

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

NOTED AS PRESENT:

Counsel for the Applicant: Barry Needleman, Esq.
(McLane Middleton)

Counsel for the Public: Peter C.L. Roth, Esq.
Sr. Asst. Attorney General
N.H. Dept. of Justice

Thomas Pappas, Esq.
Elijah Emerson, Esq.
(Primmer Piper...)

***Also noted as present from the
Applicants who were available
to provide the presentation and
answers to questions:***

William Quinlan

James Muntz

Samuel Johnson

Kevin Bowes

Jerry Fortier

Lee Carbonneau

Bob Varney

Terry DeWan

Cherilyn Widell

Mark Hodgdon

Chris Soderman

	I N D E X	
		PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	PRESENTATION BY THE SEC <i>(by Pres. Officer Tacopino)</i>	7
4	PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANTS <i>(by Mr. Quinlan)</i>	30
5	QUESTION-AND-ANSWER SESSION	39
6	PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY:	
7	Mayor Ken Merrifield	77
8	Councilor Tony Giunta	78
9	Councilor Doug Boyd	81
10	Councilor Elizabeth Dragon	83
11	Joe Drinon	86
12	John Olson	88
13	Ruth Niven	92
14	Craig Pullen	92
15	Tiler Eaton	93
16	Carolee Longley	95
17	Maggie Stier	98
18	David Darlington	99
19	Howard Moffett	100
20	Pentti Aalto	103
21	Julie Moran	105
22	Johann Busch	108
23	Fire Chief Kevin LaChapelle	110
24		

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay,
3 everybody. My name is Mike Iacopino. I am Counsel to
4 the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. I am here
5 to run the meeting tonight.

6 But, before we begin, please take a
7 look, there is a fire exit on my right, your left.
8 There is another exit behind you, where the Fire Chief
9 is at the door. Let's please keep those exits clear
10 during the course of tonight's meeting. If there is
11 any type of emergency, those are the exits that you
12 should use. And, please go through them in an orderly
13 fashion. Hopefully, that won't be an issue.

14 Like I said, my name is Mike Iacopino.
15 I am Counsel to the New Hampshire Site Evaluation
16 Committee. Thank you all for coming. We are here
17 tonight in Docket Number 2015-06, the Joint Application
18 of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public Service
19 Company of New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource
20 Energy, for a Certificate of Site and Facility. This
21 docket is for the project that is commonly referred to
22 as the "Northern Pass Transmission Line".

23 There are agendas on how we're going to
24 proceed out at the tables. In addition, there are

1 yellow cards. For anybody who might like to speak at
2 the appropriate time tonight, you should fill out a
3 yellow card, and bring it up to the Administrator of
4 the Site Evaluation Committee, who is on my left, your
5 right, that's Pam Monroe. Or, to my associate, Iryna
6 Dore, who's in the background, or any of the other
7 helpful folks who are out at the front tables.

8 But, if you have a question, we would
9 ask that you write it down, and these are questions for
10 the Applicant or about the Committee process. We ask
11 you to grab one of these green sheets from the tables
12 out front and write your question down. What we will
13 try to do is try to put them in categories, so that we
14 talk about subject matter at the same time, to the
15 extent that we can. I can already tell I've got a
16 bunch of questions here already, and we haven't even
17 begun the presentations.

18 The purpose of tonight's meeting: This
19 is a public information session. No members of the New
20 Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee are here. The
21 Administrator, Pam Monroe, and myself are here. The
22 purpose for tonight is to present information about the
23 project to you all, as the public, to give you an
24 opportunity to ask questions, and also to give you an

1 opportunity to tell us how you feel about the project.
2 The manner in which we're going to do that is we're
3 going to begin with the presentation that I will go
4 through with you, to explain what the Site Evaluation
5 Committee is and how it operates. We will then allow
6 the folks from the project, from the Northern Pass
7 Project, to make a presentation to you about what this
8 particular project is about.

9 And, then, we will entertain questions
10 from you all. And, as I said, those questions should
11 be written down on a green sheet of paper and provided
12 to any one of the folks working out back, to Iryna or
13 to Ms. Monroe. And, those questions can be for me and
14 Ms. Monroe, if they're questions about the process
15 before the Site Evaluation Committee. Or, they can be
16 to the Applicant, if you have questions about their
17 project.

18 Once we're done going through all the
19 questions, we will then take public statements. If you
20 wish to make a public statement, you'll fill out a
21 yellow card and bring it up here. We're going to call
22 the folks, with some exceptions, in the order in which
23 we received the yellow cards.

24 When you make your public statements, we

1 ask that you please be succinct, concise. You don't
2 need to repeat things that are stated over and over
3 again by folks. And, we probably will limit the public
4 statements that are made, public statements and
5 comments, at this point, based upon the number that I
6 see in the pile, probably to three minutes, give or
7 take. We'll try to let everybody have their say. But,
8 remember, there's a lot of people here. And, let's
9 please be courteous.

10 During the course of this proceeding, if
11 you disagree with something that is said, by me, by
12 representatives of Northern Pass, or by somebody from
13 the audience, please do not yell out loud. Okay?
14 Everybody will have their opportunity to say what they
15 need to say. We do have court reporters here that are
16 taking everything down. If people start yelling while
17 other folks are speaking, it is very difficult for our
18 court reporters to take down what is being said. So,
19 please, let's all be courteous.

20 And, we will begin with the presentation
21 about how the Site -- what the Site Evaluation
22 Committee is and how it works.

23 First of all, after today, if you have
24 any questions, the best place to go to get information

1 about the Site Evaluation Committee is to the
2 Committee's website, which is up there on the screen,
3 *www.nhsec.nh.gov*. And, I'll put that up again towards
4 the end of the presentation.

5 The Site Evaluation Committee was
6 created as a part of the statute known as "RSA 162-H".
7 The purpose of RSA 162-H is to provide a process by
8 which the Site Evaluation Committee can balance the
9 benefits and impacts of site selection on various very
10 important considerations to the State of New Hampshire.
11 Those include the welfare of the population, private
12 property, the location and growth of industry, the
13 economic growth of the state, the environment, historic
14 sites, aesthetics, air and water quality, natural
15 resources, and public health and safety. Basically,
16 the statute recognizes that those are all important
17 considerations that need -- that some provide benefits,
18 some provide impacts, and -- some projects provide
19 benefits and impacts, and that there needs to be a
20 balancing test.

21 The purpose of the Site Evaluation
22 Committee is also to avoid undue delay in the
23 construction of new facilities. Another purpose is to
24 timely consider the environmental consequences, to

1 provide full and complete disclosure about projects to
2 the public, and to ensure that the siting,
3 construction, and operation of energy facilities is
4 treated as a significant aspect of land use planning,
5 in which all environmental, economic, and technical
6 issues are resolved in a single manner, in an
7 integrated fashion.

8 In other words, the process is designed
9 to integrate all of the various permitting that occurs
10 when there is a major construction project. And, those
11 include environmental issues, economic issues,
12 technical issues, land planning issues, things like
13 that.

14 The Site Evaluation Committee is
15 essentially a one-stop" shopping center for permitting
16 for energy facilities and transmission lines. The Site
17 Evaluation Committee, by statute, preempts local
18 authority. In other words, your local zoning and
19 planning boards don't have the authority. The Site
20 Evaluation Committee, with a jurisdictional facility,
21 has the authority to determine whether or not a
22 particular project will be sited and constructed.

23 The Site Evaluation Committee consists
24 of a number of members. The Public Utilities

1 Commission has three members on the Committee, and
2 their Chair is the Chair of the Site Evaluation
3 Committee; the Department of Environmental Services,
4 the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental
5 Services serves as the Vice Chair of the Committee; the
6 Department of Transportation, the Commissioner for the
7 Department of Transportation serves on the Committee;
8 as does the Commissioner for DRED, the Department of
9 Resources & Economic Development; also serving on the
10 Committee is the Commissioner of the Department of
11 Cultural Resources, or the Director of the Historic
12 Resources, a division of that agency; and then we have
13 two public members. And, I'm sorry to report that over
14 the weekend Roger Hawk, one of our public members,
15 passed away. So, there will be a -- and, Mr. Hawk
16 actually resigned last week, but he passed away over
17 this weekend.

18 There is an alternate public member.
19 And, there will be orders issued, not only in the
20 Northern Pass case, but in other cases that are pending
21 before the Site Evaluation Committee, for the
22 appointment of the alternate member as the public
23 member.

24 And, the Committee today consists of

1 these individuals. Martin Honigberg is the Chairman of
2 the Public Utilities Commission, and he serves as Chair
3 of the PUC [SEC?]; Thomas Burack is the Commissioner of
4 the Department of Environmental Services, the Vice
5 Chairman of this Committee; PUC Commissioner Robert
6 Scott and Kathryn Bailey serve on the Site Evaluation
7 Committee; and Jeff Rose, from the Department of
8 Resources and Economic Development; Victoria Sheehan,
9 our new Commissioner of the Department of
10 Transportation; and either Van McCloud or Elizabeth
11 Muzzey will serve on the Committee; and our public
12 members now are Patricia Weathersby, and Rachel
13 Whitaker is the alternate public member.

14 Each of the -- Each of the members who
15 are state employees have the opportunity to appoint
16 either a senior attorney -- I'm sorry, either a staff
17 attorney or a senior director in their agency to sit in
18 their stead on the Committee, and that, in fact, has
19 happened in this case. So that the Subcommittee that
20 will hear the Northern Pass matter is made up of these
21 individuals. Chairman Honigberg will serve as the
22 Chairman of the Committee; Mr. Burack will serve as the
23 Vice Chairman; Commissioner Bailey will serve;
24 Commissioner Rose has appointed Christopher Way, who is

1 the Director of the Division of Economic Development to
2 sit for him; and Commissioner Sheehan has appointed
3 William Oldenburg, who is the Assistant Director of
4 Project Development for DOT to sit in her place; and
5 then our public members, as I indicated, would be Ms.
6 Weathersby and Ms. Whitaker.

7 That's the Subcommittee will be
8 undertaking these proceedings, and, ultimately, making
9 a decision as to whether or not to grant or deny a
10 Certificate of Site and Facility in this project.

11 In every application before the Site
12 Evaluation Committee, the public is represented by
13 Counsel for the Public. Counsel for the Public is
14 appointed by the Attorney General. His or her job is
15 to represent the public in seeking to protect the
16 quality of the environment and in seeking to assure an
17 adequate supply of energy. Counsel for the Public is
18 treated as a party to the proceedings, and has all the
19 rights, responsibilities, and privileges of an attorney
20 representing a party in a formal action, and, in fact,
21 can be represented by counsel him or herself.

22 In this particular case, Counsel for the
23 Public has been appointed, and it's Senior Assistant
24 Attorney General Peter C.L. Roth, who is seated in the

1 second row here, who I will ask to stand. And, if you
2 could just introduce yourself, Peter, and tell them how
3 the folks can get in touch with you.

4 Let me give you a microphone.

5 MR. ROTH: Good evening, everybody. I'm
6 Peter Roth. I'm a Senior Assistant Attorney General,
7 at the Office of the Attorney General, the Department
8 of Justice. I am Counsel for the Public, appointed by
9 Joseph Foster, the Attorney General. I can be reached
10 at my office at the Department of Justice. My
11 direct-dial telephone number is 603-271-1270. Or, you
12 can send me an e-mail. My e-mail address is
13 *peter.roth*, R-o-t-h, @*doj.nh.gov*
14 [*peter.roth@doj.nh.gov*]. And, I'm happy to hear from
15 anybody from the public who has a concern or something
16 to say about it, either in writing or talking to me on
17 the phone.

18 What I cannot do, unfortunately, is to
19 provide legal advice or representation to any
20 individual or organization or community. My job is
21 sort of -- is this the place to be going into this?

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes.

23 MR. ROTH: My job is sort of an unusual
24 one, in that my job is to represent the public as a

1 whole, both the people who are against the project and
2 the people who are in favor of the project. So, it
3 makes it sort of an interesting kind of dance on a
4 knife edge.

5 I have representing me in this
6 proceeding, and this is a first for Site Evaluation
7 Committee proceedings, the Primmer law firm, which has
8 a Manchester and Littleton offices. And, these
9 gentlemen here in front of me are the attorneys from
10 Primmer, Mr. Thomas Pappas and Mr. Eli Emerson.

11 We will be looking at this Application
12 very seriously, taking a very long, hard look, and
13 litigating the issues that arise in it, and
14 representing the public to the best of our abilities
15 and time and effort.

16 FROM THE FLOOR: Would you repeat your
17 phone number again please?

18 MR. ROTH: I was asked to repeat my
19 phone number. It's 603-271-1270. Thank you.

20 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
21 Peter. There is a process that we go through in Site
22 Evaluation Committee matters, and that process involves
23 some fairly tight timeframes. Some of these timeframes
24 have recently been changed, with some changes in the

1 statute last year. But I'm going to put up a list of
2 what they are and go over them a little bit with you.

3 As many of you know, there were a series
4 of meetings that were required to be held by the
5 Applicants prior to even filing their Application with
6 the Committee. Those are called "Pre-Application
7 Public Information Sessions". They are supposed to be
8 held in each county, and I understand or there was
9 representations made in this Application that they
10 were. And, those have to occur at least 30 days before
11 the filing.

12 Once an application is filed, it's the
13 obligation of the Chair of the Committee to
14 expeditiously forward the application to any state
15 agency that may have regulatory authority over the
16 project, permitting or regulatory authority. In
17 addition, the Committee is charged with expeditiously
18 reviewing the application, to make sure that it
19 contains sufficient information for the Committee to
20 carry out the purposes of the statute. That's all been
21 done. And, on December 18th, 2015, the Subcommittee
22 determined that the Application was complete. And,
23 that was after hearing from the various state agencies,
24 who have permitting or other regulatory authority, and

1 after a review of the Application by the Subcommittee.

