

**State of New Hampshire  
Site Evaluation Committee  
Docket No. 2015-06**

**Joint Application of Northern Pass, LLC and Public service Company of New Hampshire  
d/b/s Eversource Energy for a Certificate of Site and Facility.**

**Supplemental Pre-Filed Testimony of Bruce and Sondra Brekke, Members of the Dalton,  
Whitefield and Bethlehem Abutting Property Intervenor(Overhead Portion) SEC  
Mandated Group**

**April 17, 2017**

**What are your names?**

Bruce and Sondra Brekke

**What is your address?**

99 Ramble On Road, Whitefield, NH

**What is the purpose of this supplemental testimony?**

We offer this testimony to provide information not previously known or available to us, and refinements to our prior submittals, related to the 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 to construct a new high voltage transmission line, and related facilities in New Hampshire before the Site Evaluation Committee.

**What information has become available to you?**

Since submitting our pre-trial testimony on November 15, 2016 and appearing at the Technical Session Data Request on January 23, 2017, we have learned that the heights of the proposed one hundred foot towers can be lessened to heights as low as sixty feet.

**Where can this information be found and how was it made available to you?**

The document submitted by the Applicants, "2015-06\_2015\_12\_04\_app\_1\_plan\_profile.pdf", aka, "PROPOSED PLAN & PROFILES – Burns McDonnell", is a profile description of the proposed project. Specifically, on page 79, a section of Whitefield is shown, where towers DC-587 through DC-589, and towers D142-424A through D142-426 are 60 feet and 56.5 feet, respectively. Prior to and after this section, the tower heights exceed ninety feet.

**Why do you suppose that the towers were lowered for this section of NPT?**

Based on the reply that was provide to us when we inquired why the proposed towers that abut our property were at the heights that they were, which was, "The Project's visual expert determined

that the line of structures to the south of this area may create a potential visual impact on Burns Pond and the views seen from this waterbody. As such, the Applicants chose to utilize monopole structures instead of lattice structures in this area. Please refer to the Application at Pages 58 to 59 and Appendix 17, Page M-16 for a discussion of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation methods used by the Applicants to reduce potential impacts to scenic resources.”, we would imagine that the visual impact was such that the proposed towers were lowered.

**Why is this of particular interest to you?**

Our situation is very similar. As stated in our pre-trial testimony, the panoramic view at our property is a big part of why we purchased it in 2008. If lowering the tower heights to the tree level is possible because of visual impact, then the Applicant, and the Committee, should strongly consider doing so.

**Are there any thoughts that you wish to express regarding your supplemental testimony?**

We would to clarify our pre-file testimony regarding the impact of the Northern Pass on the value of our property and our quality of life.

In 1974, we were married and in settled in New Jersey. We rented a house in the southern part of the state near the Jersey shore for 8 years, and then moved to the northern part of the state where we lived for 28 years. Both areas of the state were heavily populated. Lattice power line towers 90 to 120 foot high were part of the landscape and the number of them seemed to increase every year. They were not pretty to look at, but we were aware that they were there when we bought our house in northern New Jersey.

We bought our property in Whitefield over 9 years ago as our retirement home. We chose our property in New Hampshire because of its location at the end of a quiet, private road and the spectacular view of the mountains. The photos we submitted in our pre-trial testimony do not capture the true beauty of the remarkable panoramic view of Mt Waumbek, Mt Cabot, Mt Prospect, and the Kilkenny and Pliny ranges. When we bought the property there were NO towers to obstruct our glorious view. The towers proposed by the Applicant, 90 to 120 feet high, will destroy our view, will negatively impact property value and will also permanently damage our quality of life.

**Does this conclude your supplemental pre-trial testimony?**

Yes.