlehem – Plymouth

The Subcommittee received petitions to intervene from the following non-abutting property owners residing in the Towns of Easton and Sugar Hill: (i) Robert B. Craven (777 Paine Road, Easton); (ii) Kris Pastoriza (294 Gibson Road, Easton); (iii) James H. Page, Jr. (Easton)¹⁴; (iv) Lee Sullivan and Stephen Buzzell; and (v) Timothy and Rebecca Burbank, Edward Cenerizio and Deborah Corey, and Matthew Steele individually and as owners of 41 Dyke Road, LLC.

Mr. Craven asserts that he is retired with an advanced degree in electrical engineering. He claims that he possesses a level of expertise and knowledge that may assist the Subcommittee with evaluation of the effect of the Project on public health. He also asserts that he was a two-term selectman in the Town of Easton and has a long-term interest in the Town and the welfare of its residents. Ms. Pastoriza asserts that she has a deep level of expertise in the watershed and its associated environment and historic resources of Easton. She further asserts that she authored the Nomination of the Ham Branch Watershed in Easton to the New Hampshire Rivers Management and Protection Program and its supplement. She also asserts that she co-authored two submissions to the Section 106 historic review. She concludes that her knowledge and expertise may assist the Subcommittee with reaching its decision. Mr. Page asserts he has

¹⁴ Mr. Page also owns a real estate in the Town of Deerfield. He does not assert that his property will abut or will be in close proximity to the Project. Instead, he expresses general concerns about the effect the Project will have on the Town of Deerfield.

significant experience in construction of powerlines and underground utility projects and his knowledge and experience will be helpful for the Subcommittee.

Lee Sullivan and Stephen Buzzell, Timothy and Rebecca Burbank, Edward Cenerizio and Deborah Corey, and Matthew Steele assert that the Project will be located in close proximity to the property owned by them and that the Project will have adverse effects on value of their property, the environment, and their style and enjoyment of life. They also assert that the Project will overburden the easement.

The Applicant objects to the intervention of these parties. The Applicant identifies Mr. Craven, Ms. Pastoriza, Mr. Page, and Timothy and Rebecca Burbank, Edward Cenerizio and Deborah Corey, and Matthew Steele as property owners beyond 100 hundred feet from the route and objected to their intervention. In the alternative, the Applicant requested that the Subcommittee combine their participation with that of other non-abutting property owners.

Mr. Craven, Ms. Pastoriza, and Mr. Page base their case for intervention on levels of expertise and knowledge that may be helpful to the Subcommittee in evaluating the Project. They do not demonstrate that they have a right, duty, privilege or other substantial interest that is affected by these proceedings. Therefore, the petitions to intervene filed by Mr. Craven, Mr. Pastoriza and Mr. Page are denied.

The records reveal that that Timothy and Rebecca Burbank, Edward Cenerizio and Deborah Corey, and Matthew Steele, individually and as owners of 41 Dyke Road, LLC, own real estate that, while not abutting the Project, is located in close proximity to the Project and may be affected by construction and operation of the Project. Their petitions to intervene are granted. However, they share similar interests and concerns. Therefore, to ensure the orderly conduct of these proceedings, the following individuals are combined into a single group of

intervenors for the purpose of participation in this docket: Timothy and Rebecca Burbank, Edward Cenerizio and Deborah Corey, and Matthew Steele. Each of these non-abutters may submit testimony, but the intervenor group shall designate a single spokesperson for the purposes of filing pleadings, conducting discovery and for examination at evidentiary hearing.

e. Abutting Property Owners: Ashland – Deerfield

The Subcommittee received petitions to intervene from the following abutting property owners residing in Ashland, Northfield, Canterbury, Allenstown, and Concord: (i) Carol Currier (70 Cedar Lane, Ashland); (ii) Mary A. Lee (93 Fiddler’s Choice Road, Northfield); (iii) Craig and Corinne Pullen (63 Old Schoolhouse Road, Canterbury (Windswept Farm)); (iv) McKenna’s Purchase Unit Owners Association (Concord); (v) Taras and Marta Kucman (12 Brookwood Drive, Concord); (vi) Kelly Normandeau (56 Sanborn Road, Concord); and (vii) Laura M. Bonk, MS, MBA (250 Deerfield Road, Allenstown).

The Subcommittee received petitions to intervene from the following abutting property owners who reside in Deerfield: (i) Philip H. Bilodeau and Joan C. Bilodeau - 140 Nottingham Road; (ii) Erick B. Berglund Jr. and Kathleen A. Berglund - 23 Nottingham Road; (iii) Rebecca Hutchinson - 30 Lang Road; (iv) Torin Judd and Brian Judd - 96-A Mount Delight Road; (v) Jo Anne Bradbury - 30 Thurston Pond Road; (vi) Jeanne M. Menard as a General Partner of the Menard Forest Family Limited Partnership; (vii) Jeanne M. Menard for Peter F. Menard and Anne K. Burnett; (viii) Kevin and Lisa Cini - 20 Mountain Road; (ix) Bruce A. Adami and Robert J. Cote - 32 Mountain Road; and (x) Eric and Sandra Lahr - 11/13 North Road.

The abutting property owners are concerned about the effect of the Project on the views and value of their property, their style of life and enjoyment of their property, wildlife and

environment, wetlands, and health and safety. They also express their concerns about the effect that noise associated with the Project may have on their life and enjoyment of their property.

With one exception, the Applicant did not object to requests to intervene filed by abutting property residents. The Applicant requested, however, that they be combined with all other abutting property residents. The Applicant did not address requests to intervene filed by Jeanne M. Menard as a General Partner of the Menard Forest Family Limited Partnership and by Jeanne M. Menard for Peter F. Menard and Anne K. Burnett.

The abutting property owners from Ashland, Northfield, Canterbury, Concord, Allenstown, and Deerfield have a profound and substantial interest in the outcome of these proceedings. Petitions to intervene filed by the following property owners are granted:

- Carol Currier;
- Mary A Lee;
- Craig and Corinne Pullen;
- McKenna's Purchase Unit Owners Association;
- Taras and Marta Kucman;
- Kelly Normandeau;
- Laura M. Bonk;
- Philip H. Bilodeau and Joan C. Bilodeau;
- Erick B. Berglund Jr. and Kathleen A. Berglund;
- Rebecca Hutchinson;
- Torin Judd and Brian Judd;
- Jo Anne Bradbury;
- Jeanne M. Menard as a General Partner of the Menard Forest Family Limited Partnership;
- Jeanne M. Menard for Peter F. Menard and Anne K. Burnett;
- Kevin and Lisa Cini;
- Bruce A. Adami and Robert J. Cote; and
- Eric and Sandra Lahr.