2 Now, that date, December 18th, is
3 important, because that's the date that all other
4 timeframes will run from during the course of this
5 proceeding. A Subcommittee was already designated.
6 The next step is to hold hearings like this one today.
7 And, there -- we have to hold one public information
8 session in each county. Now, this type of public
9 information session, as I explained before, is an
10 opportunity for the public to learn both about how the
11 Committee operates and about the project. It's also an
12 opportunity to ask questions, and to give us your
13 opinions.

14 And, we have to complete these hearings
15 within 45 days after the acceptance of the Application.
16 And, the dates that are up there are dates on which we
17 already have public information sessions scheduled.
18 Today, the day after tomorrow, the day after that,
19 January 20th, and January 21. Do I have that right?

20 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Yes.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.

22 Those aren't the only public hearings that we have,
23 though. Those are information sessions. After that,
24 the Subcommittee itself will come to each county and

1 hear from folks. And, that's what we call a "joint
2 public hearing". And, those hearings will be the
3 Subcommittee, along with any state agencies that have
4 jurisdiction over the project. And, those will be
5 scheduled. In this particular case, we have to
6 schedule five of them, to occur on or before March
7 17th, 2016. And, those dates are yet to be determined.
8 When they are, there will be a public notice that will
9 be, certainly, in the statewide newspaper, the Union
10 Leader, and it will notify folks of when those public
11 hearings, where the Committee actually comes and sits
12 with other state agencies, will be held.

13 In addition, you saw our website up on
14 the screen earlier. All of these notices you can find
15 on the Site Evaluation Committee's website as well.

16 Once we have completed the public
17 hearing process, there is a process whereby the state
18 agencies must provide information to the Committee.
19 And, the information that they provide are usually in
20 the form of conditions, draft conditions, sometimes
21 draft permits, which basically say "given what has been
22 filed with us, number one, we need more information",
23 or, number two, "we have enough information, and we
24 recommend a denial of the certificate or the permit",

1 or, number three, "we would recommend that you approve
2 the certificate with the following conditions."

3 Those are -- and, those conditions, what
4 we call the "draft conditions" or "agency reports", are
5 due 150 days after the acceptance of the applications.
6 In this case, by my calculations, that's May 16th,
7 2016.

8 Then, we have to have final reports and
9 final conditions from the state agencies within 240
10 days after acceptance of the application, and that is
11 August 15th in this particular case.

12 After all that occurs, that's when the
13 Committee goes into what we call an "adjudicative"
14 mode. It's very much like a trial. There will be
15 scheduled a hearing, at which witnesses will testify,
16 and will be cross-examined. There will be, in the
17 course of that proceeding, there's a discovery period
18 in that course of proceeding, where the parties who are
19 intervenors exchange information, and there will be
20 testimony that is filed in advance. Then, there will
21 be cross-examination, as well as arguments made about
22 whether the Application for the Certificate should be
23 granted or not.

24 And, then, ultimately, the Subcommittee

1 is required to issue a final decision within 365 days
2 after the acceptance of the application. In this case,
3 by my calculations, that's December 19th, 2016.

4 So, that leaves a period of time,
5 between getting all the information from the state
6 agencies and the one-year anniversary, to hold hearings
7 and issue a decision. And, if anybody has ever read
8 any of the decisions of the Site Evaluation Committee,
9 they are very thorough, they are extensive. They run
10 anywhere from 40 to 100 pages. And, they are -- it
11 takes a while to get there.

12 During the process, state agencies are
13 involved. There are state agencies that have --
14 already have permitting or what's called "other
15 regulatory authority". And, those state agencies are
16 allowed to do certain things within the course of the
17 proceedings. They can review proposals and requests.
18 They can -- they can determine whether they need
19 additional information. They determine, as I've
20 already said, whether the application is complete from
21 their standpoint. They can submit recommended draft
22 permit terms or conditions to the Committee. They can
23 also identify conditions of concerns with respect to
24 the project, and request or notify the Committee, or,

1 request and notify the Committee that they don't have
2 any concerns about the project.

3 However, when they do have issues of
4 concern, they can participate in the process. They can
5 designate witnesses to appear and provide information
6 to the Committee, and, of course, be cross-examined,
7 like every other witness. And, they can also appoint
8 a -- sorry, I'm falling behind here. They can also
9 appoint a liaison to serve, to sort of coordinate with
10 the Committee.

11 What's important to understand is that,
12 if a state agency that has permitting authority says
13 "we could not grant the Certificate", you know, "we
14 could not grant this a permit in our agency", then the
15 Site Evaluation Committee cannot grant the Certificate.
16 What's also important is that oftentimes what we have
17 is the state agencies recommend conditions to us. And,
18 if the Site Evaluation Committee determines that there
19 are different conditions that they would like to
20 impose, rather than those suggested by the state
21 agencies, then there is a process whereby the state
22 agencies get to come before the Committee, they get
23 notified, and they can inform the Committee as to why
24 their conditions should be imposed, or if they have any

1 objections to the conditions that are going to be
2 proposed by the Committee.

3 That's a new part of the statute. We've
4 never undertaken it before. It will be interesting to
5 see how that works out.

6 What's important to understand is, this,
7 where we are today, is not really the beginning. A lot
8 of stuff has gone on prior to today. Before any
9 application with the Site Evaluation Committee is
10 filed, and I can tell that many of you already know
11 that, but, before any application with the Site
12 Evaluation Committee is filed, it is not unusual for
13 there to have been some reports prepared with the
14 ISO-New England, to determine things like reliability
15 and whether or not a project can get on the grid, so to
16 speak. There are a number of environmental studies
17 that are done, both by the applicants and by other
18 interested parties. There are pre-permitting meetings
19 that occur with virtually every state agency that's
20 involved. There is consideration of the concerns of
21 regional planning commissions, municipalities,
22 transmission companies. Obviously, this is a
23 transmission line, so, that's not a big deal. Power
24 purchase agreements, financing, eligibility for tax

1 credits, and then the prefiling public information
2 sessions in each county. So, a lot goes on before --
3 even before where we are here today in this process.

4 But, once we get to this process, every
5 application has to contain certain information. They
6 must satisfy the individual application requirements of
7 each state agency. So, if you're going to impact
8 wetlands, you have to make sure that you have a
9 wetlands application as part of your Site Evaluation
10 Committee Application. You have to satisfy the
11 Department of Environmental Services that you checked
12 all the boxes and make sure that that application is
13 complete.

14 The application also has to include a
15 lot of other stuff. It must reasonably detail the type
16 of facility that's being proposed, tell us how large it
17 is, what type of facility it is. It has to identify
18 both the preferred choice, and any other choices for
19 each part of the facility, with respect to a
20 transmission line, that includes routes. Has to
21 describe in reasonable detail the impact of each major
22 part of the facility on the environment for each site
23 proposed. It must describe in reasonable detail the
24 proposals for studying and solving any environmental

1 problems. It must tell us about the applicant's
2 financial, technical, and managerial experience and
3 capabilities. It must document that the application
4 has been provided to the governing body of each
5 community where the facility is proposed to be located.
6 It must describe in reasonable detail the elements of
7 and any financial assurances for decommissioning of the
8 facility. And, it must provide such additional
9 information as may be required to carry out the
10 purposes of the statute.

11 And, what's happened with the Site
12 Evaluation Committee, in order to address that last
13 item there, is we now have new administrative rules
14 that were adopted, effective just about a month ago.
15 They are available on the Committee's website. And,
16 there are new requirements for applications, for
17 applications for transmission lines as well. Any
18 application that was pending on December 16th will
19 be -- is subject to the new rules, unless an
20 adjudicative proceeding has begun. And, in this case,
21 an adjudicative proceeding has not begun. And, so, in
22 that instance, the Committee must afford the Applicant
23 a reasonable opportunity to amend the Application to
24 include any new requirements that the new rules

1 require. And, we have, indeed, sent out a letter to
2 the Applicant in this particular case advising them to
3 do that.

4 So, that's sort of the background of the
5 process that we go through at the Site Evaluation
6 Committee. It is a lengthy process. It is designed to
7 measure both benefits and impacts of any particular
8 project. It applies to energy facilities, as well as
9 transmission lines. Right now, I believe we have three
10 applications pending before the Committee.

11 In every case, regardless of the type of
12 project that there is, there are lots of opportunity
13 for the public to participate. And, that's what I'm
14 going to go over with you now. First of all, and, by
15 the way, Peter, I didn't give them your dial-in number
16 to your office, but the main number for the Attorney
17 General's Office is 271-3658. And, one way that you
18 can participate is by letting Counsel for the Public
19 know your views, your concerns, whether you're in favor
20 or opposed to the project, and why. And, you can reach
21 him at that number as well. That's the main number
22 into the Attorney General's Office.

23 We also have pre-filing public
24 information sessions that I'll bet that many of you

1 were at, that had occurred in each of the counties.
2 And, there there was opportunities to discuss and to
3 speak about the project. And, in each one of those
4 instances, just as we are having court reporters here
5 tonight, there have been transcripts made of those
6 proceedings, and they were filed as part of the
7 Application in this case.

8 There are the hearings that we are
9 beginning tonight. And, as I said, there are five of
10 them that are going to occur within -- between tonight
11 and the end of next week.

12 And, then, there are the joint public
13 hearings, where the Site Evaluation Subcommittee, along
14 with the various state agencies with jurisdiction, will
15 hold public hearings, very much in the same manner that
16 we're hearing this tonight, although the Subcommittee
17 itself will be there.

18 In addition, upon the request of a
19 governing body or municipality, the Committee must
20 consider whether to have additional informational
21 meetings in any particular municipality. And, we have
22 had a couple of requests for those. And, those
23 requests are pending.

24 And, then, finally, you know, everybody

1 that can will have an opportunity to speak tonight.
2 But, perhaps even more importantly is the Site
3 Evaluation Committee accepts written public comment
4 right through the end of our proceedings, right up
5 until the day that they close the evidence at the end
6 of the adjudicatory hearings, right up until the time
7 that they vote at the deliberative hearing. And, any
8 member of the public can provide written comment, and
9 can provide reports or other information that they
10 think is important for the Subcommittee to consider.
11 And, we have a special place on our website where all
12 of that is public, and is made available to the public.

13 Finally, another way to participate as a
14 member of the public is to move to intervene in the
15 adjudicative proceeding itself. However, that's not as
16 broad as the rest of our opportunities to participate.
17 And, that's because, in order to intervene, you have to
18 demonstrate that you have rights, duties, privileges,
19 immunities, or other substantial interests that may be
20 affected by the proceeding. And, that the interest of
21 justice and the orderly and prompt conduct of the
22 proceedings would not be impaired by allowing your
23 intervention.

24 In this particular case, anybody who

1 wishes to intervene in this case, there has been a
2 deadline set of February 5, 2016. So, if you feel that
3 you have an interest that is impacted, a substantial
4 interest that is impacted by this project, and you wish
5 to participate as a party, you have to file a written
6 motion to intervene by February 5, 2016.

7 So, there are lots of ways for the
8 public to participate. From folks who may only want to
9 have a -- to express one particular view, to folks who
10 may believe that they have some very important
11 interests that needs to be protected by actually
12 participating as a party.

13 Now, I'm going to go over the standards
14 that the Site Evaluation Committee applies. First off,
15 the Site Evaluation Committee must give due
16 consideration of all relevant information regarding the
17 potential siting or route of a proposed facility. It
18 must give due consideration to the significant impacts
19 and benefits of a project. And, it must consider
20 whether the issuance of a certificate will serve the
21 objectives of the statute.

22 Ultimately, the Committee must determine
23 whether or not the Application for a Certificate --
24 whether in that Application the Applicant has proven

1 that there is adequate financial, technical, managerial
2 capability to assure the construction and operation of
3 the facility in compliance with any terms and
4 conditions that may be imposed. The Committee must be
5 able to find by a preponderance of the evidence that
6 the project will not unduly interfere with the orderly
7 development of the region, with due consideration being
8 given to the views of municipal and regional planning
9 commissions and municipal governing bodies.

10 Now, earlier in this talk I told you how
11 the Site Evaluation Committee process preempts your
12 local process, your local zoning or planning board,
13 this is where your local process is considered by the
14 Committee. The views of municipal and regional
15 planning commissions and governing bodies are required
16 by statute to be considered by the Site Evaluation
17 Committee. And, I can tell you, from past experience,
18 that they indeed are.

19 The Site Evaluation Committee must also
20 determine whether or not a proposed project will have
21 an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic
22 sites, air and water quality, the natural environment,
23 and public health and safety. If they find that the
24 Committee -- if the Committee finds that the project

1 will have an unreasonable adverse effect, then it will
2 deny the certificate. If it finds that there will not
3 be an unreasonable adverse effect, and all of the other
4 requirements have been complied with, then the
5 Committee should grant the certificate.

6 And, finally, a new finding that the
7 Committee must make under our new statute is "whether
8 the issuance of the certificate will serve the public
9 interest?"

10 So, I've gone over with you now sort of
11 the background of the Committee, who's on it, what the
12 timeframes are, what the types of things that the
13 Committee will consider, and how you, as the public,
14 can participate.

15 Again, the Site Evaluation Committee's
16 website is up there. And, it's *www.nhsec.nh.gov*. And,
17 that's the best place to go for information. But, of
18 course, if you have questions, you can always call us.
19 Ms. Monroe will have cards, I believe, with her number
20 on them, if you want to pick up a business card from
21 her. Or, you can reach me at 603-668-8300.

22 That's all I have as far as a
23 presentation of how the Committee operates. What we're
24 going to do next is we're going to give the folks from

1 Northern Pass an opportunity to make a presentation to
2 you about the project. And, then, we will undertake
3 questions that have been written out on these green
4 sheets. And, there looks to be a lot of them. And,
5 then, after that we will take public statements.

6 So, without further adieu, if Northern
7 Pass --

8 (Short pause.)

