

# Langford House



**REALTORS\***

Business Route 101 & Langford road • East Candia, N.H. 03040

DIAL 603/483-2131

January 24, 1991

Dear Nancy Brown McKinney:

To review the appraised value of your Mountain Road I compared your parcel to your father's property on Nottingham Road using MMC's data supplied by the Town.

Location: Mountain Road, Deerfield

Tax Map: 7, 168

Owner: Nancy Brown McKinney

Appraised Value: \$77,100

Comparison property: Nottingham Road, Map 7 - 39,  
Appraised value: \$88,700

**Factors:**

Frontage	900	785
Acreage	25	24
Road	paved	unpaved
Quality	high	poor
Dividable	yes	questionable
Marketability	excellent	poor
Cost to build	normal	extraordinary
Appeal	high	low
Access	average	requires wet land permit to build a driveway.
Topography	high, dry, fields, wood gradual slopes	Steep 20% grade to dry land, wet land across entire road road frontage.
Other	Views	none

**Comments:**

The location of the properties are in the same general geographic location, however their settings are substantially different. The setting and general characteristics of the Mountain Road land make it a significantly less desirable piece of property than the Nottingham Road property.

Given the topography of the Mountain Road land with its low wet frontage and steep slopes there are few natural building sites on the property. Access to them is difficult if not impossible without incurring extraordinary expense. Driveway construction and septic installation will limit the land's value to a developer.

One correction on MMC sheet under property under review: The Road is paved. Mountain Road is not paved.





## Conclusions:

Mountain Road is not as a desirable piece of property. I have shown the parcel several times over to past year, the conclusions are consistant that the cost of building is prohibitive.

The most likely user of this piece is the person who seeks privacy

and protection from developement. It has little more value than a single parcel. Recent sales on Haynes Road \$32,000 and Candia Road \$42,000.

The ratio of the assessed value is a better reflection of their relative market value than their appraised value.

This property is worth \$50,000.

Sincerely,

Thomas Foulkes  
Broker





**Supplemental Prefiled Testimony  
of Robert Cote and Bruce Adami  
Docket No. 2015-06  
April 2017**

**ATTACHMENT B**

# ATTACHMENT C

## Appendix C (revised) - Undergrounding Incremental Cost Analysis

	A	B
1	1,090	Megawatts of capacity for NP transmission line
2	1,090,000	Kilowatt equivalent
3	Assume 40-year period (life expectancy of the NP line), 83% delivery rate - how many kilowatt-hours are delivered?	
4	1,090,000	Kilowatts
5	x 20	Years
6	x 365	Days/year
7	x 24	Hours/Day
8	x 83%	Assumed percent utilization of the NP line
9	= 1.58503E+11	Kilowatt-hours over 20 years
10	= 7,925	Gigawatt-hours / year
11		
12	\$2,000,000,000	Assumed increase in NP project cost for underground alternative (see attached financing calculation)
13		
14		
15	\$0.0126	Estimated incremental \$/KwHr at 83% delivery rate over a 20-year period (A12÷A9)
16		
17	143,171	Gigawatt-hours / year (estimated 2019 NE annual energy from CELT Report - May 2016 attached)
18	6%	Estimated percentage of NE power from NP (A10÷A17)
19	0.07¢	Estimated incremental NE regional impact ( in cents) on wholesale energy cost from burial of NP transmission line (A18xA15x100)
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		



## Appendix C (revised) - Undergrounding Incremental Cost Analysis

	A	B
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		
61		
62		
63		
64		

mortgage calculator

### Mortgage calculator

Monthly cost      Maximum loan

---

Mortgage amount  
**\$ 1000000000**

---

Interest rate (%)      Period (years)

**8**      **20**

---

Total cost of mortgage      \$2,007,456,166

Monthly payments      **\$8,364,401**

Feedback

Bob

## ATTACHMENT D

**TS1 41** Provide the amount of oil that is kept on-site in the transformers at the existing Deerfield Substation and how much additional oil will be kept on-site as a result of the additional transformers that will be added as a result of the project.

**Response:** There are two power transformers presently in service at Deerfield substation with approximately 23,600 and 42,200 gallons of insulating fluid (Eversource most commonly uses mineral oil based insulating fluid) respectively. The exact oil quantity for the new SVC transformers has not been designed but an estimated value of 27,000 gallons would be representative for transformers used for this application.

# ATTACHMENT E

<b>Subject:</b>	NPT
<b>From:</b>	Pelletier, Rene (Rene.Pelletier@des.nh.gov)
<b>To:</b>	bob.cote@yahoo.com;
<b>Cc:</b>	Pamela.Monroe@sec.nh.gov;
<b>Date:</b>	Monday, April 3, 2017 10:06 AM

Good morning Bob:

Thanks for your letter dated March 14, 2017 identifying some of your concerns and questions relating to the DES recommendations sent to the SEC relative to the NPT project. The documents you have requested can be obtained through the SEC or by scheduling a file review appointment with our Public Information Office. You can contact Judith Brideau, at 603-271-2919 to schedule a file review.

To the extent you are asking for explanations of water quality monitoring and stormwater management or challenging the adequacy of the Department's review, those decisions speak for themselves. It should be noted that the CGP is a federally managed program that DES does not administer. Please keep in mind, the Department does not issue permits for this project, only recommendations and conditions for the SEC to consider. The Department is not required to provide individual explanations for such actions or to compile information for the purpose of supporting or refuting any conclusions or premises, whether legal or factual, stated in your request. If you believe that a Department decision is inadequate, you should direct your concerns to the SEC.