To ensure the orderly conduct of this proceeding, these parties shall be combined in a single group of intervenors that can participate as a full party in these proceedings. Each of the abutters may file testimony, but the intervenor group shall designate a single spokesperson for

the purpose of filing pleadings, conducting discovery and for examination of witnesses at evidentiary hearings.

f. Non-Abutting Property Owners: Ashland – Deerfield

The Subcommittee received petitions to intervene from the following non-abutting property owners residing in the Towns of Holderness, New Hampton, Bridgewater, Canterbury and Deerfield: (i) Joanna and Robert Tuveson (Sargent Road, Holderness);¹⁵ (ii) Nina and Elisha Gray (New Hampton); (iii) Rodney Felgate and Laura Felgate (New Hampton); (iv) the Webster Family Group (Bridgewater); (v) Lawrence Phillips and Maxine Phillips (23 Mountain View Drive, Canterbury); (vi) Lisa Wolford and Pamela Hanglin (14 Church Street, Deerfield); (vii) F. Maureen Quinn (47A Nottingham Road, Deerfield); (viii) Madelyn and Thomas Foulkes (26 Nottingham Road, Deerfield); (ix) Jeanne M. Menard as a managing member of Pawtackaway View, LLC.

All of the non-abutting property owners asserted that the Project will be visible from their properties and will have adverse effects on views from their properties, value of their properties, enjoyment of their lives, and their health and safety.

The Applicant identified these individuals as residents who live outside of 100 feet of the Project and objected to their petitions to intervene.¹⁶ In the alternative, the Applicant suggested

¹⁵ Joanna and Robert Tuveson assert that their property abuts the right-of-way where the Applicant seeks to construct the Project. It is noted that the Project will not be located in the Town of Holderness. Furthermore, the Applicant identified the Tuvesons as non-abutting property owners. Therefore, the Tuvesons are treated as non-abutting property owners in this docket.

¹⁶ The Applicant identified Rodney and Laura Felgate as abutting property owners. The Felgates, however, did not assert that their property abuts the Project. The Applicant did not provide any documentation or information that would demonstrate that the Felgates' property abuts the Project. Therefore, the Felgates are treated as non-abutting property owners in this docket.

that the Subcommittee should combine their participation with that of all other non-abutting property owners.

All of these non-abutting properties will have a view of the Project from their properties. Their rights and interests may be impacted as a result of construction of the Project. Therefore, the petitions to intervene filed by the following individuals are granted in this docket:

- Joanna and Robert Tuveson;
- Nina and Elisha Gray;
- Rodney Felgate and Laura Felgate;
- The Webster Family Group of intervenors;
- Lawrence Phillips and Maxine Phillips;
- Lisa Wolford and Pamela Hanglin;
- F. Maureen Quinn;
- Madelyn and Thomas Foulkes; and
- Jeanne M. Menard as a managing member of Pawtackaway View, LLC.

These parties are combined into one group of intervenors that can participate in these proceedings as a full party. Each of the non-abutting property owners may file testimony, but the intervenor group shall designate a single spokesperson for the purpose of filing pleadings, conducting discovery, and for the examination of witnesses at evidentiary hearings.

g. Other Individuals

The Subcommittee received a petition to intervene from Anita Giulietti. Ms. Giulietti asserts that she intended to purchase some real estate in Whitefield. She discovered, however, that the Project will be visible from the property. As a result, she changed her plans and did not purchase it. She states her frustration with the impact of the Project on her and other peoples' lives.

The Applicant objected to Ms. Giulietti's petition to intervene.

Although the Applicant's plans to construct the Project might have impacted Ms. Giulietti's decision to purchase real estate in the past, she fails to demonstrate a current

interest that may be affected by the outcome of these proceedings. Ms. Giulietti's concern about the impact of the Project on other people is general and can be addressed by Counsel for the Public and other intervenors. Ms. Giulietti's petition to intervene is denied.

Sandra and Paul Kamins reside at 429 North Road in Lancaster. They assert that the Project will have adverse effects on their community and property values.

Elizabeth Terp resides in Thornton, New Hampshire. She writes a Keeping Each Other Well column for Salmon Press. The column addresses the health effects of the power lines and the alleged inadequate offset of the carbon footprint created by Hydro Quebec. She states that she possesses some level of expertise in both topics. She is concerned about the impact the Project may have on the environment of the region.

Gail S. Beaulieu resides in Plymouth. She asserts that she is employed as a mortgage originator at a bank located on Maine Street in Plymouth. She further asserts that construction of the Project along Main Street (Route 3) will disturb access to her place of employment and will prevent her customers from obtaining her services. Finally, she asserts that she, with her siblings, owns real estate encumbered by the easement where the Applicant intended to site the Project prior to its revision. She asserts that until the Applicant officially declares that these plans are moot, her property is affected by stigma associated with the Project.

Jeanne M. Menard owns a real estate company, Parade Properties. Parade Properties' office is located at 45 North Road in Deerfield, New Hampshire. Real estate owned by Parade Properties neither abuts nor is in close proximity to the right-of-way where the Applicant seeks to construct the Project. Ms. Menard, however, asserts that the Project will have adverse effects on Deerfield aesthetics and unique qualities and, in turn, will negatively affect her and her real estate company.

Thomas N.T. Mullen asserts that he and his partner owned property known as Owl's Nest Resort & Golf Club in Campton and Thornton. The property contained a golf course and was purchased for purposes of developing and selling land, homes, and condominiums. Mr. Mullen asserts that, in 2010, the Applicant announced that it intended to construct the Project within the right-of-way that crosses Owl's Nest's property. Mr. Mullen further asserts that as a result of this decision Mr. Mullen and his partner were not able to sell real estate as planned and could not repay the debt associated with the property. In 2014, the Bank foreclosed on this property. Following the foreclosure, the Applicant announced a change in Project's route and further announced that it would not be seeking to construct the Project within the right-of-way located within Owl's Nest's property. Mr. Mullen filed a civil suit against the Applicant for slander of title. Mr. Mullen asserts that he suffered injury in fact and, therefore, has a right to intervene in this docket. Finally, he asserts that he continues to be active in the real estate and construction business. His customers, however, refuse to purchase real estate near the Project's proposed way. Therefore, he asserts that he continues to suffer injury in fact.