9 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. Good evening,
10 everybody. Can the folks in the back here me? Yes?
11 Okay.

12 All right. So, I'm Bill Quinlan. I'm
13 the President of Eversource New Hampshire. And, I do
14 want to thank you all at the outset for being here
15 tonight. I know it's a big commitment of time to come
16 here and learn about our project, and I do appreciate
17 you taking the time out of your busy day to be here.

18 I will tell you that these sessions have
19 been very valuable to us as we designed this project.
20 You know, as Attorney Iacopino mentioned, a lot has
21 happened over the last 12 months. We have actually
22 moved this project into formal siting here in New
23 Hampshire. We also have announced what we refer to as
24 the "ForwardNH Plan", and I'll share a little bit about

1 that with you in a moment. But much of that has been
2 shaped from meetings such as these, based upon input
3 from stakeholders across New Hampshire. So, again,
4 thanking for being here this evening.

5 I'm most looking forward to the
6 question-and-answer session and hearing your comments.
7 But we are going to provide you some basic information
8 about the project first, and then we'll get into the
9 question-and-answers.

10 So, first, a short video. And, again,
11 what this video is intended to do is to really give you
12 a high-level overview of the project, to reintroduce
13 our ForwardNH Plan, to the extent you're not familiar
14 with it. I'll then drill down into what this project
15 means for Merrimack County. And, then, we'll take
16 questions and answers. Okay?

17 So, with that, Andrea.

18 *[Video presentation provided on the*
19 *Northern Pass Project.]*

20 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, hopefully, that
21 video gave you an overview of the project and our
22 ForwardNH Plan. Again, much of that plan was based on
23 feedback that we received from across New Hampshire.
24 And, what we've really been trying to do is strike a

1 balance. We're trying to deliver a project that
2 addresses the concerns that we've heard from many
3 constituents here in New Hampshire about our original
4 design, and have a project that allows us to deliver
5 the type of benefits that are outlined there. We can
6 get into that a bit later. But, you know, the input
7 we've been getting has been instrumental in shaping
8 this plan as we moved into siting.

9 So, what does it mean for Merrimack
10 County? This is a depiction of Merrimack County.
11 You'll see that there's approximately 38 miles of
12 overhead construction through Merrimack County. I will
13 say, all of that is along an existing right-of-way.
14 Which means there is an existing transmission line and
15 a cleared right-of-way, and the new line will run
16 parallel to it. Okay?

17 Importantly, I think the video mentioned
18 this, here, in Franklin, this is where we're going to
19 convert from direct current to alternating current.
20 So, there will be a converter station located here in
21 the City of Franklin.

22 But the visual impact that, you know,
23 I'm sure we'll get into later tonight, it's really
24 focused on the aboveground structures that are roughly

1 80 to 85 feet in height. So, the new transmission line
2 is going to be approximately that size. The existing
3 towers and structures are in the 45- to 50-foot range.

4 One of the things that we've been doing,
5 as we get into the detailed design, is working
6 structure-by-structure to do what we can to lower the
7 structure heights to the aboveground portions. And, in
8 certain instances, actually changing the design of the
9 structure, so that it is a more streamlined structure.
10 And, I'll show you what I mean by that in a moment.

11 So, the key project elements for
12 Merrimack: Okay. So, this is an example of a view
13 simulation. Okay, this is from the top of Franklin
14 Dam. And, you'll see the existing line, it's a 115 kV
15 line, it's very difficult to see probably from back
16 there, but it runs along this treeline from a distance.
17 That's about a half a mile from the dam itself. So,
18 this view simulation is intended to give a depiction as
19 to what the new line will look like from that key
20 vantage point. And, obviously, the river is here in
21 the foreground.

22 All right. So, this next simulation
23 takes is going to show you what the view will look
24 like, okay? And, now you can see Northern Pass is

1 running in parallel. This one structure does rise
2 above the treeline, so, it's visible from this key
3 vantage point. The balance of the Northern Pass line
4 kind of runs in the foreground. This is illustrative.
5 You know, our view simulation experts have prepared
6 dozens of these simulations, so folks can have a
7 perspective as to, you know, "what does this mean from
8 these key vantage points?" And, you know, so, those
9 are available to those who have an interest.

10 But what we're intending to show here
11 is, you know, kind of a monopole design. This is one
12 of the streamlined structures that I'm referring to.
13 It was -- we made a decision to use a monopole
14 construction in this place, due to the importance of
15 this view. And, again, that's about from a half mile
16 distance. Okay?

17 So, we know that view impacts are
18 critically important, okay? And, these are something
19 that we're going to continue to focus on. You'll see
20 Department of Energy has issued their Draft
21 Environmental Impact Statement. They look at the total
22 view impact or scenic impact of this project. They
23 characterized it in a fairly modest way overall. But
24 we are taking it very seriously. You know, since the

1 Department of Energy had made this determination, we
2 have made the commitment to have underground
3 construction for that additional 52 miles that was
4 referred to in the video. So, this was their
5 determination before we had made that decision to go
6 with underground construction there.

7 I think the video does a good job
8 explaining why we selected it in that area. That's the
9 White Mountain National Forest, the Franconia Notch
10 area, the Appalachian Trail. These are areas and
11 important vantage points that we have been hearing
12 consistently from across New Hampshire stakeholders
13 that "you really need to take a hard look at this and
14 do what you can." So, that's why we selected that
15 area. But our work is not done on view.

16 And, these are steps that we're taking
17 beyond that. You know, at this point, we have over
18 80 percent of the line is either underground or in an
19 existing right-of-way, running parallel to an existing
20 structure. Okay? So, that's an important data point.

21 There are things that we can do, are to
22 look at the structure-by-structure design, there are
23 things that we can do to minimize view impacts, like we
24 can move a structure, so that it's less visible, and we

1 use shielding, some form of vegetation, to ensure the
2 view isn't impacted. And, this is the work that we're
3 going to continue to do as we move through the siting
4 process.

5 So, my point here is, our work is not
6 yet done on view impacts. We understand the importance
7 of that issue. We're committed to working locally,
8 both with landowners and municipality, on getting this
9 right.

10 So, beyond view impacts, what does this
11 project mean? Okay? There is clearly a tax
12 implication of the project, which is roughly a
13 \$1.6 billion project. Here is a snapshot of what it
14 means to Merrimack County, both at a county level and
15 then on a town-by-town basis. And, you'll see we
16 provided a range of taxes. For towns like Franklin or
17 cities like Franklin, hosting a project of this
18 magnitude could have a very significant impact from a
19 tax revenue perspective.

20 As the video mentioned, there's about
21 \$30 million of annual tax revenue that this project
22 will generate. Roughly, 10 million of that will reside
23 here in Merrimack County.

24 The ForwardNH Plan: Here are the key

1 points that I want to emphasize. You know, at a New
2 Hampshire level, when we look at this across a period
3 of time, there's almost \$4 billion of economic benefits
4 to the State of New Hampshire in hosting this line.
5 And, there's a wide range of economic benefits
6 associated with this. First and foremost, lower energy
7 costs. One of the things we heard from businesses in
8 particular, but also homeowners is, "if we're going to
9 host this project, it's got to lower energy costs here
10 in the State of New Hampshire." Our estimate is that
11 it will have a positive impact by about \$80 million a
12 year, and that's the New Hampshire portion of that.
13 That's a conservative number.

14 There's a commitment we've made to
15 create a \$200 million fund. And, that's going to drive
16 local community investment over time, particularly in
17 areas that are hosting the line, such as Merrimack
18 County.

19 We mentioned jobs and taxes. All of
20 that, in sum, it's about \$4 billion worth of economic
21 benefits to the State of New Hampshire in hosting the
22 line. Below the line, what we've done is listed the
23 environmental benefits of this project. And, they're
24 broad. You know, it will have a very significant

1 impact on carbon emissions here in New Hampshire and in
2 New England. Over 3 million tons of carbon emissions a
3 year will be the net impact.

4 We've also been thoughtful about, you
5 know, "what would the impact of a project of this
6 magnitude have on small-scale renewables, okay,
7 renewable generation systems?" Which is something that
8 you hear about, whether it's wind or biomass or other
9 projects. So, one of the things that we've committed
10 to do as part of Northern Pass is to build out some
11 transmission infrastructure, particularly up in the
12 North Country, and along existing transmission lines,
13 to upgrade that infrastructure, to actually promote
14 additional small-scale renewable generation. Because
15 we understand that that's a important issue, not only
16 here in New Hampshire, but in New England.

17 So, ForwardNH has very significant
18 economic benefits, from our perspective, very
19 significant, probably unparalleled environmental
20 benefits to this region. This is our attempt to strike
21 an appropriate balance. You know, our goal here is to
22 continue to work towards a project that New Hampshire
23 can support. We look forward to your questions this
24 evening and your comments. They're terribly important

1 in helping us as we proceed through the SEC process.

2 So, thank you for your time and
3 attention. And, with that, I'll turn it back over to
4 you, Attorney Iacopino.

5 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
6 Mr. Quinlan.

7 We do have quite a number of questions.
8 Mr. Quinlan, there is a hand-held there in case you
9 need to pass it over to somebody who needs to answer
10 questions.

11 And, Susan and Steve, how are we doing
12 over there?

13 COURT REPORTER: All set.

14 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. We
15 have a number of questions on these green sheets.
16 We've tried to categorize them by category of question.
17 All of the questions will be asked. Some of them are
18 going to be repetitive. But the first one is from
19 Representative Deborah Wheeler.

20 Now, the question is: What is -- or,
21 rather -- Will the residents of Franklin benefit from
22 Northern Pass energy-wise, or will Northern Pass be a
23 pass-through to other areas?

24 MR. QUINLAN: Part of that was answered

1 by the energy benefit that I just referred to there.
2 So when you look at that \$80-million-a-year annual
3 benefit, that is spread across customers throughout the
4 state of New Hampshire. So that's the first level of
5 energy cost savings. What's not in that number is the
6 positive impact of a Power Purchase Agreement that we
7 have negotiated with our partner, Hydro Quebec. And
8 the purpose of that is to ensure that this is not a
9 "pass-through project," as mentioned in the question.
10 In essence what it does is, is it reserves for New
11 Hampshire customers 10 percent of the power flowing
12 across that line. Why 10 percent? New Hampshire's
13 about 10 percent of New England's total load. So we
14 want to ensure that New Hampshire got at least its fair
15 share of the power flowing over the line. So we got a
16 commitment from our partner for that amount of power.
17 It's going to be very competitively priced, and it's
18 going to provide incremental energy cost savings to New
19 Hampshire customers above and beyond the \$80 million a
20 year. So there's really two effects, both of which
21 combined will have a very significant, positive effect
22 on energy costs for New Hampshire customers, both
23 business and residential.

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

1 The next series of questions involve historic
2 resources. The first question is kind of long, so
3 please bear with me. This question is from the New
4 Hampshire Preservation Alliance, and they say: The New
5 Hampshire Preservation Alliance, a statewide non-profit
6 dedicated to preserving historic structures,
7 communities and landscapes in New Hampshire. We are
8 advocating for a thorough and complete review of the
9 impacts of Northern Pass to historic resources, as
10 mandated by law, by SEC rules, through Section 106 of
11 the National Historic Preservation act, and through the
12 Environmental Impact Statements under NEPA. We have
13 been disappointed with the latter two processes so
14 far -- so I suppose that's a Section 106 and NEPA --
15 and hope that the SEC is more timely and transparent.
16 But insofar as it relies on the 106 process, it appears
17 to be short-changing the public. There is a
18 frustrating lack of adequate information and data, poor
19 communication, and few opportunities for meaningful
20 input by the public. Our specific questions are as
21 follows: In the summer of 2015, as part of the Section
22 106, four project area forms were submitted to the
23 Department of Energy and reviewed by the New Hampshire
24 Division of Historical Resources. DHR asked that

1 aspects of the methodology be altered, and also
2 suggested specific historic areas that needed to
3 receive further analysis. In addition, citizens have
4 repeatedly shared concerns about potential impacts to
5 historic resources within their towns as well, but no
6 further information about the identification of
7 historic resources has been shared, and now it appears
8 the SEC review will proceed without that identification
9 being complete as well. So the questions, are: No. 1,
10 what is the status of your identification of historic
11 resources?

12 I'm going to go give you one at a time.

13 MR. QUINLAN: One at a time. Okay. So
14 I'm joined here by Cherilyn Widell. She's one of our
15 experts from a historic resources perspective.

16 MS. WIDELL: Good evening, and thank you
17 for coming this evening. This is a complicated
18 question, so I'm going to take a little bit of time to
19 explain precisely the identification, evaluation and
20 assessment process that's going on. And I think it's
21 important for you to realize that there are actually
22 two processes here: One that's been completed by the
23 preservation company, Lynne Monroe, who is here in New
24 Hampshire and knows the resources probably better than

1 almost any historic preservation consultant. We've
2 prepared historic assessment reports for the filing of
3 the SEC application.

4 Primarily, New Hampshire Preservation
5 Alliance -- and this is an excellent question -- is
6 asking about the Section 106 process. There is, under
7 the National Historic Preservation Act, a requirement
8 for federal agencies, in this case the Department of
9 Energy, to locate historic properties that might be
10 affected by them giving a presidential permit for this
11 process. They are responsible for identifying historic
12 properties, valuing them and then mitigating any
13 adverse effects. We have, the preservation company and
14 myself, for Northern Pass, completed a very thorough,
15 comprehensive, broad-scope historic resources
16 identification report. That report is posted on the
17 web site for the SEC application. We have also
18 provided it, both in paper form and electronically, to
19 all the communities located along the line. What the
20 New Hampshire Historic [sic] Alliance have asked for
21 primarily involve local input into the Section 106
22 process. It's very important that the public, you,
23 your comments, be incorporated in that. Those comments
24 must go to the Department of Energy. They are taken

1 into consideration in the project area form and other
2 evaluations that they do. The Division of Historic
3 Resources as well is a major player in the Section 106
4 process. And in our recommendations for moving forward
5 on this application to the SEC, it would be to complete
6 a programmatic agreement that outlines all of the
7 identification, assessment and mitigation things that
8 need to be done to take care of the historic
9 properties. Having said all that, the report that has
10 been completed, the finding is that there is no
11 unreasonable adverse effect of the Project on historic
12 resources. Does that answer the question?

