

**From:** Mark Orzeck [<mailto:Mark.Orzeck@htproducts.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 09, 2015 9:03 AM  
**To:** Drew, Tim  
**Cc:** [morzeck@charter.net](mailto:morzeck@charter.net); Mark Orzeck  
**Subject:** September 9 SEC Meeting Input  
**Importance:** High

Mr Drew,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my input in regards to the upcoming meeting. Below is an article I had submitted to a few newspapers, especially in the North Country. Northern Pass had published these bullets last month, and although they sound great to the uninformed, if you compare them to all the options (especially fully underground) you will see that they are the least return for NH.

As you may know, the Northern Pass Draft Environmental impact Statement has been released by the DOE and is ready for public comment.

I read this recent blog post on the Northern Pass website, and felt I had to respond to these so called "benefits" of their antiquated overhead proposal. I've added comparative information, in italics, taken from the same Summary for each "benefit" cited by Northern Pass as they try to push the current overhead proposal.

The "Underground in existing roadway" alternatives I refer to below are alternatives 4a-4c, and 6a-6b, which can be viewed in the map found here.

<http://www.northernpasseis.us/library/draft-eis>

According to the official Northern Pass website:

"The DEIS found that Northern Pass as currently proposed (*overhead*) will:"

- "Have a "Total Average Scenic Impact" of 1.79, on a scale of 0 to 5, which is considered "low" to "very low."
  - *This also happens to be the highest impact of all alternatives, with 185 miles of roadway within the viewshed.*
  - *Underground in existing roadway alternatives will have a "Total Average Scenic Impact" of 1.62 to 1.66, with only 0 to 43 miles of roadway within the viewshed.*
- "Generate more than \$564 million of additional economic output within New Hampshire during construction"
  - *Underground in existing roadway alternatives will generate between \$974.9 and \$1,122.9 million of additional economic output within New Hampshire during construction*
  - *That's \$410.9 to \$558.9 million additional dollars to NH.*
- "Increase annual statewide property tax collections by approximately \$29 million"
  - *This is the LOWEST benefit to NH of all the alternatives!*
  - *Underground in existing roadway alternatives will increase the annual statewide property tax collections by approximately \$50.4 to \$57.8 million.*
  - *That's almost double the "benefits" of the proposed action alternative.*
- "Save New Hampshire customers between \$18.3 million and \$21.6 million in electric energy costs annually"
  - *Underground in existing roadways will also save customers between \$18.3 million and \$21.6 million in electric energy costs annually.*

- **“Create 5,369 jobs in New Hampshire during construction, as well as hundreds of permanent jobs”**
  - *Underground in existing roadway alternatives will create between 9,000 and 10,000 jobs during construction, as well as THOUSANDS (1,300 to 1,500) of permanent jobs.*
  - *That’s TWICE the number of jobs promised than in the proposed action.*
- **“Reduce regional carbon emissions by 8 percent or 3.5 million tons”**
  - *This comes with a loss of a CO2 uptake of 932 metric tons per year, due to the large clear-cut’s required.*
  - *Underground in existing roadway alternatives will only result in a loss of CO2 uptake between 115 and 162 metric tons per year, approximately 7-8 times better than the proposed action.*

“Other notable conclusions include:”

- **“Northern Pass poses no health risks associated with EMFs”**
  - *Yet there appears to be a link between EMF’s and childhood leukemia, depending on who you ask of course.*
  - *Underground in existing roadway alternatives will avoid even the slightest possibility of a public health impact.*
- **“Northern Pass will not have “population-level effects to any protected species”**
  - *But as proposed it will impact 1,217 acres of Wildlife Habitat.*
  - *Underground in existing roadway alternatives will impact between 253 to 279 acres.*
  - *While the ideal situation would be 0 acres, the underground alternatives will have approximately ¼ of the impact that the current proposal would have.*
- **“Northern Pass will have noise levels well below EPA guidance levels”**
  - *Underground in existing roadway alternatives will generate NO noise during operation, as opposed to the 28-44 dBA generated by the proposed action.*
  - *The summary does not take into account wind noise in the wires, which can be quite substantial.*

*Remember when NP continuously stated construction costs of “10 times the overhead cost”? Seems the fully underground route will cost approximately \$2 billion, not the approximately \$10 billion cost they were throwing around without evidence to back it up.*

*Is this the “balanced” proposal they speak of that takes into account the people of NH, or is it the same tired story with them selling the “benefits” of the project as proposed, to maximize their returns at the state’s expense?*

*Although I wrote this before the new route around the WMNF was disclosed, I feel all the points still apply. Northern Pass is only going underground where they HAVE TO. I feel they are trying to stay above ground so that they can continue to develop the ROW with more and more lines. Please be forward thinking enough to realize this isn’t just one line we are talking about. Once one line goes in, it’ll be “Hey, what’s one more?”. Next thing you know the Great North Woods will look like the disgrace that some areas of New York and New Jersey became.*

*New Hampshire truly is worth it, and as the song goes “you don’t know what you’ve got ‘til it’s gone”...*

*Mark Orzeck*

*Stark, NH and Westport, MA*