Dr. Deborah Warner resides in Littleton. She owns Bright Day Psychology, PLLC. She is concerned about the impact of the Project on aesthetics of the region and psychological health of people residing in the region. She also asserts that the Project may have adverse effects on tourism and, therefore, may cause a decrease in her clientele.

Peter W. Powell resides in Lancaster, New Hampshire. For the last 42 years, he has been working as a realtor serving clients in Coos County and portions of northern Grafton County. Mr. Powell asserts that he has extensive experience with selling and marketing real estate. He asserts that his experience will be helpful to the Subcommittee while evaluating the impact of the Project on the value and marketability of real estate. He further asserts that, for years, he has

been actively involved in trying to rebuild the economy and attract more jobs to the North Country. He believes that his experience may be helpful to the Subcommittee.

Michael Marino and Lee Ann Moulder reside at 37 Birch Lane in Holderness, New Hampshire. They assert that the original proposed route crossed their property. The presently proposed route which is the subject of the Application does not affect their property. They are concerned that the Applicant did not officially announce that it will not pursue the original route in the future. As to the current proposed route, they assert that their property is located approximately one mile from the town line of the Town of Ashland. They assert that, because the Project will be located in the Town of Ashland, it will have an adverse effect on the character of their neighborhood and the Town of Holderness. They also assert that they followed the Project for over five years and believe that they acquired unique knowledge that can be helpful to the Subcommittee. They also claim that they are professional forensic accountants and their knowledge and expertise may be helpful to the Subcommittee. They believe that they should be granted intervention so that they can be well-prepared if the Applicant decides to re-design and construct the Project through their property.

Barbara and Robert Mathews reside at 47 Candia Road in Deerfield, New Hampshire. They own 75 acres in Deerfield. They do not assert that the Project will have an effect on their property. They do assert, however, that the Project will have significant negative impacts in Deerfield. They seek intervention as residents of Deerfield.

The Applicant objected to the petitions to intervene filed by these individuals. In the alternative, the Applicant suggested that they be combined with all other non-abutting property owners.

The impact of past designs for the Project on existing properties cannot be a basis for current intervention in this docket. In order to intervene in this docket, the parties are required to demonstrate rights, duties, privileges or other substantial interest that are current, specific and may be affected by the outcome of this proceeding. Prior route alignments of the Project are not before this Subcommittee. The outcome of these proceedings will not affect interests and rights based on the previous route of the Project. Furthermore, interests that are general to all residents of a community, *i.e* effect on tourism, property values, and business, without more, are not sufficiently specific to warrant intervention. Petitions to intervene filed for the following individuals assert past, general, or non-specific interests and rights: Elizabeth Terp; Gail S. Beaulieu; Jeanne M. Menard; Thomas N.T. Mullen; Deborah Warner; Peter W. Powell; Michael Marino and Lee Ann Moulder; Barbara and Robert Mathews. Their petitions to intervene are denied.

3. Non-Governmental Organizations

The Subcommittee received petitions to intervene from the following non-governmental organizations: (i) Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests; (ii) Appalachian Mountain Club; (iii) Conservation Law Foundation; (iv) New Hampshire Sierra Club; (v) Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust; (vi) Sugar Hill Historic Museum; (vii) New Hampshire Preservation Alliance and National Trust for Historic Preservation; (viii) North Country Scenic Byways Council; and (viii) No Northern Pass Coalition Board of Directors.

a. Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests

The Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests (Forest Society) is a private, non-profit membership organization dedicated to protecting the State's most important landscapes while promoting the wise use of its renewable natural resources. The Forest Society

has over 10,000 members and holds property interests in over 191,000 acres throughout New Hampshire. The Forest Society identified the following properties owned by it in fee interest that will be directly affected by the Project: (i) Washburn Forest (Clarksville); (ii) Kauffmann Forest (Stark); and (iii) The Rocks Estate (Bethlehem). The Forest Society also identified 13 pieces of real estate owned by different parties in which the Forest Society owns a conservation easement and which will be allegedly affected by the Project. Finally, the Forest Society asserted that it owns additional interests in several properties located in the vicinity of the Project.

The Applicant does not object to the petition to intervene filed by the Forest Society. The Applicant, however, requests that the Subcommittee combine the Forest Society's participation with that of other non-governmental organizations in one group of intervenors.

The Forest Society, as the owner of real estate that will be affected by the Project clearly has an interest in the outcome of these proceedings that are different from the interests of other non-governmental organizations. Unlike the other non-governmental organizations, the Forest Society has a direct ownership interest in property affected by the Project. Its participation cannot be combined with any other intervenor. The Forest Society's petition to intervene is granted. The Forest Society may participate as full party in these proceedings.

b. Appalachian Mountain Club, Conservation Law Foundation, Sierra Club Chapter of New Hampshire, and Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust

The Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC) is a non-profit conservation group incorporated in Massachusetts. It is a registered charity pursuant to § 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. It has over 90,000 members, including more than 12,000 New Hampshire members. The AMC mission includes "promoting the protection, enjoyment, and understanding of the mountains, forests, waters and trails of America's Northeast and Mid-Atlantic regions." The AMC believes that "these resources have intrinsic worth and also provide recreational opportunities, spiritual

renewal, and ecological and economic health for the region.” The AMC has advocated for the protection of New Hampshire’s natural and recreational resources and landscape for the last 140 years. Furthermore, it requested and was granted status as an intervenor in a number of Site Evaluation Committee’s dockets – Granite Reliable Power (Nos. 2008-04 and 2014-03), Wild Meadows No. 2013-02) and Antrim Wind (No. 2012-01). AMC asserts that siting, construction, and maintenance of the transmission line through New Hampshire substantially threatens the use and enjoyment of New Hampshire’s rivers, trails, and scenic vistas by AMC members. AMC further asserts that it believes that the Project will fragment the landscape, impair scenic and recreational resources, and may affect federal and state threatened species in the region. AMC concludes that its members’ interests will be affected by the Project and its impact on the aesthetics, wildlife, historic and recreational sites of New Hampshire. AMC asserts that it has been involved with proceedings related to the Project since 2010 and has helped define impacts related to the Project through comments to the Department of Energy during the National Environmental Policy Act review and by performing its own Visual Impact Assessment in 2012.

