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P R O C E E D I N G

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All right.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Michael Iacopino. I am Counsel to the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee, and we are here tonight in Docket Number 2015-06, the Joint Application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and Public Service Company of New Hampshire doing business as Eversource Energy for a Certificate of Site and Facility for the project commonly referred to as the "Northern Pass". The purpose of our meeting tonight is to put on a public information session.

There are agendas out at the table as you came in. I'm going to first explain to you the agenda, how we're going to go through this meeting tonight. It has a number of different parts.

The purpose of the meeting is to provide information to the public, from the Site Evaluation Committee and from the Applicants, the Joint Applicants in this case, the people who are -- who wish to develop the Northern Pass Project.

We will start off with a presentation that I will present to you all, just explaining you a little bit about the Site Evaluation Committee, how
it's composed, how it works, and some of the features of RSA 162-H, which is the statute that governs the Site Evaluation Committee. After that, we will then have a presentation by the Applicant put on, so that the Applicant can explain its Project to you.

Once the Applicant has completed its presentation, we will take questions from the audience. If you have a question, you should write it down on a green sheet that you can get out at the table out front, and maybe somebody could bring some of these in here as well, in case people come up with questions while they're seated here and they don't have to run outside. But, if you have a question for either the Site Evaluation Committee or the Applicant, it should be written on a green sheet like this [indicating].

And, what we do up here, you can see we've already started doing it, we try to categorize them, so that we can talk in an organized fashion about different issues that may come up. So, if you have a question, either for the Applicant or the Site Evaluation Committee, please write it down on a green sheet.

Once we have gone through the questions and answered them hopefully, both from the Site Evaluation Committee and from the Applicants, we will
then go into a public comment session. And, in front of me, there is a dais. If you wish to make a public comment or a public statement about the proposed Project, you should fill out a yellow sheet, and bring that up to the front table here, or hand it to any one of the workers who are here in the facility, or my associate, Iryna Dore, right behind you there with her hand raised, and we will make sure that you get put in line to speak at the time for public comment.

We are going to follow that agenda, okay? That means that, if you have a question, don't wait until public statement time to ask the question. Write your question down on a green sheet of paper, and it will be asked and answered by the appropriate person. If you come up and start asking questions during the time for public statements, I will simply say to you "Well, those are good rhetorical questions. Thank you." You won't get an answer during that period, okay? We're trying to do this in an organized fashion. We have found, over many years, that this way of doing this works the best.

And, with that, we'll begin. To my left is Pamela Monroe. She is the Administrator of the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. As I said before,
my associate, Iryna Dore, is in the back. I am Counsel
to the Committee. There are no Committee members here
tonight. And, the reason why that is is because this
is a session where information is provided to you
primarily.

There will be a public hearing held
here, in Rockingham County. I don't know that the date
has been set yet. But it will be held, I believe, in
Deerfield. At the public hearing, there will be five
of them, actually, there will be one in each county
where this Project is proposed for, at those public
hearings, one in each county, we will have the
Subcommittee that is hearing this, that will decide the
issue, at those hearings.

The way the Legislature has created our
statute is we have this session, which is a public
information session, must be held within 45 days of
acceptance of the Application. And, then, within the
next 45 days, we'll have five more public hearings.
And, those public hearings will actually have the
Subcommittee present. And, they will be run very much
like this one, however, without the presentation from
myself.

So, the New Hampshire Site Evaluation
Committee has a website. The Northern Pass Application for a Certificate of Site and Facility, which is the permit that the Site Evaluation Committee issues, is on our website. The website is www.nhsec.nh.gov. If you wish to see that Application, you can get it there for free. It is lengthy, it is long. Please bear with us, if it takes your computer a long time to load any of the documents.

The Site Evaluation Committee is a creature of statute. RSA 162-H is the statute, the New Hampshire statute that creates the Committee. And, RSA 162-H has several purposes. It has a purpose of balancing the impacts, the benefits and impacts of the selection of sites for energy facilities and transmission facilities. And, it balances those benefits and impacts on various things, such as the welfare of the population, the effects on private property, the location and growth of industry, economic growth of the state, the environment of the state, historic sites, aesthetics, air and water quality, public health and safety, natural resources, and, generally, the public interest.

The second purpose of the statute is to avoid undue delay in the construction of new
facilities.

Third purpose is to provide full and timely consideration of environmental consequences.