Rene Pelletier, P.G.

Assistant Director, Water Division

N.H. Dept. of Environmental Services

P.O. Box 95, 29 Hazen Drive

Concord, N.H. 03302-0095

603-271-2951

[Rene.pelletier@des.nh.gov](mailto:Rene.pelletier@des.nh.gov)

# ATTACHMENT E

---

## Attachments

- 4456\_001.pdf (127.53KB)



# ATTACHMENT F

March 14, 2017

Rene Pelletier, PG  
Assistant Director – Water Division  
NH Department of Environmental Services  
PO Box 95, 29 Hazen Drive  
Concord, NH 03302-0095

RE: Joint Application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC and Public Service  
Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy  
Site Evaluation Committee (SEC) Docket No. 2015-06 (Northern Pass /  
Applicant)

Dear Mr. Pelletier:

This communication requests clarification of your March 1, 2017 letter notification to Pamela Monroe of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee regarding New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (DES) final decisions on the parts of the Northern Pass application that relate to DES permitting or regulatory authority.

The project is unprecedented in scale and I acknowledge the effort by DES to review and condition the project. As an Intervener (Deerfield Abutters Group) in the Northern Pass project, I have commented in Prefiled Testimony on what I perceive as a significant misconception on the Applicant's part regarding compliance with the US EPA Construction General Permit (CGP) for Stormwater Discharges. In particular, I disagree with the Applicant's assertion (during technical sessions), that regulated stormwater discharges (outfalls or discharge points, as variously referenced in the CGP) will only be present at transition stations, the Deerfield Substation, Scobie Pond substation, and the Franklin Converter Station.

It is my understanding based on my professional experience as a NH-licensed Environmental Engineer with significant stormwater permitting work that in fact hundreds of surface water discharge points are likely to be present and subject to the CGP monitoring and Best Management Practice (BMP) requirements along the 192 mile length of the project. This includes the requirement to identify all outfalls, provide site plans showing all outfall locations and the specific BMPs that will be utilized in the associated drainage areas to minimize surface water quality impacts.

With outfall identification in consideration, several of my specific questions are as follows:

- Page 25 of 31, Item 12 of your letter requires turbidity sampling. With respect to this requirement, please clarify at what points along the path of the project do you intend this requirement to apply.
- Page 25 of 31, Item 13 requires pre- and post-construction water quality monitoring. I believe this is inconsistent with the CGP, in that the most significant requirement, monitoring DURING construction, is missing from this DES condition.
- Page 28 of 31 Item C requires Emergency Inspections During Storm Events. With respect to this requirement, please clarify at what points along the path of the project do you intend this requirement to apply. Please clarify how “inspections shall occur...whenever plumes are visible” can be determined unless inspections are required during all storm events.

I formally request that a copy of the CGP Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, referenced on Page 25 of 31, Item 9 of your letter be required to be submitted to DES and specifically made available to the public no later than when the Applicant files its Notice of Intent for coverage under the CGP.

I also request confirmation regarding the availability of DES personnel to adequately provide compliance monitoring for a project of this magnitude. Please provide any available information regarding the need for changes in DES staffing levels to oversee the permitting requirements described in your letter, and whether you believe authorization to fund these changes will be provided by the State.

Finally, the Deerfield Substation electrical equipment (transformers) will contain approximately 93,000 gallons of dielectric fluids (insulating oils). I formally request that a copy of the oil Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan referenced on Page 26 of 31, Item 14 be specifically made available to the public at the time the Applicant submits its SPCC Plan to DES.

Thank you in advance for your response to this inquiry.



Robert J. Cote, P.E.  
P.O. Box 507  
32 Mountain Road  
Deerfield, NH 03037  
603 315-6135  
bob.cote@yahoo.com



# ISO-NE Forecast Comparison Table: Annual Energy

*Draft 2017 CELT and 2016 CELT*

Draft 2017 CELT (GWh)					2016 CELT (GWh)				Change (GWh)			
Year	Gross	BTM PV	PDR	Net	Gross	BTM PV	PDR	Net	Gross	BTM PV	PDR	Net
2017	140,583	1,880	11,903	126,800	141,997	1,655	11,903	128,439	-1,414	225	0	-1,639
2018	142,078	2,282	13,279	126,517	143,775	1,898	13,279	128,598	-1,697	384	0	-2,081
2019	143,447	2,607	14,911	125,929	145,268	2,097	14,911	128,260	-1,821	510	0	-2,331
2020	144,611	2,865	17,038	124,708	146,486	2,278	16,800	127,408	-1,875	587	238	-2,700
2021	145,799	3,072	19,422	123,305	147,706	2,444	18,567	126,695	-1,907	628	855	-3,390
2022	147,127	3,269	21,623	122,235	148,982	2,582	20,220	126,180	-1,855	687	1,403	-3,945
2023	148,507	3,463	23,631	121,413	150,267	2,713	21,765	125,789	-1,760	750	1,866	-4,376
2024	149,884	3,639	25,442	120,803	151,513	2,836	23,209	125,468	-1,629	803	2,233	-4,665
2025	151,233	3,782	27,059	120,392	152,731	2,959	24,559	125,213	-1,498	823	2,500	-4,821
2026	152,593	3,926	28,486	120,181								