The Conservation Law Foundation (CLF) is a private, non-profit environmental organization dedicated to the protection and responsible use of New England’s natural resources. It has over 4,100 members, approximately 500 of whom reside in New Hampshire. CLF asserts that it and many of its members will be directly affected by the Subcommittee’s decision. It further asserts that its participation will be in the interest of the justice and will assist the Subcommittee with its decision-making. CLF asserts that it has been deeply involved with evaluation of the Project for the last five years. CLF submitted seven sets of written comments on the Project’s Presidential Permit Application and participated as a consulting party in the Department of Energy’s consultations with stakeholders under Section 106 of the National

Historic Preservation Act. It, therefore, believes that its expert participation will enhance the Subcommittee's thorough review of the Project.

The Subcommittee also received a petition to intervene from the Sierra Club Chapter of New Hampshire (Sierra Club). The Sierra Club's mission is to "explore, enjoy and protect the earth." The Sierra Club asserts that its mission requires due diligence to support clean energy that does not destroy the environment, communities and way of life. It further asserts that it is concerned that the energy source of the Project is neither clean nor renewable, that the construction will be a burden on property owners, ratepayers, and the state, and that there are other sources of energy that could provide wiser investment.

The Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust (ACT) is a nationally accredited regional land trust formed in 2000 and protecting over 3,000 acres of land in 22 towns in northern Grafton and Coos counties. Its mission is "to encourage land conservation as an integral part of the growth and future well-being of New Hampshire's North Country, through conserving places with ecological, historic, community, or scenic values." ACT is especially focused on conserving the farms and working forests that are the foundation of the region's economy and character. ACT asserts that the Project, as proposed, will directly affect its service area and mission. ACT asserts that the Project will not only span towns that are in its service region, but will be specifically be in towns where ACT currently owns easements – Lancaster, Bethlehem, Sugar Hill and Easton. ACT further asserts that many of its members will be affected by the construction and operation of the Project. ACT further asserts that it was actively involved with government agencies, local communities, residents, and other commissions and committees since the announcement of the plans to construct the Project. According to ACT, it has numerous staff and board members that possess unique knowledge and experience that may assist the Subcommittee with reaching its

decision. ACT asserts that its intervention is in the interest of justice because it is dedicated to protecting the values of wildlife habitat, public recreation, scenic view sheds, intact working forests, and an economy benefiting from sustaining traditional patterns of use and protection of region's land and landscape.

The Applicant does not object to petitions to intervene filed by the Appalachian Mountain Club, Conservation Law Foundation, New Hampshire Sierra Club, and Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust. The Applicant requests that the Subcommittee combine them into one group of intervenors.

The Appalachian Mountain Club, Conservation Law Foundation, New Hampshire Sierra Club, and Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust possess a level of expertise and knowledge that may assist the Subcommittee with reaching its decision. Their participation in this docket is in the interest of the justice. Petitions to intervene filed by the Appalachian Mountain Club, Conservation Law Foundation, New Hampshire Sierra Club, and Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust are granted. To ensure the orderly conduct of the proceedings, these parties are combined into one group of intervenors. Each of the organizations may file testimony, but the group shall designate a spokesperson/attorney for the purpose of filing pleadings, conducting discovery and the examination of witnesses at evidentiary hearings.

c. Sugar Hill Historical Museum, New Hampshire Preservation Alliance and National Trust for Historic Preservation, North Country Scenic Byways Council

The Sugar Hill Historical Museum's stated purpose is "to be an educational resource for the public through research, study, collection, preservation and exhibition of artifacts that illustrate the history of [its] community." The Museum asserts that it is the primary resource for the identification, preservation and protection of historical and cultural resources for the town. The Museum is concerned about the impacts of the Project on preserved historical and cultural

landscapes, archeological deposits, historic properties, historic districts in the town specifically, and in Grafton and Coos Counties generally. The Museum asserts that its intervention will be in the interest of the justice because it possesses expertise and knowledge that may assist the Subcommittee with reaching its decision.

The New Hampshire Preservation Alliance and National Trust for Historic Preservation filed a petition to intervene with the Subcommittee. The Alliance is a New Hampshire 501(c)(3) non-profit preservation organization. The Alliance asserts that it strengthens communities and stimulates local economies by encouraging the protection and revival of historic buildings and places. It strives to demonstrate that historic preservation is an integral part of new economic and environmental trends and that community development and environmental sustainability are compatible with historic preservation practices. According to the Alliance, it actively assists preservation projects in towns along the Project, including Ashland, Boscawen, Concord, Dixville, Lancaster, Stark and Whitefield. The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a congressionally chartered 501(c)(3) non-profit organization organized under the laws of the District of Columbia. It has a field office in Boston. It is a privately funded non-profit organization that works to preserve America's historic places. It has approximately 800,000 members, approximately 1,200 of whom live in New Hampshire. They assert that they have been involved with the Project since 2011, including: (i) participating in the US Department of Energy's National Environmental Policy Act review for the issuance of a Presidential Permit for the Project; (ii) participating as consulting parties in the Department of Energy's review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; and (iii) participating in public hearings in the current docket.

The Alliance asserts that it brings specific expertise related to the historic and cultural resources of the state and knowledge of the communities and people along the Project's route. Similarly, the Trust asserts that it brings extensive experience and expertise related to the identification and assessment of historic and cultural resources, archaeology, historic and cultural landscapes, heritage tourism, and the economics of historic preservation. They assert that their members' interests will be directly affected by the Project "including its impacts to the historic, cultural, archaeological resources, cultural landscapes, scenic byways, traditional cultural properties, recreation, and heritage tourism of New Hampshire."

The North Country Scenic Byways Council (NCSBC) is a volunteer body that was formed to develop and implement management plans for scenic byways in Coos and Northern Grafton Counties. NCSBC asserts that the overhead portion of the Project will cross scenic byways in eight locations in Coos and Northern Grafton Counties and will cross access roads to many of the region's scenic, cultural and recreational attractions. They assert that the Project will have an unreasonable adverse effect on the aesthetics of scenic byways. NCSBS is also concerned about the impact of the Project on tourism.