13 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: If you say
14 it does, because the next question is actually for the
15 Committee, and I'll answer that.

16 The next question is: Will the SEC be
17 relying on the as-yet incomplete data under Section 106
18 or some other data?

19 What you have to understand is, the Site
20 Evaluation Committee is not necessarily bound to
21 Section 106, although they certainly do consider that,
22 or anything else that's done at the federal level. The
23 Site Evaluation Committee's determination is whether or
24 not, based upon the record before it, there is any

1 unreasonable adverse impacts to historic resources.

2 And the way that the Committee will do that is it will
3 consider all the information that has been submitted
4 with the Application. In addition, between now and the
5 time that we have our adjudicative proceedings, those
6 parties who are participating in the adjudicative
7 process will go through a discovery period where they
8 will trade information. And they will put on
9 witnesses, and those witnesses will discuss the effects
10 on historic resources. And from that testimony and
11 from the exhibits that are filed during the course of
12 the adjudicative proceeding, which may include all of
13 the Section 106 materials, I don't know if it will or
14 won't, the party presents that as part of the
15 application or as part of the adjudicative hearing. It
16 will be considered, and it's from that that the Site
17 Evaluation Committee will make its own independent
18 determination as to whether or not there are any
19 unreasonable adverse impacts on historic resources.
20 So, to the extent that this question is directed to the
21 Site Evaluation Committee, that's the way that they
22 will operate, and that's what they will consider. They
23 will comply with their statutory obligation.

24 The next question, though, does go to

1 the Applicant.

2 When will the necessary additional work
3 be done to identify historic resources, and when will
4 it be made available to the public?

5 MS. WIDELL: The historic property
6 assessment report is complete. We evaluated 1294
7 properties in what's called "the area of potential
8 effect," a mile on either side of the line. We
9 identified all properties that were constructed prior
10 to 1968, and we also used a viewshed map to see which
11 properties had more than minimal views of the project.
12 We also did what is called a "windshield survey,"
13 driving every mile through 29 cities and towns to see
14 what properties may have been affected by the Project;
15 we then found 194.

16 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. And
17 the next question, I guess, goes to the SEC process,
18 too.

19 It says: When will citizens be given
20 the opportunity to comment and play a meaningful part
21 in the process? Specifically, with only nine months to
22 make a decision, how can this possibly be a timely part
23 of the SEC process?

24 First of all, it's a 365-day process

1 from the date that the application is accepted; so,
2 it's actually a year-long process for the Site
3 Evaluation Committee. And as I explained during my
4 presentation, there are many opportunities for the
5 public to participate in that process. You can
6 participate through Counsel for the Public and let him
7 know your concerns about historic resources or any
8 other issue. You can participate by coming to meetings
9 like this one and asking questions, or providing your
10 input through making a public statement or comment.
11 And as I indicated before, everything at these meetings
12 is being recorded, and it becomes part of the record
13 that the Committee will consider in its ultimate
14 determination. You can come to the public hearings,
15 where the Subcommittee will be sitting, and there will
16 be a similar process to what we're going through
17 tonight.

18 In addition, as I said, and this is
19 probably the most important thing for folks who don't
20 intervene in this proceeding, you have the opportunity
21 to present written public comment and reports
22 throughout the process. And by statute, the Site
23 Evaluation Committee is required to review those and
24 consider those in its determination.

1 And then, finally, if you can
2 demonstrate that you have a substantial interest in the
3 Project that would be affected and that you won't
4 interfere with the orderly and prompt holding of our
5 hearings, you can move to intervene. So there are a
6 number of different ways in which the public can
7 participate, whether they're interested in historic
8 resources or any other issue. And so that's the
9 opportunity that the Committee will give to the public.
10 And we do that in every case, not just Northern Pass,
11 but in every case that comes before the Committee.

12 MS. WIDELL: Counselor?

13 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sure. Go
14 head.

15 MS. WIDELL: The report is done to
16 accepted standards that are developed by the National
17 Park Service for determining what properties are
18 eligible for the National Register. Also, all of the
19 individuals that do this work must meet the Secretary
20 of Interior Standards for Professionals, for
21 architectural historians, for historians in the case of
22 archeology, for archeology. And the standard that is
23 used for determining whether there's an effect is
24 called "an adverse effect." And an adverse effect is

1 anything that might diminish either the significance --
2 meaning, why is that building important? Is it
3 architecture? Is it agriculture? Is it a cultural
4 landscape -- and then, also, whether it has integrity.
5 Would it affect the integrity, meaning its materials,
6 its setting, its design, association with the location
7 where its located? So, all of those things are taken
8 into consideration when you make decisions about, one,
9 what is the historic property that might be affected;
10 two, what is that property important for? What is its
11 significance? What is its integrity? And three, how
12 is it affected? What is the adverse effect? You can
13 have an adverse effect by demolishing a historic
14 building like this or putting a subway under it and
15 shaking it, or building a fast-food restaurant across
16 the street and visually changing what you see. But in
17 this case, the visual adverse effects is what we were
18 looking at. What we were looking at was from the
19 building, the view of the building, whether it isolated
20 it from its setting or whether it created a focal
21 point. And if you go to the report in your community,
22 you will be able to learn the effects of historic
23 properties on your town and of the Project. Thank you.

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: We have one

1 more on historic resources. You might want to stay up
2 here.

3 Our family owns and runs Windswept Farm,
4 a 140-acre historic farm built in 1745 in Canterbury.
5 We run a B & B and have a sizeable and successful
6 equestrian facility. Our clientele is drawn to the
7 historic landscape and beauty. PSNH right-of-way goes
8 through the middle of our land. Current power lines
9 are hidden behind the tree line.

10 No. 1, why was our historic property not
11 identified in your list of historic properties? And
12 No. 2, do you acknowledge the negative impact to our
13 two businesses?

14 MS. WIDELL: Thank you for your
15 question. I'm not familiar with the individual
16 property and would have to check the database of the
17 1294 properties we looked at. But I would tell you
18 that we did a very thorough view of each property that
19 I just described. We looked at the relationship of the
20 building and its setting to the line; what was its
21 significance; what was its integrity, and was there
22 actually an adverse effect. So I would hope the
23 information would help provide the reason behind not
24 finding an adverse effect. And I would encourage you

1 to be in touch with the Department of Energy and the
2 Division of Historic Resources for this Section 106
3 process, to make sure that the Department of Energy
4 takes the property into account as well. Thank you.

5 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The
6 next two questions deal with the Site Evaluation
7 Committee and its authority, so I'm going to answer
8 those.

9 First one: Why can't New Hampshire
10 citizens be allowed to vote in a statewide referendum?
11 The fact that this decision will affect so many private
12 residents' homes and lands makes it inappropriate for
13 politicians to decide for us.

14 Well, the easy answer -- I understand
15 the sentiment. But the easy answer is because your
16 legislature that you voted for provided a process
17 through R.S.A. 162-H. The Legislature did not provide
18 for a referendum process. They provided for an
19 administrative quasi-judicial process, which is what
20 the Site Evaluation Committee process is. Unless the
21 Legislature decides otherwise, that's the process that
22 the law requires us to go through and requires you as
23 the public to go through. So that's why there won't be
24 a referendum unless one is called for by the

1 appropriate authority of the Legislature.

2 Next question also deals with the
3 authority of the Site Evaluation Committee, and it
4 starts off: SEC, what makes this commercial project
5 any different than any other developer that wants to do
6 construction in multiple towns? There is no benefit to
7 the New Hampshire existing utility services, and it is
8 not required for reliability. Why doesn't the SEC
9 defer to the local town government for siting
10 commercial projects like this?

11 And it's pretty much the same answer I
12 just gave. The Legislature created the statute. The
13 Legislature determined that the construction of energy
14 facilities and transmission lines was important not
15 only to the individual towns, but also to the entire
16 state and the entire region. As a result of that, the
17 Site Evaluation Committee was formed, and it was formed
18 in a way, at least according to the Legislature, so
19 that it took into account both local concerns as well
20 as statewide concerns. And that's why, in the very
21 first slide that I showed you here today, that slide
22 talked about balancing benefits and balancing impacts.
23 And the Legislature has determined that the wisest way
24 to do that is through a statewide committee that will

1 make the determination for the public, because they
2 have determined that energy facilities and transmission
3 lines are such important features, that it ought to be
4 a statewide determination that is made. So that's the
5 answer, in terms of the authority given to the Site
6 Evaluation Committee comes from the legislature.

7 Now, the next series of questions deals
8 with financial issues and stranded costs. First
9 question is a stranded cost question.

10 The question is: I am concerned that
11 the investment might turn up as a stranded cost in the
12 future. Is this possible?

13 MR. QUINLAN: Short answer is no, it's
14 not possible. This investment is not being made by
15 Eversource New Hampshire, the former PSNH. It's being
16 made by Northern Pass Transmission, LLC. It's a
17 completely separate corporate entity. It is not a
18 regulated utility, in the sense that its rates are set
19 by the PUC. So there is really no possibility for the
20 cost of this project to be borne by former PSNH
21 customers.

22 And I will say that's been something
23 we've been trying to ensure from the outset. We've
24 been saying that New Hampshire customers will not pay

1 for Northern Pass, and that remains the case. So, even
2 though we've added costs to this project by committing
3 to additional underground construction, this project
4 will not be paid for by any New Hampshire customers.

5 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And the
6 next question is not really about stranded costs, but
7 it's on the same page, so I'm just going to ask you,
8 Mr. Quinlan:

9 Does the new undergrounding of the DC
10 system allow for multiple terminals to be used -- for
11 example, for wind power from northern New Hampshire?

12 MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to turn this
13 question over to -- let me introduce them.

14 Jim Muntz is our President of
15 Transmission; Ken Bowes is Vice-president of
16 Engineering. So, Ken, if you could.

17 MR. BOWES: So I would say -- again, I
18 would say the simple answer is no, it's not considered
19 in the design today. It's not a multiple-terminal
20 line. It's a single point, end-to-end line at this
21 point.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next
23 question deals with finances again.

24 I receive my power from New Hampshire

1 Electric Co-op. What effect will the Northern Pass
2 have on my bill?

3 MR. QUINLAN: So, earlier I talked about
4 the two effects that this project will have to lower
5 energy costs to New Hampshire customers. The first one
6 will enure to the benefit of all New Hampshire
7 customers. In fact, all of New England customers. So,
8 if you are a New Hampshire Electric Co-op customer,
9 when I talk about \$80 million a year in total energy
10 cost savings, a proportionate share of that will flow
11 to New Hampshire Electric Co-op customers. The second
12 effect, which is the lowering of energy costs as a
13 result of the Power Purchase Agreement with Hydro
14 Quebec, that will run to Eversource New Hampshire
15 customers. But the short answer is: New Hampshire
16 electric customers will see the lowering of costs by
17 its *pro rata* share of the \$80 million a year.

18 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Mr.
19 Quinlan, the next two questions are very similar, so
20 I'm going to read both questions and let you answer,
21 okay.

22 The first one is: Being a landowner in
23 a business that relies upon the beauty and historic
24 value which would be financially affected by this

1 project, how do you propose to compensate the
2 landowners whose land and livelihood is devalued? If
3 you don't think it is devalued, why do you not think
4 it's devalued?

5 And then the other question is very
6 similar.

7 How do you plan to compensate landowners
8 whose land will be devalued as a result of their
9 proximity to Northern Pass?

10 MR. QUINLAN: So, you know, without
11 getting into any particular property or landowner, you
12 know, we are working with those landowners up and down
13 the route to understand the areas of concern and to
14 address impacts where possible. I talked about some of
15 the things we're doing to address visual impacts
16 through the location and design of the structures. We
17 literally had hundreds of meetings with landowners
18 along this route where those very topics are being
19 discussed. As to the issue of will the transmission
20 line devalue adjacent property, it's a question of --
21 it's really a question of proximity and the specifics
22 of the land. Most of the studies suggest a fairly
23 modest impact on the value of the property perspective.
24 But notwithstanding that, our commitment is to work

1 with landowners to address their specific concerns
2 along the route.

3 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next
4 question's a little bit long.

5 A number of New Hampshire towns are in
6 litigation with PSNH or Eversource over fees to be paid
7 to those towns for rights-of-way, et cetera.
8 Eversource is seeking to lower these fees. Can
9 Eversource guarantee that, should the Northern Pass
10 line be built, that it won't sue the City of Franklin
11 after the fact to lower payments paid to Franklin in a
12 fashion similar to what is happening with other New
13 Hampshire towns?

14 MR. QUINLAN: Just so we're clear, those
15 instances where we have an issue with an existing town
16 or existing property, it's not as a result of using a
17 right-of-way; it's how do you value utility property
18 for tax purposes. And there is a industry-accepted
19 practice for valuing utility property. It's consistent
20 largely throughout New England and mostly across the
21 country. And that's a methodology we're very
22 comfortable with. Assuming municipalities are valuing
23 property using that methodology, we're very comfortable
24 making the commitment that was referred to here, which

1 is to not seek to abate property taxes. The only time
2 we have an issue with the town is when they're using a
3 different methodology that dramatically increases the
4 amount of taxes paid by our customers. Now, we have a
5 fiduciary obligation to our customers to keep our rates
6 as low as possible. And when a town imposes taxes
7 using a methodology that drives significant cost
8 increases to our customers, that's when some of these
9 issues arise.