The fourth is to provide full and complete public disclosure. That's why it's important that everybody who is interested look at our website, because every document that is filed in the case will be on the website, including the Application, including the comments of the public. We take written comments throughout our proceedings, and they are posted on our website.

And, finally, the purpose of RSA 162-H is to ensure that the construction and operation of energy facilities is treated as a significant aspect of land use planning, in which all environmental, economic and technical issues are resolved in an integrated fashion. That purpose for the Site Evaluation Committee and for this statute was developed by the Legislature.

In essence, the Site Evaluation Committee is the statewide planning board for energy projects. And, when I say "energy projects", that includes transmission lines. The Site Evaluation Committee is designed to integrate all of the various
permitting processes, as well as environmental, economic and technical issues, into a single permitting process.

Now, that doesn't mean that an applicant or a developer doesn't have to get permits. They still file all of their applications, just as if they were building a Walmart across the street or something, they still have to get all of those permits and file them. What happens, though, is that the final decision is integrated into the Site Evaluation Committee process, which I will go through in just a minute.

When I say that we are a "statewide planning board", the Site Evaluation Committee, RSA 162-H preempts, that's a fancy lawyer word, for it nullifies the responsibility and authority of your local planning board, zoning board, and local ordinances.

Now, the Site Evaluation Committee, by statute, is required to take your local ordinances into consideration in making any decision that it's called upon to make. However, that authority will no longer rest with the local planning board or zoning board. We call this the "supermarket theory" or the "one-stop one shop" -- "one-stop shop theory" of permitting.
I am not the person who will make the decision on the Northern Pass Application. That decision will be made by the Site Evaluation Committee members. I am only counsel to that Committee. But that Committee consists of a number of important people in the state. And, up on the wall I have who those officers are. Each of the three Public Utilities Commissioners for the State of New Hampshire sit on the Site Evaluation Committee, as does the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Services, the Commissioner of the Department of Transportation, the Commissioner of the Department of Resources and Economic Development, and the Commissioner of the Department of Cultural Resources or the Director of the Division of Historical Resources, and, usually, it's the Director of the Historical Resources Division that sits on the Site Evaluation Committee. In addition, we have two public members. One of whom, by statute, is required to be an attorney. Both of whom are required to have expertise in this area. And, there is one alternate member, one alternate public member.

At present, one of our public member's seats is vacant. Unfortunately, our member, Roger Hawk, passed away last weekend. So, our alternate
member, Rachel Whitaker, has recently been appointed to sit on the Committee.

The Committee today consists of these folks up here. I've just gone through their offices. But the Chairman of the Committee is Martin Honigberg, he also the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission; Thomas Burack, the Commissioner of the Department of Environment Services is our Vice Chairman; Robert Scott and Kathryn Bailey are the other two Public Utilities Commissioners who sit on our Committee; Victoria Sheehan is our new Commissioner of Transportation, she is on our Committee; Jeff Rose is the Commissioner of DRED, he sits on our Committee; Elizabeth Muzzey is the Director of the Division of Historical Resources, she is a member of the Committee; we have one vacancy in a public member; Attorney Patricia Weathersby, from Portsmouth, New Hampshire, is a public member; and our alternate public member is Rachel Whitaker, from Berlin, New Hampshire.

Now, those are the members of the Committee. Each one of those state agency members have the authority to have somebody from their agency sit in their place. The statute says that it must be either a staff attorney or a senior administrator within their...
agency. In this particular case, a Subcommittee has
been appointed, and people have been designated to sit
on that Subcommittee.

And, they are Martin Honigberg, our
Chair, will chair the Subcommittee in this particular
case; Commissioner Burack has appointed Craig Wright,
who is the Director of the Air Resources Division of
DES, to sit in his place; Kathryn Bailey, as a
Commissioner of the PUC, will sit; Commissioner Rose,
from DRED, has appointed his Director of the Economic
Development, Christopher Way, to sit; Commissioner
Sheehan, from the Department of Transportation, has
designated William Oldenburg, who is the Assistant
Director of Project Development for DOT to sit; and our
public members on this Subcommittee will be Ms.
Weathersby and Ms. Whitaker. These are the folks who
will actually hear the evidence in this case, and
decide whether or not to grant a permit or, as we call
it on the Committee, a "Certificate", a Certificate of
Site and Facility to the Applicants for this
transmission project. So, that's our Committee.