The Applicant does not object to petitions to intervene filed by Sugar Hill Historical Museum, New Hampshire Preservation Alliance and National Trust for Historic Preservation, and North Country Scenic Byways Council. With the exception of NCSBC, the Applicant requests that the Subcommittee combine all non-governmental organizations into one group of intervenors. The Applicant suggests that the Subcommittee should combine North Country Scenic Byways Council's participation with that of the conservations commissions.

The Sugar Hill Historical Museum, New Hampshire Preservation Alliance and National Trust for Historic Preservation, and North Country Scenic Byways Council represent interests

that will be affected by these proceedings and possess a level of expertise and knowledge that may assist the Subcommittee with reaching a decision. Their participation in this docket is in the interest of the justice. Their petitions, therefore, are granted. In order to assure the prompt and orderly conduct of the proceedings, these intervenors will be combined as a single group of intervenors. Each may file testimony, but they shall designate a single spokesperson/attorney for the purposes of filing pleadings, conducting discovery and for the examination of witnesses at evidentiary hearings.

d. No Northern Pass Coalition

The No Northern Pass Coalition (NNPC) asserts that it has conducted extensive research on the environmental impact of Hydro Quebec. It also asserts that it collected over 6,000 signed petitions from individuals across the State of New Hampshire and New England opposing the Project. Although NNPC did not provide said petitions to the Subcommittee with its petition to intervene, it asserts that it would like to be able to enter them into evidence. It further asserts that some of the individuals that signed the petitions will be directly affected by the Project.

The Applicant objected to participation of NNPC in this docket. In the alternative, the Applicant requested that the Subcommittee combine the Coalition's participation with that of the other non-governmental organizations.

NNPC fails to demonstrate any right, privilege, duty or other substantial interest that may be affected by the outcome of these proceedings. Apart from stating that it represents 6,000 unidentified individuals, NNPC fails to state with specificity how its interests or the interests of its members will or may be affected by the Project. To the extent that NNPC has a signed petition, the petition may be filed as public comment. The No Northern Pass Coalition's petition to intervene is denied.

4. Businesses and Organizations with Economic Interests

The Subcommittee received thirteen petitions to intervene from businesses and organizations that assert their economic interests in the Project: (i) Liebl Printing and Design; (ii) Garland Mill Timberframes; (iii) Cate Street Capital/Burgess Biopower; (iv) International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; (v) BAE Systems; (vi) Dyn, Inc.; (vii) Globe Manufacturing; (viii) Wilcox Industries Corp.; (ix) New England Ratepayers Association; (x) Coos County Business and Employment Group; (xi) Dixville Capital, LLC and Balsams Resort Holdings, LLC; (xii) Wagner Forest Management; (xiii) North Country Chamber of Commerce; (xiv) Greater Rochester Chamber of Commerce; (xv) Greater Nashua Chamber of Commerce; and (xvi) Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce.

a. Liebl Printing and Design and Garland Mill Timberframes

Liebl Printing and Design is located at 15 Forbes Hill Road in Colebrook, New Hampshire. Its owners assert that the Project will have negative impact on tourism in the area and, consequently, will negatively affect their business by diminishing its client base. They also assert that the property value of their business will be adversely affected.

Garland Mill Timberframes designs and builds heavy timberframed structures and high performance buildings for area residents and people moving to the area. Its owner, Benjamin M. Southworth, asserts that the Project will have a negative effect on business by discouraging people to move and reside in the North Country.

The Applicant did not object to petitions to intervene filed by Liebl Printing and Design and Garland Mill Timberframes. It suggested, however, that their participation should be combined with that of other businesses.

Liebl Printing and Design and Garland Mill Timberframes fail to raise specific interests and privileges that will be affected by the Project. Concerns about the impact of the Project on their businesses are general and speculative. They do not demonstrate specific concerns that warrant participation of these businesses in this docket. The claims raised by these businesses are no different than concerns of the general public. The petitions to intervene filed by Liebl Printing and Design and Garland Mill Timberframes are denied.

b. Cate Street Capital, Inc.

Cate Street Capital, Inc. (CSC), is the manager of a 75 MW biomass-fired power project known as Burgess BioPower, LLC (Burgess). CSC asserts that Burgess utilizes the Coos Loop Transmission Line that will be upgraded by the Applicant as a part of the Project. As a result of the proposed upgrade, the Loop's potential capacity may increase by up to 100MW. CSC asserts that the upgrade will significantly improve curtailment issues experienced by Burgess. CSC further asserts that, as a manager of Burgess, it will be directly affected by the economic stimulus the Project is expected to bring to the North County and surrounding communities. CSC also asserts that it is concerned about the projected retirement of approximately 8,000 MWs from the New England electric grid due to plant retirements.

The Applicant did not object to petitions to intervene filed by the CSC. It suggested, however, that its participation should be combined with that of other businesses.

CSC will be directly affected by the construction and operation of the Project. Its interests in the upgraded Coos Loop and economic benefits that, as proposed, will directly benefit it are apparent. CSC's petition to intervene is granted. The interests raised by the CSC, however, are similar to the interests raised by the City of Berlin. Therefore, CSC's participation in this docket is combined with Berlin.

c. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) is a labor organization representing more than 3,000 employees in New Hampshire. IBEW asserts that its members' future employment opportunities depend on the Subcommittee's decision to grant or deny a Certificate.

The Applicant did not object to the petition to intervene filed by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. It suggested, however, that the IBEW's participation be combined with that of other businesses.

Construction and operation of the Project will have a direct impact on members of IBEW. The employment and income earning ability of IBEW members is affected by the outcome of this proceeding. IBEW's petition to intervene is granted. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers may participate as a full party in these proceedings.

d. BAE Systems, Dyn, Inc., Globe Manufacturing, and Wilcox Industries Corp., and New England Ratepayers Association

BAE Systems, Dyn, Inc., Globe Manufacturing, and Wilcox Industries Corp. request intervention. They assert that they are among the largest energy consumers in the State of New Hampshire. They further assert that the cost of electricity negatively affects their businesses. According to them, the Project will bring reliable, low-cost energy to New Hampshire and, therefore, will have positive effects on them. Finally, they assert that their "participation will speak directly to the important economic benefits of this project to [their] businesses and why this project is in the public interest."