10 So, back to the slide I was showing. We
11 provided ranges of taxes under different assumptions
12 associated with this project. We're also willing to
13 make commitments to the municipalities or towns hosting
14 in the form of, in essence, a tax pledge. That's
15 something we would commit to on a town-by-town basis;
16 taxes would not go below those numbers. And that's
17 based upon the methodology that is accepted in the
18 industry.

19 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Mr.
20 Quinlan, I have three more questions about taxes, and
21 that's sort of the end of the financial circumstances.
22 One of them is different than the other two. The other
23 two are kind of similar, so I'm going to start with one
24 that's a little bit different.

1 This project promises tax revenue for
2 several years. Is that money coming from PSNH or
3 Northeast Utilities? Where is it coming from?

4 MR. QUINLAN: Yeah, so the taxes are
5 part of the ongoing expense of operating the Project.
6 The way this project is being approached, Eversource is
7 building the project. So we're incurring the expense
8 associated with the project, and we'll recover it
9 through our contract with Hydro Quebec. So, in
10 essence, not only the original capital investment, but
11 the associated expense for things like property taxes
12 will essentially flow from Hydro Quebec to Northern
13 Pass, to the municipalities.

14 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next
15 two questions are similar, so I'm going to read them
16 both to you and ask that you please answer them both,
17 okay. The first one's a little bit long.

18 Given that Eversource is presently suing
19 something more than 50 small towns, many in the North
20 Country, to reduce their tax assessments by as much as
21 two thirds, why should select boards and citizens place
22 any faith at all in the tax benefits estimated for
23 Northern Pass to the host communities?

24 And then the other question that's

1 similar is: We are aware that PSNH is suing many towns
2 right now to give PSNH tax abatements from promised
3 revenue of existing projects. Please name all of the
4 towns that PSNH is currently litigating against.

5 So you might want to take those one and
6 two.

7 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So they're
8 obviously related questions. But, you know, back to my
9 earlier response. To the extent the municipality is
10 using the accepted methodology for determining taxes,
11 we don't have an issue, and we pay our fair share of
12 taxes. I think we're probably the single largest
13 taxpayer in the state of New Hampshire on behalf of our
14 customers. It's in instances where a municipality
15 dramatically over-taxes our customers that we have to
16 raise the issue. We have a fiduciary obligation to our
17 customers to do so. There are several dozen
18 municipalities in this state who have used
19 methodologies that are really not consistent with the
20 industry practice, and that's where we're working to
21 resolve the issue.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Here's one
23 you didn't expect here: How does this benefit the
24 residents of Stark?

1 MR. QUINLAN: The residents of Stark
2 will be similar to residents throughout New Hampshire.
3 The Forward NH Plan I talked about, with nearly
4 \$4 billion in benefits to the state of New Hampshire,
5 you know, a portion of that will go to the town of
6 Stark. You know, Stark obviously is in the North
7 Country. Many of the commitments we've made there are
8 going to have a particular focus on towns like Stark in
9 the North Country and other towns hosting the line.
10 So, residents of Stark will see lower energy costs,
11 will see job opportunities, will see tax benefits, and
12 will see environmental benefits as well.

13 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Why should
14 I have to look at these towers and wires for my
15 lifetime?

16 MR. QUINLAN: Well, that's --
17 (Audience applause)

18 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Go ahead.

19 MR. QUINLAN: So, you know, this project
20 is a very important project to New Hampshire and to the
21 region. If we are truly trying to replace the retiring
22 power plants across this region, we've got to find
23 alternative suppliers. Something will be built,
24 whether it's transmission lines, wind projects, gas

1 infrastructure. The reality is that we've got to
2 replace the power plants that are retiring, whether
3 they're nuclear plants in Massachusetts and Vermont,
4 coal plants, oil plants. Across the region, we are
5 moving away from the generation fleet that this region
6 has relied on for many decades to keep the lights on.
7 In our view, this is the single best project for
8 beginning to replace that retired capacity. It is a
9 clean source of electricity. It is a reliable source
10 of electricity. It is affordable, and it looks like a
11 power plant -- meaning it's available all hours; it is
12 not intermittent. That's why this project is in the
13 best interest of New Hampshire and New England and
14 should move forward.

15 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
16 Mr. Quinlan. Now, about the next 12 pages we have are
17 all questions that involve burying the transmission
18 lines. Some of them have a little bit of a different
19 take on them. I think I'll try to start with those.

20 The first question along these lines is:
21 Did you study the option of burying Northern Pass along
22 interstate highway corridors? If not, why not? If so,
23 why did you not pursue such an action?

24 MR. QUINLAN: Yes, and I have Mark

1 Hodgdon here. So we have looked at many alternatives
2 to the existing route, one of which is the so-called
3 "4A option" under the Department of Energy's review.
4 Those of you not familiar with the document, it's
5 essentially to have the power lines run down Interstate
6 93.

7 So, Mark, can you address that issue?

8 MR. HODGDON: Interstate I-93 isn't
9 really a viable option for burial of this project for a
10 wide variety of reasons, but which I can't really cover
11 in a meeting like this. But the most important ones
12 are that, if you think of I-93, what it is, it's a
13 major freeway through the state of New Hampshire. It
14 is a central line that runs up the heart of New
15 Hampshire from southern New Hampshire for both goods
16 and services and trucking from southern New Hampshire
17 all the way up through northern New Hampshire, to
18 Vermont and beyond. It is intended to be a high-speed
19 and efficient road. And that's very important from
20 DOT's perspective. They want to protect the efficiency
21 and the safety of that road and its design purposes.
22 In accordance with that, they've adopted rules for when
23 a utility can use the right-of-way in what is called a
24 "longitudinal" manner, meaning along the road rather

1 than across.

2 When you're going longitudinally, or
3 with the road, you have to -- the first thing you have
4 to do is show an extreme hardship. And DOT criteria
5 sets forth a number of standards you have to meet to
6 show extreme hardship. The most important one for
7 people to understand is you have to show that you have
8 no other viable alternatives. In other words, they
9 want it to be a last resort. And from DOT's
10 perspective, the roads that are proposed to be used are
11 viable alternatives. From DOT's perspective, those
12 roads are preferable than the impacts on I-93 that
13 would result. Now, keep in mind that, if you could
14 meet the extreme hardship criteria, if you could, DOT's
15 then standards, the next level of standards would
16 require, one, you can't be in the median, and most
17 certainly you can't be underneath the existing roadway.
18 They want you to be out at the existing edge of the
19 right-of-way by the fence line. And if you drive up
20 I-93, you'll see off to the left or the right --
21 actually, it would be on the right. You'll see the
22 fence line off in the woods. And to access that area,
23 they're not going -- you're not permitted to use the
24 roadway itself. So you would have to build essentially

1 an access road along that area, and you'd have to clear
2 that area. And if you drive along, you'll see a lot of
3 ledge. Extensive tree removal would be required.
4 You'd have wetlands impacts. The change of the I-93
5 driving experience would be enormous. Quite simply,
6 it's just not a viable alternative when you consider
7 all those kinds of impacts would be required.

8 In addition, there is no further
9 construction allowed in the Franconia Notch without
10 federal approval. And you're not likely to get that
11 for this sort of project. And keep in mind, Franconia
12 Notch is, at least in my humble opinion, probably the
13 most environmentally sensitive and culturally important
14 area in our state. So you're not likely to get
15 approval there, which means, as a practical matter,
16 from Bethlehem down to Woodstock, you're going on the
17 roads that are proposed, if you're going on roads.
18 Those are the only viable options that at least I'm
19 aware of. So, as a practical matter, I-93 just doesn't
20 work as an option for those reasons and a number of
21 others that have been stated in the record.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The
23 next question is: What is the cost difference between
24 the existing design and a complete burying of the

1 lines, and how long of a time would it take to amortize
2 those costs?

3 MR. HODGDON: I'm a lawyer, not an
4 accountant, so I have to defer to --

5 MR. QUINLAN: So I'll turn this over to
6 the team in a moment. But the high-level incremental
7 cost, if we were to go from 60 miles of underground
8 construction, which is what we currently have, to 190
9 or so of underground construction, it's approximately
10 an additional billion dollars. It's \$5- to \$10 million
11 per mile of additional costs over conventional overhead
12 construction. So, when you run that out, assuming, you
13 know, kind of an average set of field conditions, it's
14 about \$1 billion of incremental costs.

15 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: For the
16 lawyer: If it is impossible to use the Route 93 as an
17 underground corridor, why did New Hampshire DOT
18 designate it as an underground utility corridor in
19 HB626?

20 (Audience applause)

21 MR. HODGDON: Well, the -- is this on?

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes.

23 MR. HODGDON: The HB -- I forget the
24 number --

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: 626.

2 MR. HODGDON: -- 626 process has been
3 extended for years. And I think what they're referring
4 to is the map that was provided. And if you look on
5 the bottom of that map, it's "for discussion purposes
6 by DOT." But remember, DOT will consider, under
7 certain circumstances, using I-93. But when they do
8 consider using I-93, it's out at the fence line. And
9 that's where people sometimes don't fully appreciate
10 the impacts that would result from being out by that
11 fence line, both aesthetically and environmentally.

12 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: More I-93.

13 You stated previously that you cannot
14 use any part of the I-93 corridor for any part of a
15 buried component of this project. Is this because New
16 Hampshire DOT has told you the corridor is not
17 available to you, or is it because of some other
18 reason; and if so, what is that reason?

19 MR. HODGDON: Sorry, but I disagree with
20 the premise of that. But that aside, DOT has not said
21 you can't use it. They said you have to comply with
22 our regulations. And it's those regulations and rules
23 which are intended to protect the integrity of I-93
24 that we are focusing on and which I've discussed.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next one
2 probably goes back to you, Bill.

3 Is it -- isn't it true that, if the
4 lines were to be buried, the cost of the Northern Pass
5 project would increase? Wouldn't this create increase
6 in property taxes collectable, and wouldn't burying the
7 lines create more local jobs?

8 (Audience applause)

9 MR. QUINLAN: Yeah. So, as to the first
10 question, clearly the cost would increase. Again, if
11 we went from our current proposal to an all-underground
12 project, it would add a billion dollars of cost. So
13 the taxable property would go up and, therefore, the
14 associated tax revenue would go up. As far as jobs are
15 concerned, it depends. You know, underground
16 construction is specialty work, okay. So it may be
17 that you have to rely more on contractors from outside
18 of the state of New Hampshire to perform that work.

19 You know, I will say that one of the
20 things I didn't mention at the outset is we've made
21 what we refer to as "New Hampshire first" commitment,
22 okay. So, for the entirety of this project, in every
23 instance we have an opportunity to put New Hampshire
24 residents to work, that's our intention to do so. So,

1 while we may be bringing some national contractors to
2 oversee this work, to the extent possible, all of this
3 will be sourced locally, including the electrical.

4 So, I think as to the second question,
5 you know, are there more jobs in it for New Hampshire
6 for underground, it depends.

7 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I have five
8 sheets of questions here that all pretty much ask the
9 same thing. This one capsulizes it the best, and then
10 there are some other sort of side lights on some of the
11 questions. So what I'm going to do is go through them,
12 but they all really come under the same heading of this
13 question: Why can't the proposed power lines be
14 buried, all of them?

15 The next one is: Aside from not making
16 as great a profit, what reason is there to not bury all
17 of the lines?

18 Next one is: As tourism is the third
19 largest employer in the state, and the Lakes Region
20 generates the largest percentage of tourism dollars,
21 why does Northern Pass not consider the viewsapes of
22 the Lakes Region as important as those of the White
23 Mountains and propose burial of the lines throughout
24 our region also?

1 The next one is: There are three
2 proposed power line proposals in the Northeast, all of
3 which have acknowledged that buried is technically
4 feasible in New Hampshire. Why, therefore, are you not
5 burying the line 100 percent, other than it will cost
6 Northeast Utilities more money?

7 And finally: Today, housing
8 developments have the utility wires buried. Why
9 doesn't that apply to these utility wires?

10 These questions all ask why you won't
11 bury the entire line. There's one question that
12 suggests that consideration of the Lakes Region may be
13 appropriate because of its tourism. If you could
14 address all of those questions, is that fair?

15 MR. QUINLAN: Yeah, we'll give it a try,
16 okay.

17 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.

18 MR. QUINLAN: So, I said at the outset
19 we've been working to strike a balance between a
20 project that works technically, is affordable, and
21 addresses, to the extent we can, New Hampshire
22 concerns. And that's some of the things that we talked
23 about earlier in delivering New Hampshire benefits.
24 So, as to the question of underground, you know, if we

1 added a billion dollars of cost to this project with
2 complete underground construction, our view is that the
3 Project is no longer economical. At the end of the
4 day, someone is going to pay for this project, and
5 right now it's our partner. The additional billion
6 dollars of cost with all underground construction is
7 not a project that, in our view, is economic. So,
8 that's one of the key drivers behind our decision.

9 Why did we select the areas that we did
10 for underground construction? It was based on feedback
11 that we received from across New Hampshire. Almost
12 universally, regardless of where you were in the state
13 and who you were talking to, people focused on the
14 impact on the White Mountain National Forest. Mark
15 talked about Franconia Notch. We heard that. And we
16 heard the Appalachian Trail, didn't matter where you
17 were in the state, repeatedly. So, in striking this
18 balance and prioritizing the Project, you know, and
19 let's mitigate the most critical views, that's why we
20 selected the 60 miles that we've selected. It was
21 based upon feedback from you in the state of New
22 Hampshire and our attempt to strike a balance that
23 addresses those principal concerns and is still
24 economic.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The rest of
2 the questions don't fall within any particular
3 category.

4 The first one is: What will be the
5 impact to an already tough biomass market? These
6 markets are crucial to good forestry in New Hampshire.