There's another very important part of
our process. And, that is, who represents you, the
members of the public? Under RSA 162-H, Section 9,
there is Counsel to the Public, appointed by the Attorney General, represents the public in seeking to protect the environment and in seeking to assure that there is an adequate supply of energy. Counsel for the Public is involved in our cases just like any other party. He has all of the rights, responsibilities, and privileges of a party in a formal proceeding.

And, in this particular case, our Counsel for the Public is Senior Assistant Attorney General Peter Roth. Where is he? If you would stand up and maybe speak to the folks, and tell them how they can reach you and what you do.

MR. ROTH: Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

MR. ROTH: Good evening, everybody. Is this thing working? Yes. My name is Peter Roth. I was appointed by the Attorney General to serve as Counsel for the Public in this matter. I have served as Counsel for the Public in a number of matters over the last ten years. This one being, of course, the largest.

My job is to represent the interests of the public. And, I don't represent the people who are against the Project, but I do, and I don't represent
the people who are for the Project, but I do. I represent the overall public interest. And, while that sounds confusing, it's fairly straightforward.

We don't generally take a position with respect to a project. My job is to analyze the evidence and challenge the evidence as I see it. And, in that respect, I'm assisted, in this Project, by two attorneys from the Primmer firm, who are seated here: Eli Emerson, who is an energy attorney, from Saint Johnsbury, Vermont, and has an office in Littleton; and Tom Pappas, who is a Nashua resident, and also works out of Manchester.

We anticipate bringing evidence in this case, hiring experts, which is something we're allowed to do, to challenge the evidence and bring our own point of view to the case, to make sure that the statutory purposes for my mission are fulfilled; that is, a proper balance between the need for energy and the environmental impacts.

If you have questions or concerns, you can reach me at the Department of Justice. I'll give you my direct-dial telephone number and my e-mail address. But please be aware that I cannot represent anybody individually or any organization. So, I can't
give you legal advice or counsel. I can provide you information and some insights here and there. But my telephone number is 271-1270, and my e-mail address is peter.roth, R-o-t-h, @doj.nh.gov.

And, if anybody wants to approach me during the meeting or afterwards, I'd be happy to talk to you and answer any questions you may have about what we do. Thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, Peter.

The Site Evaluation evaluation process is a process that takes approximately one year. There are timeframes that are set by the Legislature for the Committee to do its job. And, I'm going to go over with you what those timeframes are. And, these apply in every time that an application for any type of energy project is submitted to the Committee.

First, there is what we -- any applicant who proposes an energy facility or a transmission line is required to hold sessions, very much like this, before they ever file their application. And, in this particular case, I understand that the Northern Pass developers did, in fact, hold five Pre-Application Public Information Sessions, and they had to be held at
least 30 days before filing their application.

Once an application is filed with the Site Evaluation Committee, it's the obligation of the Chairman of the Committee to forward that application to all agencies that have permitting or other regulatory authority, sometimes we just refer to that as "agencies with jurisdiction". And, it's also required that the Committee immediately begin to undertake a review of that application to determine whether or not the application contains sufficient information for the Site Evaluation Committee to do its job.

If the Committee determines that the application is complete, and if it hears from each of the state agencies that the application is complete, it will do what we call "accept the application". All that means is that the application will then go into the process for review by the Committee. That determination, of whether or not an application should be accepted or not, has to be made within 60 days, two months, of when the application was filed.

In this particular case, the Site Evaluation Committee met and voted to accept this Application, finding that it contained sufficient
information, and hearing from each of the state agencies that it contains sufficient information for their purposes. And, an order accepting the Application was issued by the Committee on December 18th, 2015. And, that is the date that all of the other deadlines run -- runs from.

We already had a Subcommittee appointed in this particular case, and we showed you who's on that Subcommittee. The next step in the process is what we're doing right here right now, and that is to hold a public information session in each county in which the site -- in which the Project is proposed to be developed. Rockingham County is one of those counties. That's why we are here tonight. There are five of those sessions scheduled. We had one in Franklin earlier this week. There is the one that we are doing tonight, I believe tonight's the 13th, if I'm correct. There will be one on the 14th, on the 20th, and on the 21st. And, I don't have those, where they are, but I know that they are in Laconia this week, --

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Whitefield.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Laconia,

Whitefield, --
ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: And Lincoln.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- and Lincoln, in that order. So, January 14th in Laconia, January 20th in Whitefield, and January 21 in Lincoln. And, if anybody here is interested in going to those, you can find out where they are in each of those towns on our website, or, if you just come up and ask Pam or myself, we'll direct you to the proper place. I think it's -- well, just ask us and we'll get you where they are.