The New England Ratepayers Association is a non-profit social welfare organization that advocates for the interests of ratepayers throughout New England. Its members are individuals and businesses in New Hampshire and other New England states who are concerned about the

high cost of electricity in the region and its impact on the economy. It seeks to participate as “an organization whose focus is on lowering electricity rates to New Hampshire families and businesses.”

The interests raised by BAE Systems, Dyn, Inc., Globe Manufacturing, Wilcox Industries Corp., and the New England Ratepayers Association are general in nature. They are concerns that are shared by businesses and individuals across the state. These businesses do not demonstrate the type of substantial interests that warrant participation as an intervenor. Their concerns will be adequately addressed by the overall process. The petitions to intervene filed by BAE Systems, Dyn, Inc., Globe Manufacturing, Wilcox Industries Corp., and the New England Ratepayers Association are denied.

e. Coos County Business and Employers Group

The Coos County Business and Employers Group is a non-profit voluntary corporation that was organized to encourage and cultivate economic development and opportunities across business sectors for the promotion of growth and prosperity of cities, towns, villages, and unincorporated locations within Coos County, New Hampshire. The Group asserts that construction and operation of the Project will bring numerous economic benefits and will ensure creation of numerous construction jobs. The Group asserts that the benefits will lead to economic prosperity in the region, which advances the goals and mission of the Group.

The Applicant did not object to petition to intervene filed by the Coos County Business and Employers Group, but suggested that the Group’s participation be combined with that of other intervenors in this docket.

Members of the Coos County Business and Employers Group have a direct interest in the outcome of these proceedings. Their income, employment, and prosperity may be directly

affected by the Subcommittee's decision to deny or grant the Certificate. The Group's petition to intervene is granted. The Group may participate as a full party in these proceedings.

f. North Country Chamber of Commerce

The North Country Chamber of Commerce (NCCOC) is a New Hampshire nonprofit organization with an office located in Colebrook, New Hampshire. Its mission is the promotion, development, publicizing and improvement of the region it serves in Northern Coos County (New Hampshire) and Northeastern Essex County (Vermont). It has over 130 members from the region's business community. NCCOC asserts that the Project will have adverse effects on tourism and related economy. It also will have adverse effects on the local and regional environment, property values, and aesthetics. NCCOC asserts such effects will impact its members and, therefore, NCCOC's interests, rights, and privileges.

The Applicant did not object to the petition to intervene filed by the North Country Chamber of Commerce, but suggested that its participation be combined with that of other intervenors in this docket.

The Project, if approved, will have a direct and significant effect on residents and businesses of Coos County and, consequently, on members of NCCOC and its mission. NCCOC's petition to intervene is granted. NCCOC is allowed to intervene as a full party in these proceedings.

g. Dixville Capital, LLC and Balsams Resort Holdings, LLC

Dixville Capital, LLC, and Balsams Resort Holdings, LLC, assert that they entered into a number of contracts and option agreements seeking to purchase approximately 11,000 acres and the Balsams Resort. They seek to substantially develop the resort as a year-round destination by undertaking a project that would include expansion of skiing terrain to 2,200 acres, creation of an

extensive and fully-integrated trail network for Nordic skiing, hiking and biking, building new lodging and connecting lodging to the trail system, revitalization of the existing golf course and restoration of the historic clubhouse. The overall cost of the redevelopment is expected to be approximately \$143 million. Dixville Capital, LLC, and Balsams Resort Holdings, LLC, assert that the Project will run parallel to the eastern boundary of the resort and may affect their plans to expand skiable terrain. They also assert that the Project may affect the availability and cost of power that will be used by the resort.

The Applicant did not object to the petition to intervene filed by Dixville Capital, LLC, and Balsams Resort Holdings, LLC, but suggested that their participation be combined with that of other intervenors in this docket.

The interests of Dixville Capital, LLC, and Balsams Resort Holdings, LLC, will be affected by the outcome of these proceedings. The Project's proximity and potential constraints on the resort's ability to expand its terrain as well as its ability to obtain electricity will have an immediate and direct impact on the resort and entities that own it. Their petition is granted and they may participate as a single party in this docket.¹⁷

h. Wagner Forest Management

Wagner Forest Management manages forest lands along 24 miles of the proposed route, land that the Applicant seeks to use for the construction of the Project. The Applicant has leased portions of the lands for the construction and operation of the Project from Wagner. Wagner Forest Management thus has a direct economic interest in the outcome of these proceedings. The

¹⁷ Subsequent to the filing of the petition to intervene, the Applicant announced an advance grant of \$2 million from the Forward New Hampshire Fund to the redevelopment of the Balsams Resort.

petition to intervene filed by Wagner Forest Management is granted. Wagner Forest Management may participate as a party in these proceedings.

i. Greater Rochester, Nashua and Manchester Chambers of Commerce

The Greater Rochester, Nashua and Manchester Chambers of Commerce are non-profit business advocacy organizations whose members are businesses located in their regions. They assert that their members continue to raise concerns about the availability and high costs of electricity. According to them, the Project will bring additional electricity and decrease the cost of electricity in New Hampshire. It will have a positive effect on Chambers of Commerce members and, consequently, will affect the Chambers' rights and interests.

The Applicant did not object to petitions to intervene filed by Chambers of Commerce, but suggested that their participation be combined with that of other businesses.

The interests expressed by the Rochester, Manchester, and Nashua Chambers of Commerce are general in nature. Interests in economic benefits and supply of electricity associated with the Project affect all members of the public. Those interests will be addressed and represented by the process and by Counsel for the Public and other intervenors. The petitions filed by the Greater Nashua, Rochester, and Manchester Chambers of Commerce are denied.

5. State Legislators

The Subcommittee received a petition to intervene signed by 4 senators and 63 state representatives (State Legislators). The State Legislators assert that their constituents have expressed serious concerns about the Project. They further assert that construction and operation of the Project, in one way or another, will affect the interests of their constituents. Therefore, they seek intervention to ensure that the rights, interest, and privileges of their constituents and issues raised by the Project are addressed by the Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee also received an individual petition to intervene from Laurence M. Rappaport, New Hampshire State Representative, Coos District One. Representative Rappaport asserts that he represents all the communities from Pittsburg to North Stratford in the New Hampshire legislature and seeks to represent the interests of his constituents in these proceedings.