7 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So I mentioned
8 earlier that one of the things we're doing is we're
9 going to be upgrading a portion of the existing Coos
10 Loop. That's a transmission loop that exists up in the
11 North Country. There are several biomass plants that
12 feed into that loop. Our hope and expectation is that,
13 through that upgrade we are actually going to unlock
14 some of the small-scale renewables and allow them to
15 get to market more frequently, whether they're wind or
16 biomass or small-scale renewable. We've made that
17 commitment, and we think that they're going to see a
18 benefit.

19 You know, as to other biomass projects
20 across the state, those plants generally are dispatched
21 because they generate what we refer to as "renewable
22 energy credits." Those credits are highly valued in
23 the market. So, for the most part, unless there's a
24 transmission issue, those plants should be running, so

1 it should not be negatively impacted by a project like
2 Northern Pass.

3 I will say, just back to an earlier
4 point, you have almost 8,000 megawatts of generation
5 retiring in New England for the five-year period,
6 whether it's nuclear, coal or oil. Northern Pass will
7 replace a little over 1,000 of those retiring
8 megawatts. So there's plenty of room for other forms
9 of generation to backfill that diminished supply.

10 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Next
11 question goes to economics.

12 Out of the \$80 million in savings, what
13 is the per-household or per-customer savings for people
14 in New Hampshire? Is it \$1 per year, \$50 per year? Is
15 it worth it?

16 MR. QUINLAN: So it's going to vary,
17 depending on the customer, whether you're a residential
18 customer, what your consumption is, or if you're a
19 business customer. On average across the New Hampshire
20 customer base, not just PSNH, but also the Co-op and
21 Liberty and Unitil, we're estimating about a 5-percent
22 energy cost savings. Now, in addition to that, I
23 mentioned the Power Purchase Agreement which will yield
24 some additional savings for Eversource New Hampshire

1 customers.

2 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. And
3 the last two questions I have involve the Franklin
4 facility.

5 Why is the conversion station planned
6 for Franklin instead of Deerfield? Wouldn't it be less
7 expensive to bury the lines if they were DC to
8 Deerfield?

9 MR. QUINLAN: So I'm going to refer that
10 question over to Jim or Ken. Or Sam. Sam is another
11 one of our project engineers.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Hi. Careful consideration
13 was made into where the converter facility would be
14 located. We looked basically at any area between
15 Deerfield and actually a little bit north of Franklin
16 when we originally looked at the line. There's several
17 considerations that need to be included, most notably
18 from an electrical standpoint: Where does it make the
19 most sense to site a facility; and then secondly, do
20 you have a community that's willing to host you? Quite
21 frankly, from the beginning, Franklin was a very
22 open-armed community, and it made sense for us to put
23 it here. So, the two big considerations are the
24 electrical location within the system itself and then

1 finding a place that would host in the community.

2 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Second part
3 of the question was: Is it less expensive to bury the
4 lines if they were DC?

5 MR. JOHNSON: No, it is more expensive
6 to bury the lines. As Bill alluded to earlier, it's
7 somewhere in that \$5- to \$10 million.

8 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Stay here.
9 One more question for you.

10 Would there be less line loss of
11 electricity if the DC to AC converter station proposed
12 for Franklin was built in Massachusetts?

13 MR. QUINLAN: Repeat the question,
14 please?

15 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Would there
16 be less line loss of electricity if the DC to AC
17 converter station proposed for Franklin was built in
18 Massachusetts?

19 (Company representatives conferring.)

20 MR. JOHNSON: Sorry. We're just having
21 a little -- the answer is DC lines have less line
22 losses on them. So if the line did go all the way to
23 New Hampshire -- I'm sorry -- to Massachusetts, there
24 would be less line losses. However, this project

1 doesn't bring the energy to Massachusetts. It brings
2 it to a point in New Hampshire, where it enters the
3 system in Deerfield.

4 MR. QUINLAN: Just so -- let me add to
5 that, not from a technical perspective but from a
6 financial perspective.

7 Having the power delivered to Deerfield,
8 New Hampshire, will drive the biggest energy cost
9 savings at that delivery point, okay. So, location
10 matters. And another way of saying that is New
11 Hampshire customers benefit from the fact that the
12 power is delivered in this state as opposed to
13 Massachusetts. The local price suppression is greatest
14 at the point of delivery, okay.

15 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. I
16 think that we have exhausted all of the written
17 questions that we received. We're now going to move
18 into that part of our meeting where we allow the public
19 to make comments or statements. If you wish to make a
20 comment or statement, you should fill out one of these
21 yellow sheets at the table outside the doors and drop
22 it off with Ms. Monroe here or with Iryna or one of the
23 other workers out in the back. I have approximately 15
24 yellow cards right now. If that's all we're going to

1 get, I'm going to allow about four minutes per speaker.
2 And just so everybody knows, I'm going to take the
3 Mayor of Franklin and the city councilors first, and
4 they will be given the same amount of time to speak as
5 everybody else, okay. So let's start off with Mayor
6 Merrifield.

7 Incidentally, if I call your name to
8 make a statement and you're up in the balcony, there
9 are microphones up there. You can speak from up there.

10 Mr. Mayor.

11 MAYOR MERRIFIELD: First I would like to
12 offer a welcome to the panel this evening for coming to
13 the city of Franklin, and certainly to everyone in the
14 audience. I don't recognize all of you, so I think
15 that some of you may be from out of town.

16 But I do want to invite you all -- I do
17 want to invite you all to come back and enjoy some of
18 the amenities that we have here in Franklin, whether in
19 cold weather or warm, a lot of water resources. When I
20 think about those water resources here in the city of
21 Franklin, I think back to a hundred years ago when
22 Franklin was a great commercial and economic center
23 because of the water resources that are here. And I
24 think that it's really fitting that Franklin may well

1 see, because of the DC converter station that we've
2 been discussing, may well see a second Golden Age
3 because of that great investment in our community.
4 Current estimates for the taxable value of the DC
5 converter station is about \$400 million, and the entire
6 city of Franklin today is only valued at \$500 million.
7 So it is an extraordinary, once-in-a-lifetime
8 opportunity for this community that has over the past
9 decades struggled tremendously with costs associated
10 with educating our students, caring for those in need
11 here with infrastructure needs. And I speak on behalf
12 of a united and unanimous city council, who just few
13 days ago fully endorsed this project. So we are
14 hopeful that the process will go smoothly for the Site
15 Evaluation Committee, and we look forward to approval.
16 Thank you.

17 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
18 Mr. Mayor.

19 Tony Giunta.

20 MR. GIUNTA: Thank you very much,
21 Attorney Iacopino. It's a pleasure to be here this
22 evening. Thank you all for coming. I want to give
23 credit to you in starting off this whole presentation
24 by making us aware of R.S.A. 162-H. And I think it put

1 it into perspective, and it allowed me to sort of start
2 my comments by just highlighting some of the things you
3 said that the SEC will consider when they're looking at
4 this project: Viability of manufacturing, growth of
5 industry, economic growth and welfare of the
6 population. So, as a city councilor, instead of
7 looking at the macro vision, let me show you a micro
8 vision of what I see as a city councilor.

9 I represent Ward 1. Ward 1 happens to
10 have the most industry and manufacturing in the city of
11 Franklin. So I get a chance to interact with the
12 owners of businesses and manufacturing. For the last
13 two and a half years, I have to tell you that those
14 owners, CEOs, manufacturing business owners, have told
15 me they are very, very concerned with the price of
16 electricity. I don't think it comes as a surprise to
17 anybody in this room that New England has the highest
18 electric rates anywhere in the United States. So they
19 are fearful of the fact that they are no longer
20 competitive, not just with India and China on an
21 international scale, but on a national scale. When
22 you're looking at twice the electric costs in this
23 region as compared to the south, as compared to the
24 west, they don't have to move thousands of miles

1 anywhere. The consideration is now: Do I move
2 250 miles to the southwest and get have half the rate
3 for my electric costs? So if we're discussing here
4 tonight and saying what is the effect going to be on
5 me, what is my rate going to be, and you're paying \$150
6 on average, it doesn't sound like much when it's 5 or
7 10 percent. But with the manufacturers and industry in
8 this city, when they're spending a half a million
9 dollars a year on electric rates, the ability to reduce
10 that number in some cases in half by moving 250 miles
11 has to become a serious consideration for these
12 businesses.

13 Quick demographics about the city of
14 Franklin. We have about 4400 workers in the city of
15 Franklin; 20 percent of them working in manufacturing
16 and business in this city. That represents four
17 manufacturers that over 1,000 people in this city
18 employ. If one of those manufacturers leaves, it's a
19 significant impact to this city. And one has already.
20 And I will tell you right now, when that industry
21 leaves, they're very unlikely to come back. How do I
22 know that? Because we've asked them. In 2006 an
23 industry left. Last year we asked them, "Hey, how
24 about coming back to the city of Franklin?" And their

1 answer wasn't just "No," it was "Hell, no, we're not
2 coming back. We like it in the Carolinas. It's
3 actually warm here in the winter time. Plus, our rates
4 are a lot less when it comes to energy."

5 So it does boil down to us. I
6 understand that. But recognize you're talking about
7 1,000 individuals in this city that depend on business
8 and manufacturing. And if these manufacturers decide
9 to leave, we are in serious trouble. So when it comes
10 right down to the welfare of our population, please
11 consider my comments and do whatever you can to help
12 reduce the rates for our businesses and industries here
13 in the city of Franklin. Thank you.

14 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: City
15 Councilor Doug Boyd.

16 MR. BOYD: "Support clean energy.
17 Support the Northern Pass." I should have worn my
18 jersey. I have one. Let me just say that I have done
19 commercials for Northern Pass. A couple years ago I
20 think I started that, only because I was extremely
21 supportive of the Northern Pass. It's going to be a
22 great thing our -- for all of New England. And I think
23 the other thing, too, is it's welcome to have all you
24 people here. I thought deer hunting season was over.

1 In any event, watching the situations
2 and asking everything about what's going to go on for
3 Northern Pass, they say 1200 construction jobs, and now
4 they're thinking it's going to be a lot more than that
5 for what has to be done. And that's going to give a
6 lot of people some great jobs for a period of time.
7 Twenty-eight million dollars per year in local, county
8 and state tax revenue; \$20- to \$35 million in low
9 energy costs. These are some things that have to be
10 emphasized. Even here in our great people's community,
11 they're talking somewhere in the area of between \$4- to
12 \$6 million. They're not absolutely sure what it's
13 going to be in taxes. But I must say, if it was going
14 to be nothing, we'd still be totally in favor of the
15 Northern Pass for what it's going to do for all the
16 great people that live here. But even if it was less,
17 no one would care.

18 Every one of us that live in the great
19 state of New Hampshire, in our great country, you
20 should be supporting the Northern Pass 100 percent.
21 Believe me, it's going to be fantastic. Sixty miles
22 underground, that's going to be unbelievable. And when
23 you go up and drive up through Lincoln New Hampshire
24 now, this and that, you don't see a lot of that. And

1 you see the mountains and you see everything, and it's
2 still great. And it's never going to change as a
3 result of this. I'm very, very, very impressed with
4 everything that has been done. And I did the
5 commercials for them. I had some people say to me,
6 "Well, how much did they pay you to do that?" Well,
7 they didn't pay me one penny, because the only reason I
8 would do anything -- as an ex-Marine, as an ex-state
9 trooper and chief of police, the only thing I care
10 about is what is in the best interest of this great
11 state, and the Northern Pass is that.

12 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Next
13 we have Elizabeth Drogan [sic].

14 MS. DRAGON: Hi, my name is Elizabeth
15 Dragon, D-R-A-G-O-N.

16 COURT REPORTER: Could you spell that,
17 please?

18 MS. DRAGON: D-R-A-G-O-N, just like it
19 sounds.

20 As you heard this evening already,
21 recently the city council voted unanimously in support
22 of this project. But I'm sure most of you know it's
23 not the first time we've had that discussion because
24 we've participated in this process for the last few

1 years. And one of the reasons it's so important to us
2 is obviously the socioeconomic impacts of the project
3 for the city of Franklin, but also for the state of New
4 Hampshire. It's a \$1.6 billion project that is
5 taxable. And giving the communities a revenue boost at
6 a time when we're all fighting to come out of the
7 biggest recession in recent history is very important.
8 The city of Franklin, as you heard from the mayor, was
9 once a vibrant mill town, but now we have students in
10 our schools that, one out of every two are eligible for
11 free or reduced lunch. That's our reality. The city
12 of Franklin, as you also heard, has a tax base of just
13 over \$5 million, and this project would be
14 approximately \$4 million added to the tax base. That's
15 \$5 million of tax revenue each year, tax revenues that
16 is brought to the city without impacting services.
17 Oftentimes when a project is built in your community,
18 there's also an impact to the services that are
19 provided with that project. Once the lines and the
20 facility are built, there really is, for most
21 communities, no impact to community services;
22 therefore, little to no increase of cost to provide
23 services for a project like this.

24 And we heard about jobs. And I know

1 that there's been a lot of controversy about whether
2 the jobs are permanent or temporary. But any job is
3 important to a person when they don't have one.

4 Economic spinoff. When a project like
5 this is built, it's going to bring people to our
6 community. Tonight there are people in our community,
7 and when the construction happens, there will be people
8 in the community for over three years, those people who
9 might need lunch or stop at the store and buy a gallon
10 of milk. Certainly not something that's going to
11 support a business forever, but it might be enough for
12 that store or that small business owner to do that
13 project that they've been putting off for years. It
14 might give them that temporary boost that they so
15 desperately need.

16 We also know that we support renewable
17 energy, and this project will provide enough renewable
18 energy to power one million homes in New Hampshire.
19 That is not a small number. One million homes.

20 Also, it's important to know that the
21 Hydro Quebec project is entirely paid for by Northern
22 Pass. Oftentimes when projects like this are built,
23 it's passed on to the ratepayer, and this project is
24 not. So, in reality, we all like to use our cell

1 phones, but we often don't want the cell tower in our
2 communities because we simply just don't want it in our
3 back yards. But one can't function without the other.
4 The same goes for projects like this. We all want to
5 reduce our carbon footprint and have affordable energy
6 to run our homes and businesses, so we need projects
7 like this to get us there.