So, that's the first step in the process, and that is a public information session. It's an opportunity for folks to come and learn about the Committee and learn about the project.

The next step is what we call "Joint Public Hearings". And, they have to be held within 90 days of acceptance of the application. In this case, those Joint Public Hearings must be held before Saint Patrick's Day 2016. We have to have five of them before that date. And, again, there has to be at least one in each county.

At the Joint Public Hearings, we will have all of the members of the Subcommittee, as well as representatives from state agencies who have regulatory
authority, and that's also their opportunity to sort of hear from the public. Those are in the process of being scheduled. And, if you're interested in attending those, you should keep your eye on our website, because there will be a notice published on the website, as well in the Manchester Union Leader.

The next deadline that occurs is, after the Joint Public Hearings, we have to have all the state agencies who are involved prepare preliminary reports or draft conditions and submit them to the Site Evaluation Committee. Those preliminary reports and draft conditions are required to be provided to the Committee within 150 days after acceptance of the application. And, by my calculation, in this case, that means by May 16th, 2016. And, those agencies also have to provide us with their final decisions on applications -- on permits by within 240 days, or nine months, after acceptance of the application. And, in this case, that is on August 15th, 2016.

Once we have the final input of the state agencies, the Site Evaluation Committee then meets in what we call an "adjudicative" session. And, that is very much like a trial. We will probably meet in Concord. There will be witnesses that will be
called, they will be cross-examined, there will be evidence presented. And, there will be, after all of the evidence has been presented, there will be deliberations in public by the Subcommittee. And, then, within 365 days after the acceptance of the application, the Subcommittee must issue a decision either granting or denying a Certificate.

Now, while this is all going on, the parties to the case, the Applicant, Counsel for the Public, anybody who has asked and been granted intervention in the proceeding, all go through a period of what we call "discovery", where they trade information. They get to ask each other questions. So that all of the important information about the case should hopefully be in everybody's hands before we get to that adjudicative process.

During that period leading up to the adjudicative process, our state agencies play a very important role. There are state agencies that have what we call "permitting or other regulatory authority". Those are agencies that, if this was a Walmart, and not an energy facility, they would have to issue a permit. I'll give you an example. The Department of Environmental Services, if you're going
to impact wetlands, requires you to get a permit in order to do that. And, you have to satisfy certain regulatory requirements. So that the -- that is an agency that has "permitting or regulatory authority".

There are some agencies that don't have regulatory authority, but have an interest in a proceeding. A good example of that is Fish & Game. The Fish & Game Department in New Hampshire doesn't issue any permits, yet they have a very important interest in the effects of a project on wildlife and the environment in our state.

Agencies with permitting or other regulatory authority are authorized by our statute to receive proposals and permit requests within their field, determine whether they are complete, and report to the Committee. Those agencies are also permitted to review proposals and submit permit conditions, as I discussed, or terms. They are also, and we rely on them for this, responsible for identifying issues of concern in any particular proposal, or notifying the Committee that they don't have any issues of concern.

When there are issues of concern for a state agency, and this is something new that's only come into the statute last year, the state agency can
participate as a party, basically, call witnesses and
designate a liaison to actually participate in that
adjudicative process that I discussed previously.

And, then, finally, as I indicated these
agencies will submit conditions or reports. If a state
agency says "This Application cannot meet the
requirements of our permitting", then the Site
Evaluation Committee is required to deny a certificate.
However, if the Site Evaluation Committee -- if that
doesn't happen, but the Site Evaluation Committee wants
different conditions than what a state agency has
recommended, we have to allow that state agency to come
before us and tell us why they think their conditions
are better than the ones that the state -- that the
Site Evaluation Committee is proposing. That is a new
part of the statute as well.

So, as you can see, our process, with
the involvement of state agencies, is pretty robust,
and it should catch every issue that might be of
corecern with respect to these types of projects that
are proposed and seeking permits in our state.

But, even before we start this process,
a lot of things go on. And, I'm sure that the
Applicant will talk more about these things. But,
before any Application is filed before the Committee, you should understand that there are a number of things that applicants will generally do. They will make arrangements or contract for studies to be performed with ISO-New England, which is our grid operator, especially if they are a transmission company or electric generating company. ISO is very important to them. They're the folks who control where -- how electricity gets on the grid and how it gets transmitted.