The Applicant objected to the petitions to intervene filed by the New Hampshire State Legislators. In the alternative, the Applicant suggested that all senators and representatives be combined into one group of intervenors.

The State Legislators do not express individual interests that will be affected by these proceedings. Their requests to intervene are solely based on the interests of their constituents. The State Legislators do not identify a single individual or related interest that, in fact, may be affected by the outcome of these proceedings. The interests asserted by the State Legislators are generalized and are not sufficient to warrant intervention in this docket. New Hampshire benefits from the sacrifices of our citizen legislature, but election to the legislature does not create the type of right, privilege, or interest that is required to be demonstrated by an intervenor in an administrative adjudicative hearing. The petitions to intervene filed by the New Hampshire Legislators and Representative Rappaport are denied.

6. New England Power Generators Association, Inc.

The New England Power Generators Association, Inc. (NEPGA), is a trade association representing competitive electric generation companies in New England. Its members collectively generate approximately 25,000 megawatts of generating capacity in the region, with more than 2,700 megawatts generated by New Hampshire companies from wind, solar, gas, nuclear, biomass, and hydro. Its mission is to promote sound energy policies to further economic

development, jobs and balanced environmental policy. NEPGA asserts that it has a “direct and substantial interest in ensuring this project competes on a level playing field with other projects of this nature and in ensuring that Eversource Energy’s competitive electric affiliate, Northern Pass Transmission, LLC (NPT), is not unfairly advantaged to the detriment of other non-affiliated companies operating in the region” NEPGA seeks limited intervention status so it can address the following issues: (i) the implications for the Applicant of the affiliate relationship between Eversource Energy and Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and the potential for any undue benefit that may arise therein; (ii) impacts to the competitive electricity markets, including but not limited to, competitive procurement practices and the potential power purchase agreement; and (iii) any proposed public interest stated by the Applicant. NEPGA also asserts that it has knowledge, experience and perspectives that are likely to be of value to the Subcommittee and other parties.

The Applicant objected to NEPGA’s participation.

NEPGA fails to establish specific and substantial interests that may be affected by the outcome of these proceedings. Instead, NEPGA asserted that it seeks intervention to “ensure this project competes on a level playing field with other projects of this nature and . . . [to ensure that] . . . Northern Pass Transmission, LLC (NPT), is not unfairly advantaged to the detriment of other non-affiliated companies operating in the region.” Ensuring fair or competitive markets is not a reason for intervention and is not within the purview of the Site Evaluation Committee. The Committee makes siting decisions and does not regulate competition amongst electric generators. NEPGA fails to demonstrate a substantial interest, right, or privilege that may be affected by the outcome of these proceedings. NEPGA’s petition to intervene is denied.

7. Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee

The Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee's duties include the requirement to consider and comment on any federal, state, or local governmental plans to approve, license, fund or construct facilities that would alter the resource values and character for which the river is designated. The Pemigewasset River was designated in 1991. The Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee's focus is on the implications of proposed development activity on water quality, water quantity, and aesthetic impact on the river. The Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee asserts that the river and supporting wetlands will be negatively affected by the Project.

The Applicant did not object to the petitions to intervene filed by the Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee, but suggested that its participation be combined with that of the conservation commissions.

The Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee has a substantial interest in ensuring that rivers and wetlands will not be negatively impacted by the Project. The Committee's petition to intervene is granted. The Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee may intervene as a full party in these proceedings.

III. Conclusion

This matter is without precedent in New Hampshire. More than 160 motions to intervene were filed, many of which were on behalf of multiple entities. Most of those seeking intervenor status have been able to identify direct and substantial interests in this matter and have a right to intervene. It is simply not possible, however, to administer a proceeding of this nature with that number of individual, separate parties. Fortunately, the statute and rules governing intervention allow limitations to be imposed on intervenors, including consolidation and combination of

intervenors, as long as the limitations are not “so extensive as to prevent the intervenor from protecting the interest which formed the basis for intervention.” RSA 541-A:32, IV. Here, while each intervenor has something that makes him, her, or it unique, there are many common interests and positions that make the combinations and consolidations described above appropriate. Even with all of the combinations, there will still be more than 20 separate individuals and groups, in addition to the Applicant and Counsel for the Public, who will be speaking at hearings and technical sessions, propounding data requests, and filing motions and other types of pleadings.

With respect to those whose intervention petitions are denied, they are not precluded from participating in this matter in a number of ways. They are free to continue to submit comments, and those who have special knowledge and expertise are also able to assist like-minded individuals and groups who are intervenors.

IV. Orders

It is hereby ordered that the petitions to intervene filed by the following parties are granted:

1. **Towns, Towns Governing Bodies, Municipal Sub-Units, Conservation Commissions, Grafton County Commissioners, Rick Samson, Local Government Entities**
 - a. **Towns, Bodies, Municipal Sub-Units and Conservation Commissions**
 - **Municipal Group 1** – Pittsburg, Clarksville, Stewartstown, Colebrook, Northumberland, Whitefield (Board of Selectmen and Planning Board), Dalton (Board of Selectmen and Conservation Commission), Bethlehem (Board of Selectmen, Planning Board and Conservation Commission); and Littleton – as a single party;
 - **Municipal Group 2** – Sugar Hill, Franconia (Board of Selectmen, Planning Board, and Conservation Commission), Easton (Board of Selectmen, Planning Board, and Conservation Commission), Woodstock, and Plymouth – as a single party;

- **Municipal Group 3** - Holderness (Board of Selectmen and Conservation Commission), Ashland (Board of Selectmen, Conservation Commission and Water & Sewer Department), Bridgewater, New Hampton, Bristol, Canterbury, Concord, Pembroke (Board of Selectmen and Conservation Commission), and Deerfield (Board of Selectmen, Planning Board, and Conservation Commission) – as a single party.
 - City of Franklin – as a full party.
- b. Grafton County Commissioners and Commissioner Rick Samson – as a single party
- Grafton County Commissioners
 - Commissioner Rick Samson