8 This project is vital to the city of
9 Franklin in terms of tax revenue. But hopefully I've
10 also illustrated it's vital to the state of New
11 Hampshire as well. So, on behalf of the mayor, the
12 city council, and myself, we continue our unanimous
13 support for this project. And I'm happy to answer any
14 additional questions you have throughout the rest of
15 the process.

16 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next person
17 in line is Joe Drinon. And when you approach the
18 microphone, just spell your name for our court
19 reporters, please.

20 MR. DRINON: Thank you for the
21 opportunity. My name's Joe Drinon. I'm from Bow.
22 We're not affected by this transmission line, but you
23 don't have to be a Marine and a former fireman and a
24 police or state policeman to love this state. And I'm

1 against this project because I do love the state. And
2 I didn't appreciate the snide remark about the hunting
3 season being over. I felt welcome to this town until I
4 heard that comment.

5 I have a question for Mr. Quinlan.
6 Hydro Quebec is paying for the entire Northern
7 transmission line. What is the justification for the
8 12-1/2 percent return on equity annually that
9 Eversource is receiving from Hydro Quebec? That
10 amounts to -- I don't expect you to tell us what you
11 think that is. Probably proprietary. But it would
12 seem to me that's probably going to be somewhere around
13 \$100 million a year. The Project costs around
14 \$1.6 billion, something like that. So my question is
15 two parts. What risk is Eversource taking on to
16 warrant such an enormous return on equity, which is
17 \$100 million a year?

18 And my other question is, if you were to
19 incur another \$100 million -- a billion dollars in
20 costs, how would that affect this 12-1/2 percent? And
21 is that cost incurred by you or Hydro Quebec? How does
22 that work out?

23 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr. Drinon,
24 the time to ask questions was before, and we did it in

1 an orderly process. Now is the time for people to make
2 statements. So I think for now we'll have to consider
3 your question as a rhetorical question that people can
4 consider. This isn't the time to quiz the
5 representatives of the Applicant.

6 MR. DRINON: That's okay if you don't
7 want to answer the question. That's fine.

8 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sure
9 there will be plenty of answers for you. Okay?

10 Again, we do these meetings in an
11 organized fashion, so that everybody can go home with
12 at least an understanding of everybody's position.
13 And, that's the way we're going to run them tonight,
14 and for the next four of them, and then when the
15 Committee is, too.

16 So, if you have questions, and you come
17 to another meeting, and you have a question, please
18 write it down on the forms that we provide, so that the
19 questions can be asked in an organized fashion.

20 The next person who has asked to speak
21 is John Olson.

22 MR. OLSON: Thank you very much. Many
23 of you know me by name. I'm a manufacturer. I employ
24 1,000 people in Charlestown. We pay -- manufacturing

1 pays over 70 percent of the taxes in the State of New
2 Hampshire. We pay, other than professional services,
3 we pay the highest hourly wages of anybody in New
4 Hampshire. Our company's minimum wage, with bonus, was
5 \$22.72 an hour. And, everybody worked a 52-hour week,
6 plus over time. And, they have huge benefits. That's
7 what manufacturing brings to the state.

8 However, the cost of electricity, in our
9 particular plant, is a major consideration. Millions
10 of dollars a year are spent on electricity. And, we
11 are the highest in the nation, published in the paper,
12 by the way, highest in the nation. I'm getting calls,
13 like the gentleman before me said, other manufacturers
14 are, all over this country. Georgia Power quoted me
15 3.5 delivered, for all I want. My bill last month was
16 20.1 per kWh average.

17 Now, I'm worried about my 1,000 people
18 and how long they're going to be here. I compete, I'm
19 the only manufacturer of emergency warning signals.
20 Yes, the blinking lights on the top of the police cars
21 and the sirens, in the United States. Fourteen other
22 competitors manufacture their products in China and
23 India. I employ a thousand people in New Hampshire,
24 900 people in Connecticut, and over 250 people in

1 Coventry, England. I worry about about those people.
2 But I have to worry about staying in business. And,
3 the high cost of electricity is one of the decisions
4 that have to be reckoned with.

5 When Northern Pass first announced, and
6 started throwing around some numbers of how much
7 electricity was going to cost, most of the Canadians
8 right now get about 8.1, 8.2 per kilowatt-hour, plus
9 delivery, plus delivery. I wrote editorial that were
10 in every newspaper, on behalf of BIA, in support of
11 Northern Pass.

12 But now that I find that we have almost
13 doubled the cost of Northern Pass, yes, it will be more
14 than double when you get through. I'm an engineer by
15 profession also. I know how numbers work in the
16 beginning stages and where they end up in the end.
17 And, by the way, you don't need to have an A in
18 Economics from college to understand who pays for this:
19 You do. Every single penny comes out of your pocket.

20 Okay? Don't be fooled. Oh, "Eversource
21 is paying for it", "this guy's paying". I haven't
22 heard the people from Northern Pass say that; the
23 people on the floor are saying it. They're not right.
24 We are going to pay a much higher rate for electricity

1 than we pay now, when this is all done.

2 Also, it's over ten years late. I
3 started trumping this thing in New Hampshire ten years
4 ago, that we need power. When my general manager and
5 vice president gets a call on a hot summer afternoon to
6 shut down and go on generator, you don't have the
7 power.

8 But let me tell you something, I've been
9 talking to all my compatriots in New Hampshire, BIA
10 members and manufacturers, we're going to have plenty
11 of power without Northern Pass, because we're moving.
12 The biggest manufacturer in New Hampshire is about to
13 announce a move. And, other companies are moving
14 one-by-one.

15 You will have a surplus of electricity
16 without Northern Pass. It isn't worth the investment,
17 because you can't afford what's going to come off of
18 it. Now, that's 180 degrees past my editorials that I
19 wrote. I'm sorry, but economics dictate that we can't
20 afford what you're going to deliver. Thank you very
21 much.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
23 sir. Our next speaker is Ruth Niven.

24 And, ma'am, if you could spell your last

1 name, too, so, the court reporters can get it down.

2 MS. NIVEN: My name is Ruth Niven,
3 N-i-v-e-n. I'm from Franklin, New Hampshire. I've
4 always lived in Franklin. I grew up in New Hampshire.
5 Like many other New Hampshire residents, I love this
6 state. And, it hurts to see that financial
7 considerations sway our good judgment.

8 We were asked, in the guidelines, for
9 our comments not to be repetitive. But those of us who
10 oppose the Northern Pass Project have said the same
11 thing for five years: "We don't need it. We don't want
12 it. But, if we must have it, bury it."

13 After five years of saying the same
14 thing, the Northern Pass Project has decided to bury 58
15 out of 192 miles of overhead transmission lines.
16 That's not enough. Bury all of it.

17 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next would
18 be Craig Pullen.

19 MR. PULLEN: Hi. My name is Craig
20 Pullen, P-u-l-l-e-n. I live in Canterbury, Windswept
21 Farm, 1745 it was established. And, now, we've
22 undertaken that project. We're less than a quarter of
23 a mile away from these lines. We count on the beauty
24 of our area to bring our clientele to us. We're an

1 equestrian facility, we have a Bed & Breakfast there.

2 Looking at our easement that goes
3 through our property, you have an easement through for
4 the lines that are there now, not for additional lines.
5 Northern Pass is leasing it from the wrong people. It
6 should be the property owners. I pay taxes on that
7 property. I maintain that property underneath.

8 Sorry. We leave our private property
9 open for all public use. You're not welcome on it.

10 Sorry. This is quite hard for me,
11 because it's -- we've put a lot of effort and time and
12 finances into maintaining our property. It's, like as
13 I said, it's 1745. Why it's not a historic resource,
14 why it wasn't looked at? I couldn't tell you. But I
15 think your Application is incomplete, and the effort
16 hasn't been there.

17 Everybody has a concern here in this
18 room. There's only one answer. If you want the
19 profits, bury it for everybody. That will make you
20 happy. Thank you.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next
22 speaker is Tiler Eaton.

23 MR. EATON: Hi. My name is Tiler Eaton.
24 And, I'm here tonight as a New Hampshire resident.

1 And, I also support and work for thousands of
2 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers members
3 in the State of New Hampshire. We are 100 percent in
4 favor of Northern Pass, and believe the compromises
5 that have been made are huge.

6 The underground section alone may be the
7 largest and longest underground DC transmission cable,
8 not only in the United States, but possibly in the
9 world, according to ABB's website. So, you can check
10 it out.

11 The jobs, they're real jobs. They come,
12 you know, not minimum wage, where taxpayers have to,
13 you know, like Walmart workers or whatever. These are
14 jobs that come with healthcare, pensions, and other
15 ways to support families.

16 But we heard it tonight, when we're in
17 communities, when we do these projects, we're all about
18 the communities. We spend our money in the
19 communities, whether it be in restaurants, stores.
20 This is a good project for the State of New Hampshire.
21 It's a good project for the region.

22 And, again, a lot of us don't like
23 change. But, you know, who thought that 20 years ago
24 that, you know, everything that we did would be done

1 off of a cellphone, but we got used to that. I think
2 we have to think about everybody.

3 I believe we should also concentrate on
4 bringing manufacturing to the North Country. DC power
5 is the best source for manufacturing. My family, we
6 own property, own a home in the North Country. And,
7 you know, it's, from when we first purchased it some 30
8 years ago, if you go up there now and you see some of
9 these towns with houses boarded up, that it seems to me
10 there's nothing there for the community, nothing there
11 to keep the younger people to want to stay in the North
12 Country, like people were before when the paper mills
13 were going strong and all that.

14 So, this job is about lowering the cost
15 of energy, not only for New Hampshire residents, but
16 everybody in New England. And, I think it's the right
17 time, it's the right thing. And, I hope it happens
18 soon. Thank you.

19 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Our next
20 person who asked to speak is Carolee Longley.

21 And, ma'am, when you come up, if you
22 could spell both your first name and your last name for
23 our court reporters please.

24 MS. LONGLEY: Hi. It's Carolee,

1 C-a-r-o-l-e-e, and last name is Longley, L-o-n-g-l-e-y.

2 I'm very thankful for the opportunity to
3 be here tonight. I'm a resident of Merrimack County, I
4 live in Northfield. And, it's my opinion that this
5 project will have an unreasonably adverse impact on the
6 beautiful scenic and aesthetic quality of life that we
7 enjoy in this state called "New Hampshire". This
8 project will have an unreasonable adverse impact on the
9 natural environment of this state.

10 If the Northern Pass cannot be buried
11 100 percent, then New Hampshire says "no". I say "no"
12 to 85-foot towers. I say "no" to your 38 miles of
13 overhead construction in my Merrimack County.

14 We have heard that New Hampshire will
15 receive a benefit of \$30 million in property taxes.
16 Well, we just heard tonight that 10 million of that
17 will remain in Belknap County -- I'm sorry, Merrimack
18 County. How many cities and towns are in Merrimack
19 County? Do the math. Will it be worth it at the
20 expense of our natural resources?

21 And, the Northern Pass mentioned tonight
22 the tax pledge that it will be on a town-by-town basis
23 that they will not apply for tax abatements. People
24 better pay attention.

1 It's been said that the Northern Pass
2 will bring a new electricity source to New Hampshire.
3 Really? We just heard here tonight that Northern Pass
4 will carry 90 percent of the electricity to
5 Massachusetts. Keeping only 10 percent of it in New
6 Hampshire. Will this really benefit the public in New
7 Hampshire? I say "no".

8 Don't fall for it, like the elderly
9 gentleman said. Don't fall for it. As a Native
10 American, who deeply respects the natural beauty and
11 the natural resources of this state, I say don't let
12 the Northern Pass scalp our lands. Spend the
13 additional million dollars -- billion dollars and bury
14 the Pass.

15 I've heard talk that Northern Pass will
16 provide over 2,000 jobs for New Hampshire. The truth
17 is, many of these jobs will require skilled workers.
18 And, the reality is, New Hampshire is having a
19 workforce crisis right now. We're lacking skilled
20 workers. And, the Northern Pass is going to have to go
21 out-of-state to hire some of these jobs. Don't be
22 fooled. That's the truth.

23 Do the right thing, bury the Pass
24 100 percent, or I say "no".

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Maggie
2 Stier.

3 MS. STIER: My last name is Stier,
4 S-t-i-e-r. I represent the New Hampshire Preservation
5 Alliance. And, I just want to thank you for the
6 opportunity to address you tonight, to ask questions
7 and provide comments.

8 The review of historic resources is
9 quite complicated. And, we understand that, for many
10 in the audience tonight, the Section 106 process, the
11 NEPA process, and the SEC process can be difficult to
12 separate and understand thoroughly.

13 What I think is important to understand
14 tonight is that not just buildings, but rural
15 landscapes, and both pre- and post-contact
16 archeological resources are at stake here. And,
17 whether it's aboveground or belowground, here in
18 Franklin, or anywhere throughout the state, this is a
19 complex process. Made even more challenging by the
20 timeframe, the number of people involved, and the
21 differing sets of data, which have been shared so far
22 and will be forthcoming.

23 It's important to the Preservation
24 Alliance and to all of you involved here to say that

1 cooperation is going to be really key, between
2 landowners, between the Department of Energy, between
3 Northern Pass, all of the stakeholders and the
4 consulting parties. That we do this in a collaborative
5 and open and transparent and robust way as possible, to
6 get through the review of historic resources, and to do
7 whatever we can to agree on those adverse effects,
8 using the proper channels, SEC review, Section 106
9 review, in particular.

10 So, we look forward to being part of
11 that. Thank you.

12 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: David
13 Darlington.