They will do environmental and natural resource studies. They will attend early pre-permitting meetings with various state agencies -- state and federal agencies, to find out what state and federal agencies are going to require for such a project. They will generally meet with our regional planning commissions, with your towns, select boards, city councils, whatever it may be.

If you're before the Site Evaluation Committee and you want to build a power plant, obviously, you're going to be talking to transmission companies about how you're going to get the power out on the grid. If you're a power generator, you're going to be talking about who you're going to sell your power
to, who's going to buy it.

Everybody is always interested in how they're going to finance a project. And, of course, applicants would be interested in any availability of tax credits and things like that.

All of that legwork is hopefully done before an application comes to the Site Evaluation Committee. And, the public is made aware of all that through the pre-filing public information sessions that are held in each county. And, as I said before, those have been held in this docket already.

And, then, the Application is filed. Our application requirements are not meager. They are quite robust. Every application, in the first instance, must contain sufficient information to satisfy all of the requirements that they would have to -- that they would have to satisfy with each state agency.

So, I'll go back to the Walmart example. If a Walmart is going to have a grill in it, it's got to satisfy some air pollution requirements with DES. If they're going to impact wetlands, they have to get a wetlands permit. If they're going to have a driveway cut in, they have got to go get a curb cut from the
Department of Transportation.

All of those types of things have to be contained within the Site Evaluation Committee application, along with all of the completed agency forms. And, the applicant also has to pay the filing fee for each state agency, in addition to the filing fee that it pays to the Site Evaluation Committee.

In addition to those applications, the Site Evaluation Committee application also has to contain, by statute, some very important information. Obviously, it has to have details about the type and size of each major portion of the facility; has to identify the choice of the site and each alternative choice that was considered for each major part of the facility; the application must describe in detail the effect of each major part of the proposed facility on the environment; it must describe in detail any proposals for studying and solving environmental problems that the project may pose; it must describe in reasonable detail the applicant's financial, technical, and managerial capabilities, so that the Site Evaluation Committee can be assured that the developer has the financial wherewithal to site -- properly site, construct and operate the facility; the application...
must document that written notice of the project, including copies of the application, have been provided to each community in which the facility is proposed to be located; it must have a decommissioning plan, with detail -- detailing the elements and financial assurances for decommissioning; and it must provide such additional information as the Committee may require to carry out its purposes.

And, our Committee recently promulgated a whole new set of regulations, came out on December 16th, 2015, for applications that are filed. And, those new requirements contain -- require the applicants to provide materials that were not required under the old rules. So, we do have a rule that says that, if your application is pending at the time that the new rules became effective, and Northern Pass was, it is still going to be subject to the new rules. However, the Site Evaluation Committee must give the applicant an ample opportunity to amend its application to include any new information that may be required.

And, in this particular case, the Applicants have been informed of that obligation, a letter has gone out to them, and we expect that they will comply and provide any additional information.
that's not already contained in the Application. And, if you're interested in seeing that when it comes in, keep your eye on our website, because it will be posted on the website as it comes in.

Now, because this is a public meeting, I am sure that many of you are interested in "how can the public participate in the proceedings of the Site Evaluation Committee? And, there are a number of ways. One you've already heard about, and that is to make your voice known, make your opinions known. If you have questions that you think can be answered by Counsel for the Public, to get in contact with his office. He gave you his direct line. I was not so bold, I put the main number for the Attorney General's Office there. Either number should get you to our Counsel for the Public, Mr. Roth.

In addition, there were Pre-Filing Public Information Sessions in each county, which were open to the public and were noticed in the newspapers. There are these sessions that we are doing now. And, as I said, this is the second one of five. There will be three more after tonight. There will be the Joint Public Hearings. And, those -- there will be five of those, one in each county. Now, both tonight and at
the Joint Public Hearings, where the Subcommittee is actually there, the public gets to ask questions and also make public statements. So, these are all ways in which you can participate.

The Site Evaluation Committee, by its statute, is required to consider all of the public comments that are made. And, if members of the public wish to submit reports, newspaper articles, maybe you have a scholarly article about something, the statute requires that the subcommittee is required to review that.

In addition, there can be additional informational meetings, if the Chairman of the Committee determines that they are necessary, upon the request of a municipality or an unincorporated place.

