

**From:** Mark Orzeck [<mailto:Mark.Orzeck@htproducts.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 09, 2015 9:10 AM  
**To:** Drew, Tim  
**Cc:** [morzeck@charter.net](mailto:morzeck@charter.net); Mark Orzeck  
**Subject:** 9/9/15 SEC Meeting Input

Mr Drew,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide written input. I regret that I cannot attend the meeting in person, but I trust my written testimony will be sufficient.

I am a proud member of the SPNHF, and I would like to echo and hopefully reinforce the points below:

**First**, I think it is unreasonable for the final EIS to limit its entire study to one international border crossing, the one chosen by the applicant to be located over Hall's Stream in Pittsburg. The DOE has repeatedly suggested that its regulatory purview in the case of the NP project is limited to granting a Presidential Permit to cross the international border. **It is more than ironic that the DEIS considers 11 alternatives for transmission corridor siting over which DOE has no regulatory authority and only one location for the international boundary crossing, where the DOE decision is focused by law.** It would greatly improve the final EIS if it considered at least one other international border crossing.

**Second**, if the DOE's final EIS does consider more than one international border crossing, the most reasonable location for a **completely buried** transmission line would be down Interstate 91 from Derby Line, Vt. to the intersection of I-91 and I-93 in Waterford, Vt., then down I-93 to a terminus in southern New Hampshire or northern Massachusetts where the electrons can be successfully integrated with the New England grid. Not only would this likely result in the least damage to the environment of all alternatives studied, it should also reduce the total project construction cost. **The length of the facility between Derby Line and Exit 40 on the N.H. part of I-93 is actually 10 miles shorter than the serpentine route in the "proposed action" between Halls' Stream in Pittsburg and Exit 40.**

**Third**, the final EIS should eliminate any consideration of building the DC/AC converter station in Franklin, and should consider at least one termination point south of the present terminus in Deerfield. The converter station should be built as close as possible to the point where the electricity is introduced to the New England grid. This allows for less line loss of electricity and provides for the cheapest way of building a completely buried transmission facility through New Hampshire. Since the electrons themselves are headed for markets in Massachusetts, considering a buried HVDC line through New Hampshire to a termination point in Massachusetts should be one alternative studied in the final

**Mark Orzeck**

**Westport, MA and Stark, NH**