14 MR. DARLINGTON: David Darlington, from
15 Litchfield, New Hampshire. First off, I'd say, for
16 Franklin, I don't blame them for wanting to take the
17 money and run. But, unfortunately, it kind of reminds
18 me of their heritage, like other towns in New
19 Hampshire, they were an old mill town. But, and like
20 Northern Pass, it affects more than just one town.
21 And, I hope the SEC evaluates the entirety, and not
22 single out what it does for Franklin specifically,
23 because it's a false premise that you could build any
24 other kind of construction site here.

1 I mean, with the mills, no one cared.
2 They just took their effluent, threw it in the river,
3 polluted everyone downstream. It's kind of the same
4 thing with Northern Pass. It may be good for Franklin,
5 but it's no good for the rest of the state. And, I
6 hope you evaluate the entirety. Thank you.

7 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Howard
8 Moffett.

9 MR. MOFFETT: Thank you. I'm up here,
10 too. I'm Howard Moffett. I'm a State Representative
11 from Canterbury, also represent Loudon. And, I
12 appreciate the opportunity to be here tonight.

13 Incidentally, I'm one of the co-sponsors
14 of HB 626, the legislation to which reference was made
15 earlier. Which would allow, but not require, high
16 voltage direct current electric transmission lines, and
17 other -- other energy infrastructure, to be buried in
18 interstate highway rights-of-way owned by the state.
19 I'm not going to comment on the -- on the
20 representations that were made earlier about DOT. I
21 think those are going to have to stand on their own.
22 And, we'll see how that comes out. But that bill is
23 now in the Legislature.

24 I'm not here tonight to attack Northern

1 Pass. But I do want to say a couple of things. I want
2 to make two points.

3 The first is, I understand the
4 significance and the importance of the converter
5 station to the City of Franklin, and especially to its
6 tax base. I don't think that can be dismissed.

7 But the second thing I want to say is, I
8 personally believe that Franklin's best chance of
9 seeing that converter station built is to have the vast
10 bulk of the Northern Pass Project, if not the entire
11 Project, buried underground.

12 Why? It's very simple. If the Project
13 were substantially buried, the opposition would
14 disappear. If it's not going to be buried, if the rest
15 of it isn't going to be buried, and, with all due
16 respect, Mr. Quinlan, you talk about "balancing the
17 interests", I don't think that you balanced the
18 interests between the White Mountain region, and the
19 North Country, and the rest of New Hampshire, from
20 Plymouth south. If you can bury it through the White
21 Mountains, you ought to be able to bury it in the North
22 Country, and south of Plymouth as well.

23 And, if the Project isn't buried, the
24 fight over this Project is going to go on for another

1 two, three, four years, in the courts, in the
2 Committee, in the communities.

3 And, meanwhile, something very, very
4 important happened last Tuesday in the State of Vermont
5 that affects everything that we're talking about here
6 tonight. The Vermont Public Service Board, which is
7 the equivalent in Vermont of the Site Evaluation
8 Committee here in New Hampshire, approved the New
9 England Clean Power Link. That is another high voltage
10 direct current electric transmission project, which
11 would bring approximately the same amount of power to
12 New England, but it's buried. It's buried under Lake
13 Champlain, and under highways through the State of
14 Vermont, to Ludlow, where it terminates.

15 The real significance of the New England
16 Clean Power Link is that they started with their
17 approval process three years after the Northern Pass.
18 Northern Pass filed its Application in December of
19 2010. Northeast Clean Power Link filed their
20 Application in late 2013. Clean Power Link now has all
21 the federal approvals it needs and all the state
22 approvals it needs. Why? Because it's buried.
23 There's a message there.

24 And, I would suggest that, if you want

1 this Project to be built, if Eversource wants this
2 Project built, if Franklin wants this Project built, if
3 the IBEW wants this Project built, the best way to do
4 it is going to find a way to put it underground. Thank
5 you.

6 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Our next
7 member of the public is Pentti Aalto. Sorry if I
8 mispronounced your name, sir.

9 MR. AALTO: That's not a problem. Thank
10 you very much for the opportunity. My name is Pentti
11 Aalto, P-e-n-t-t-i, A-a-l-t-o. I'm from Pembroke.

12 I guess my concern here is that we're
13 building a major piece of infrastructure that's going
14 to last for many years. It may or may not be needed.
15 It may be that, as we get into this coming decade or
16 two, that we're at the beginning of a process that's
17 similar to what happened with mainframe computers.
18 Over a fairly lower short period, personal computers
19 began to be the main way of doing computations. Now,
20 they're done on our phones.

21 We're at the edge of a process of
22 distributed generation that may substantially reduce
23 the need for long distance transmission in many cases.
24 It may become a white elephant in time. My sense is

1 that we will pay for it, as a previous speaker pointed
2 out, one way or another.

3 I understand that I can't ask questions.
4 But, for the Commission to look at, the 10 percent
5 that's being reserved for New Hampshire customers, is
6 that being reserved in the default service category or
7 is that being for all customers? Our distribution
8 charges are already very, very high.

9 This brings us to another piece of the
10 issue with distributed generation. We're shortly going
11 to be looking at issues of net metering. People that
12 put in solar on their roof may find themselves exposed
13 to charges of \$50 or \$100 a month of fixed charges,
14 because they're supposedly not paying their fair share
15 of the wiring that brings power to them. If that's the
16 case, do we want to add more to that kind of charge?

17 I would argue, if this facility is
18 built, that it should be required that it provide for
19 support for the intermittent sources that will be
20 developing, solar, wind and other sources, so that
21 power can flow two ways. That we can make use of the
22 storage capability in Canada, in an effective way, when
23 there's surplus power here, to use it as a storage
24 system. That would tend to increase the value of that

1 power in New England and in New Hampshire.

2 We have -- we're at a point where there
3 are many, many questions that are going to be before
4 us. We're entering a very disruptive period in
5 electricity supply. I leave it to the Commission
6 looking at this to determine whether this individual
7 facility is necessary, or could another clean power
8 type of circuit going elsewhere be less expensive, to
9 do the same job, if it's needed? Thank you very much.

10 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
11 sir. Next is Julie Moran.

12 MS. MORAN: Thank you. Welcome back,
13 Bill. Julie Moran, M-o-r-a-n. And, the last time we
14 spoke, you had said that you only heard to bury one
15 spot, the Appalachian Mountain Trail. Well, I think
16 you have to admit at this point that you've heard
17 everyone say?

18 FROM THE FLOOR: Bury it.

19 MS. MORAN: In its entirety. So, the
20 next hearing, we'd like to hear that you have heard us,
21 that we said "Bury the whole thing."

22 Now, I've heard people say "well, maybe
23 you shouldn't bury it in this forest or that forest,
24 where nobody will see it." But you're hearing from the

1 people, and the people are asking you "Bury the whole
2 thing."

3 We really don't buy the fact that, you
4 know, burial is going to increase the ratepayers'
5 amount. You know what? If Hydro-Quebec wants to cut
6 their little percentage of 12 and a half or whatever
7 outrageous percent they have that they're giving their
8 investors, they could cut that a little bit and take
9 off all that \$1 billion in a heart beat. And, we would
10 be all very happy.

11 I don't think that you're going to lower
12 New Hampshire's rates. We're the highest in the
13 country now. How you are going to lower them with one
14 energy project? You can't. It's not going to happen.
15 I haven't seen energy rates go down yet. The only way
16 it's go to lower is when we all start producing our own
17 electricity. And, some people are thinking of doing
18 that.

19 So, that's not going to lower the rates.
20 Northern Pass is not going to lower our rates. And,
21 putting another billion dollars into it is not going to
22 raise the rates significantly either way. None of us
23 believe any of those things that have been told to us.

24 So, those of us from the very far North

1 Country where I come from, we're all completely opposed
2 to this Project. And, as I told you, after our last
3 meeting at the Mountain View Grand, we've all made a
4 huge compromise. We've all said, "okay, we will stand
5 with our brothers and sisters down below in Sugar Hill,
6 and we will go for burial, rather than fight this whole
7 thing, and fight against you and say, you know, "don't
8 build this"."

9 We have all said, from now on, "okay, we
10 will accept it." If you said, and all your investors
11 and Hydro-Quebec, and all the powers-that-be that you
12 have to represent, and I feel bad for you, then, if
13 they would allow you to say "okay, we will bury the
14 whole Northern Pass", this sea of orange would change
15 to blue.

16 *[Audience interruption.]*

17 MS. MORAN: That's all we need to know
18 that you have heard tonight, is that we have
19 consistently driven two hours from here and two hours
20 from there, to come to these meetings for the last five
21 years to tell you to "bury this thing". And, once the
22 people listen to you that you have heard us, and that
23 is what we're saying, and that they can save an awful
24 lot of money from fighting this, and just start

1 building it, then you'll have a project. Your project
2 will come. Our people will go back to work. They'll
3 start burying things, they'll start doing electrical
4 lines, they'll start doing the connections, they'll
5 start doing everything that you guys want them to do,
6 because we want them to go back to work as well. This
7 orange shirt does not mean "I don't want my brothers
8 and sisters to go to work." I want them to go back to
9 work. And, I want the power to be the right price.

10 However, it's got to be buried. And,
11 when it's buried, we believe that your Project will go
12 through.

13 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Our next
14 speaker is Joanne Busch.

15 MR. BUSCH: Correction, it's "Johann".

16 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry.

17 MR. BUSCH: That's okay.

18 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, if you
19 could spell both your first and last name for our court
20 reporter please.

21 MR. BUSCH: No problem.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
23 sir.

24 MR. BUSCH: It's Johann, Juliet Oscar

1 Hotel Alpha November November --

2 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

3 MR. BUSCH: Oh, I'm sorry. It's
4 J-o-h-a-n-n, the last name is Busch, B-u-s-c-h. And,
5 I'm a resident in Sanbornton. I wanted to express a
6 few points. One is a historical point. Speaking to
7 someone who I admire quite a lot, and that is Nikola
8 Tesla, who was a great investor, who actually developed
9 the alternating current, which is providing light and
10 audio for us right now. And, one of his developments,
11 after working in Colorado Springs, was the wireless
12 transmission of electricity, which he had perfected
13 during his time. And, he proceeded then to establish a
14 tower in New York, in Long Island, called the
15 "Wardenclyffe Tower". And, this was financed by JP
16 Morgan. And, everything was going well, until it was
17 found out that the electricity could be transmitted
18 wirelessly to any point on earth, but the problem was
19 that it would be unmetered. So, they can't have that.
20 You know, no free electricity. So, that was the end of
21 that, and it was shut down.

22 So, that one -- that one event, it was
23 because of, from my perspective, the greed of one man.
24 And, I'm just considering, like, we wouldn't have this

1 problem, we wouldn't be debating this, if that had been
2 allowed to continue. But it was mostly because of the
3 power of this one man that had some greed, and was not
4 willing to let that go through.

5 So, I'm just making the point,
6 hopefully, that if we can be aware of greed. And,
7 maybe that we -- if we can work on the greed that's
8 inside of each of us, the world would be a much better
9 place. Thank you very much.

10 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, our
11 last public commenter is Chief Kevin LaChapelle.

12 FIRE CHIEF LaCHAPELLE: Thank you,
13 Mr. Iacopino. I appreciate the opportunity to speak
14 tonight. I had no intentions in coming here tonight to
15 speak. But, after listening to the comments and
16 piecing together for the last five years the
17 discussions about Northern Pass coming to Franklin,
18 first of all, five years ago, I never imagined that I'd
19 be the Fire Chief. So, it didn't -- at that point, it
20 didn't really -- it wasn't a consideration. Been the
21 Fire Chief and the Emergency Management Director for
22 about four years now. And, it's very exciting, as a
23 young fire chief, to have discussions about a project
24 of this magnitude.

1 And, sitting back there tonight, I was
2 thinking that I can only imagine the feelings that ran
3 through the Fire Chief's head in Seabrook, in the early
4 1970s, of what type of impact that it would make on a
5 community with that type of hazard coming in. And, I
6 think that it was very overwhelming for him. I've
7 talked to fire chiefs and police chiefs that were
8 involved in the early 1970s with a project of that
9 magnitude. It was very stressful for them.

10 And, I think, tonight, that I'm grateful
11 to be the Fire Chief in a process like this, where
12 folks are allowed to come in and speak their minds of
13 whether you want the Project buried or if you want the
14 Project above ground.

15 However the Project is completed, if it
16 is completed, the safety that it will offer for our
17 members, which is most important to me as the Fire
18 Chief and the Emergency Management Director, and the
19 citizens of our community, it's much safer than a
20 project that was offered in the early 1970s as -- for
21 nuclear power.

22 When we prepare grants on a daily basis
23 in any department across the country, we always look at
24 critical infrastructure. And, one of the things that

1 afforded us to have a grant issued this year was the
2 fact that we were in close proximity to the nuclear
3 power plant in Seabrook. We're 73 miles away from
4 Seabrook. And, we do offer regional response to that
5 area. And, when I talked to a grant writer in Florida,
6 he said "You need to make sure that you write down that
7 your 73 miles from a nuclear power plant, because that
8 is a hazard. That you may not think is in your
9 community, but you will respond, and it offers a hazard
10 to those in your community and your first responders."

11 So, I only offer the comment tonight
12 that I'm very grateful for the fact that we're not
13 talking about a project that will necessarily harm our
14 first responders and the citizens of our community.
15 So, that's very important to me. And, I was only able
16 to sow those thoughts up tonight by listening to
17 everyone speak here in the room tonight.

18 So, I do believe that it's -- if it
19 offers clean energy, and, most importantly, it's a safe
20 project. So, thank you very much.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.

22 Ladies and gentlemen, that's the end of our speakers
23 tonight. Thank you all for coming.

24 Again, I'd just like to remind you all

1 the ways to participate before the Site Evaluation
2 Committee. We take written comments until the
3 conclusion of the case. There will be -- February 5th
4 is the deadline to intervene, if you believe that you
5 have a substantial interest in the proceeding. Good
6 night, everybody.

7 ***(Whereupon the public information***
8 ***session was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.)***

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24