And, finally, and this is something that is unusual for administrative agencies, we accept written comment from the public right up until the day that we issue a decision. There will be no cut-off, other than the date of the decision -- the date -- I'm sorry -- the date of the vote for the decision, there will be no cut-off. You can come in three days before the hearing and say "Here's my written public comment."

And, by statute, as I said, the Committee must consider
that written comment.

And, finally, if you believe that you have a substantial right, duty or other substantial interest in -- that's going to be impacted by this Project, you have the right to seek intervention as a party. That is that you have the right to request the Committee to allow you to participate. We call that being an "intervenor". And, you have the right, if you can demonstrate that you have a substantial interest in the proceeding and that you won't interfere with the orderly and prompt proceeding, that you can file a motion to intervene. And, if you are granted intervention status, you'll have the same status as Counsel for the Public or the Applicant. You'll be permitted to call witnesses, you'll be permitted to cross-examine witnesses, and act just as any other party before the Site Evaluation Committee.

So, those are the ways that the public can participate. There's quite of few of them. We encourage public participation in all of our dockets.

What ultimately must the Subcommittee do? The Subcommittee must give due consideration to the relevant information regarding the potential siting or routing of a proposed facility. The Subcommittee
must give due consideration to the significant impacts and benefits, as I discussed earlier. And, the Subcommittee must determine whether the issuance of a certificate will serve the objectives of RSA 162-H, which are those objectives that were on that very first slide that I showed to you. In doing that, the Subcommittee cannot issue a Certificate of Site and Facility, in other words, they cannot permit the Northern Pass Project, if they cannot find that the Applicant has adequate financial, technical, and managerial capability to ensure that construction and operation of the facilities is in compliance with terms and conditions of a certificate. In other words, in order to grant the certificate, the Site Evaluation Committee must find that the Applicant has that capability.

The second thing that the Committee must find is that the project will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region, with due consideration being given to the views of municipal and regional planning commissions and municipal governing bodies. That's where your local authorities come in. If they send comments or if they intervene, the Site Evaluation Committee is required to consider their
views. And, oftentimes, for instance, the master plan for towns will be submitted, as will zoning ordinances or planning ordinances, and all of those types of ordinances and local planning criteria will be considered by the Site Evaluation Committee. Now, that doesn't mean the Site Evaluation Committee is going to go along with whatever a local planning board wants, but it has to be considered.

The third criteria is that the Site Evaluation Committee, before they can issue a certificate, it must be demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that the project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air and water quality, the natural environment, or public health and safety. All of those things must be considered by the Committee. And, if the Committee finds that there will be an unreasonable adverse effect on any one of those criteria, the Committee must deny the certificate.

And, the final consideration that the Committee must determine is whether or not the project -- the issuance of a certificate for the project, the permitting of the project will serve the public interest. If each of those criteria are met by
a preponderance of the evidence, in other words, the applicant, who has the burden of proof, has demonstrated these things through our year-long process to the Committee, then the Committee should issue a Certificate of Site and Facility. If the Committee fails -- if the Committee feels that the applicants have failed to demonstrate any one of those criteria, then the Committee will deny a Certificate of Site and Facility.

So, that's how the Committee works. That's the process that we use. The best place to get continuing information about the Northern Pass Project, or any other project, is on our website at www.nhsec.nh.gov.

Once again, the procedure that we're going to use for the rest of tonight is this: Once I sit down, the Applicant, through, I believe, Mr. Quinlan, will make a presentation to the public about the Project and tell you some of the details about it. We will then take questions. And, again, if you have a question, write it down on the green question card and drop it off up here. And, like I say, we're going to categorize these by category and ask them in an organized fashion. Once we have asked
all the questions, we will then take public statements and comments. And, if you want to make a public statement or comment, we need you to fill out a yellow card. And, please, as I said, let's do questions during the question segment and comments during the comment segment.

With that, I'm going to turn the dais over to the Applicant, Mr. Quinlan.

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. Thank you. And, good evening, everyone. I'm Bill Quinlan. I'm the President of Eversource New Hampshire. I want to thank you all for being here tonight and taking time out of your busy day to give us your feedback on our Application.

Now, as Attorney Iacopino mentioned, this is our second round of public information sessions. And, I can assure you the feedback we've gotten from meetings like this, and others, has really helped us to shape the Project that we are first taking into siting, and then, ultimately, into the construction phase. So, thank you, again, for being here.