2. **Individual Parties**

- a. Abutting Property Owners: Clarksville – Dalton
- i. *Clarksville-Stewartstown Abutting Property Intervenors (underground portion of the Project), as a single party*
- Charles and Donna Jordan
 - Sally A. Zankowski
 - Jon and Lori Levesque
 - Roderick and Donna McAllaster
 - Lynne Placey
 - Arlene Placey
 - Brad and Daryl Thompson
 - David Schrier
 - Nancy L. Dodge
- ii. *Dummer, Stark, Northumberland, Whitefield, and Dalton Abutting Property Intervenors (overhead portion of the Project), as a single party*
- R. Eric Jones and Margaret J. Jones
 - Elmer C. Lupton and Claire C. Lupton
 - Mary Boone Wellington
 - Bruce and Sondra Brekke
 - Elaine V. Olson
 - Eric M. Olson
 - Joshua Olson
 - Elaine V. Olson
 - Kevin Spencer
 - Rodrigue J. and Tammy L. Beland
 - Susan E. Percy for Percy Summer Club

- Mark Lagasse and Kevin Spencer for Lagaspence Realty, LLC
 - Robert Heath
 - James and Judy Ramsdell
 - Charles and Cynthia Hatfield
 - Donald and Betty Gooden
 - Tim and Brigitte White
- b. Non-Abutting Property Owners: Clarksville – Bethlehem, as a single party
- Robert Martin
 - Roderick C. Moore, Jr., Joseph John Dunlap, Shawn Patrick Brady and Christopher Thompson
 - E. Martin Kaufman, Bradley J. Thompson, and John Petrofsky on behalf of 44 residents of Stewartstown and East Colebrook (Dixville Notch-Harvey Swell Location residents);
 - Mark W. Orzek and Susan Orzek
 - John W. Davidge for Prospect Farm-Lancaster, LLC
 - Linda Upham-Bornstein
 - Rebecca Weeks Sherrill More, PhD for the Weeks Lancaster Trust
 - Richard M. McGinnis
 - Frederic P. Fitts
 - Gerald and Vivian Roy
 - Edward A. Piatek
 - Frank and Kate Lombardi
 - Marsha J. Lombardi
 - Alexandra M. Dannis and James G. Dannis
 - David Van Houten
 - Wendy Doran
 - Andrew D. Dodge.
- c. Abutting Property Owners: Bethlehem – Plymouth, as a single party
- Nigel Manley and Judy Ratzel
 - Russel and Lydia Cumbee
 - Walter Palmer and Kathryn Ting
 - G. Peter and Mary S. Grote
 - Paul and Dana O'Hara
 - Virginia Jeffreys
 - Carol Dwyer
 - Gregory and Lucille Wolf
 - Susan Schibanoff
 - Ken and Linda Ford
 - Campbell McLaren, M.D.
 - Eric and Barbara Meyer
 - Robert W. Thibault
 - Dennis Ford

- Carl Lakes and Barbara Lakes
 - Bruce D. Ahern
 - Frank Pinter
- d. Non-Abutting Property Owners: Bethlehem – Plymouth, as a single party
- Lee Sullivan and Stephen Buzzell
 - Timothy and Rebecca Burbank, Edward Cenerizio and Deborah Corey, and Matthew Steele, individually and as owners of 41 Dyke Road, LLC
- e. Abutting Property Owners: Ashland – Deerfield, as a single party
- Carol Currier
 - Mary A Lee
 - Craig and Corinne Pullen
 - McKenna’s Purchase Unit Owners Association
 - Taras and Marta Kucman
 - Kelly Normandeau
 - Laura M. Bonk
 - Philip H. Bilodeau and Joan C. Bilodeau
 - Erick B. Berglund Jr. and Kathleen A. Berglund
 - Rebecca Hutchinson
 - Torin Judd and Brian Judd
 - Jo Anne Bradbury
 - Jeanne M. Menard as a General Partner of the Menard Forest Family Limited Partnership
 - Jeanne M. Menard for Peter F. Menard and Anne K. Burnett
 - Kevin and Lisa Cini
 - Bruce A. Adami and Robert J. Cote
 - Eric and Sandra Lahr
- f. Non-Abutting Property Owners: Ashland – Deerfield, as a single party
- Joanna and Robert Tuveson
 - Nina and Elisha Gray
 - Rodney Felgate and Laura Felgate
 - The Webster Family Group
 - Lawrence Phillips and Maxine Phillips
 - Lisa Wolford and Pamela Hanglin
 - F. Maureen Quinn
 - Madelyn and Thomas Foulkes
 - Jeanne M. Menard as a managing member of Pawtackaway View, LLC

3. Non-Governmental Organizations

- a. Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests –as full party;

- b. Appalachian Mountain Club, Conservation Land Foundation, Sierra Club Chapter of New Hampshire, and Ammonoosuc Conservation Trust – as a single party; and
- c. Sugar Hill Historical Museum, New Hampshire Preservation Alliance and National Trust for Historic Preservation, North Country Scenic Byways Council – as a single party.

4. Businesses and Organization with Economic Interests

- a. Cate Street Capital, Inc. and City of Berlin – as a single party;
- b. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers – full party;
- c. Coos County Business and Employers Group – full party;
- d. North County Chamber of Commerce – full party;
- e. Dixville Capital, LLC and Balsams Resort Holdings, LLC – full party; and
- f. Wagner Forest Management – full party.

5. Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee.

and;

It is hereby further ordered that the motions to intervene filed by the following parties are

denied:

- 1. City of Nashua;
- 2. City of Manchester;
- 3. Lafayette School Board;
- 4. Anita Giulietti;
- 5. Sandra and Paul Kamins;
- 6. Elizabeth Terp;
- 7. Gail S. Beaulieu;
- 8. Jeanne M. Menard (as to her Parade Properties petition);
- 9. Thomas N.T. Mullen;
- 10. Deborah Warner;
- 11. Peter W. Powell;
- 12. Michael Marino and Lee Ann Moulder;
- 13. Barbara and Robert Mathews;
- 14. Robert B. Crave;
- 15. Krsi Pastoriza;
- 16. James H. Page, Jr.;
- 17. No Northern Pass Coalition;
- 18. Liebl Printing and Design;
- 19. Garland Mill Timberframes;
- 20. BAE Systems;
- 21. Dyn, Inc.;
- 22. Globe Manufacturing;

23. Wilcox Industries Corp.;
24. New England Ratepayers Association;
25. Greater Rochester Chamber of Commerce;
26. Greater Nashua Chamber of Commerce;
27. Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce;
28. State Representatives and Senators; and,
29. New England Power Generators Association, Inc.

March 18, 2016



New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee
Martin P. Honigberg, Chairman