I'm going to keep these introductory remarks brief. The first thing we're going to do is
we're going to show you a short video, just to remind you of what the Northern Pass Project is, share with you a little bit of what we refer to as the "ForwardNH Plan", which is an attempt to articulate the benefits of this Project to the State of New Hampshire. I'm then going to briefly drill down into Rockingham County. And, then, probably most importantly, we'll take questions and answers, and that's we look forward to your feedback.

So, just as to those questions and answers, you know, we have a lot of Project Team members here tonight. If your question is not answered or we don't get to it this evening, you know, contact one of the Project Team members here, either tonight or, you know, through our website or through some other means. But, most importantly, we do want to understand where the questions are and get you answers to the best of our ability, okay? So, don't hesitate to do that.

So, let's show you this quick video. And, again, this is kind of a reintroduction of the Project and a high-level overview.

[Video presentation provided on the Northern Pass Project.]

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, hopefully, you
found that to be a useful kind of overview of the Project and some of the benefits here in New Hampshire.

Now, specific to Rockingham County.

Now, as the video mentions, the line does enter Rockingham in the Town of Deerfield. There is this blue segment indicating, it's a little over seven miles, that's the only new portion of the line in this county. It's all in the Town of Deerfield. There is an existing right-of-way where this new line is going to run, there is an existing power line. So, they're basically going to run in parallel for those seven miles. Okay?

The power, all of it, will then be delivered to an existing substation also in Deerfield. And, that's, in essence, the termination point of the Northern Pass Project. So, all of that 1,090 megawatts of power will flow into that substation in Deerfield, where it will then flow into the regional electric grid.

Now, the reason we're showing this purple line indicating, essentially runs from Deerfield down to Londonderry, is that there are some modifications to existing structures on an existing power line that we need to make along that current
route. And, that's summarized down here [indicating], and we refer to them as "related system upgrades". Of the 343 existing structures that are carrying a transmission line, approximately ten of them have to be elevated roughly five feet each. Okay? So, that's the only impact in that purple area.

And, you know, we have been working on this blue area, as we have along the entire Northern Pass route, to address one of the issues that we've heard most about, which are the visual impacts of the Project. You know, if you've been following this Project closely, you'll know that we have made some technological changes, and actually have reduced the size of the Project from what we originally envisioned. That allowed us to reduce the structure heights by approximately five feet on average.

We are also looking for opportunities to use a more streamlined structure than what you might be familiar with. Many transmission structures across New England, across the country, are what are referred to as "lattice" structures. They tend to have four legs, and they look like an erector set.

In the areas that are of visual significance, we're going with a more streamlined
structure that looks more like a conventional telephone pole or electric pole. It's referred to as a "monopole", which means that it's a single leg. And, I'll show you an example of that. So, where necessary and appropriate, we are continuing to work on the design to address visual impacts. But we do understand we have additional work to do.

This is a -- one of many visual simulations that our experts have developed to essentially demonstrate to interested parties what this Project will look like visually. This one is taking from the Deerfield Town Hall, and this is the existing view. It might be difficult when I show you what it's going to look like with Northern Pass. So, you're essentially at the Town Hall, and Northern Pass, when it's built, is roughly two-tenths of a mile away from this vantage point. Why did we select this? It was one of the significant vantage points that were identified for us by others. And, there are many kind of historic or other vantage points that are similar to this that we've developed simulations for.

And, I'll show you in a minute what Northern Pass will look like. You'll see it in this area [indicating], among the trees. Okay? So, you see
that one structure. It's a monopole structure, which means it's a single pole, and you'll see some conductors. So, if you just focus on that, you'll see the change.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can we turn off the lights, so we can see it better?

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. We can do that. That might help. And, again, this is illustrative. So, this is the area [indicating]. And, one structure will become visible once it's built. Do you see?

Okay. That's from a distance of about two-tenths of a mile. So, it's relatively close. It is a large pole, it's a tall pole. It's one of the taller poles on the route. Okay?

There are many, literally dozens of these visual simulations that we've had prepared. And, those are accessible to folks who are interested in a particular vantage point.

We do recognize, however, that visual impacts remains a principal concern. You know, when we -- when the Department of Energy, and Attorney Iacopino mentioned their role, the Department of Energy is the federal agency responsible for permitting this Project, looked at it, issued their Draft Environmental
Impact Statement, this was their conclusion around scenic impact and visual impact. And, this was several months ago. This was before we made some fairly significant changes to the Project.

Now, since that point, we've added 52 miles of underground construction in and around the White Mountain National Forest, really to address areas of significant visual impact. So, the point being is that, you know, the Department of Energy views this as a "modest visual impact". We think we have taken further steps to address some of the principal areas. But our work is not done. And, these are some of the techniques down below that we intend to continue working on to address this key issue. Okay? And, they range from some of the structure designs, locations. You know, is there screening that we could create to improve view impacts or reduce impacts? So, we understand that it remains a significant issue, and we continue to work on it.

Beyond the -- I'll say the "design impacts" on Rockingham County, this is what it means from a tax perspective. You saw the introduction, it's roughly a $30 million annual tax benefit to municipalities and counties within the State of New
Hampshire. Here, the municipal portion really is just Deerfield. That's where the new line will run [indicating], and that's where the substation is being upgraded [indicating].

And, when you look at the tax revenues to Deerfield, as well as those at the county level, you're in that 2 to $3 million a year range for Rockingham County. Okay?

Here's a summary that we prepared for the ForwardNH Plan. This is really to address the other question that we received extensively in these sessions, which is "What are the benefits to New Hampshire for this Project?" You know, there's a misperception that existed that this Project was all about getting low-cost clean energy into southern New England, Massachusetts and Connecticut in particular, and that there was nothing in it for the State of New Hampshire. Okay? That's something that I heard routinely when I first got involved in this Project about 18 months ago. And, we've put together the ForwardNH Plan really to demonstrate the direct and significant benefits to New Hampshire in hosting this line. Okay?

The video talked about the "$80 million
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a year in energy cost savings". That's for businesses and residential customers across the State of New Hampshire. This is at a time where, you know, this region is struggling with very high electricity rates. So, this is a very significant issue for businesses.

The ForwardNH Fund, this is something we've committed to. It's really intended to be invested in communities along the route who are hosting the line. Identified four focus areas that are articulated up there, but, really, this is a direct commitment to drive benefits into those communities where this line will be located. And, that's a fairly significant fund. It's $200 million. Okay?

Jobs and economic benefits: You know, when you look at the impact of a $1.6 billion infrastructure project on the State of New Hampshire, it's going to create many job opportunities, for those who are not only building the line, typically, electrical workers and other contractors, but also in all of the businesses along the route who will provide services to this Project. When you look at that, that's a very significant impact, over $2 billion of GDP for the State of New Hampshire. Okay?

We've done some other things to further
create job opportunities. In the North Country, we've created a discrete job creation fund. The sole purpose of that, and it's going to be not managed by the Company, but managed by key business leaders in the North Country, is to invest money, over $8 million worth of the Company's funds in job creation opportunities in the North Country that they will identify. And, I mentioned the tax revenues.

So, very significant economic benefits, when you sum it all up. So, almost $4 billion worth of economic benefits to the State of New Hampshire as a result of hosting this Project.

You know, I oftentimes get the question "Well, what happens if the Project isn't built? What if it's built in Maine? What if it's built in Vermont?" The short answer to that question is, these benefits, for all intents and purposes, go to Maine and Vermont. Okay?

So, that's the economic side. I tried to identify some of the environmental benefits of the Project down below. You know, first and foremost is the impact on carbon. You know, we're talking about a clean, renewable source of electricity. There's no source that you can visualize right now that's going to
have that kind of carbon emission reduction, over 3 million tons a year from a single source across the region. So, a very significant carbon emissions reductions.

We have done some things beyond the carbon to derive environmental benefits here in New Hampshire. We've created a fund with the National Fish & Wildlife Foundation. Actually, we introduced it here in the Town of Londonderry. They're doing some great work with respect to New England cottontail habitat here in this state, and trying to bring back what is basically an endangered species. So, we've committed over $3 million to that fund, and they're going to be investing it in important projects across New Hampshire.

We've also committed to use 5,000 acres of properties that we own up in the North Country for mixed use, some of it will be preservation in nature.

So, some fairly significant environmental benefits. I would call them, in many instances, unique. And, the last one, I'll just hit it quickly. Because one of the things that we hear often is "Well, you're going to bring in a very large amount of hydropower into the region, over a thousand
megawatts. What about all the small-scale renewable
that we're trying to develop, whether it's wind or
solar?" You know, there's a couple answers to that.
One, as the video showed, there's about a quarter of
New England's generation fleet has or will be retiring.
Okay? Almost 8,000 megawatts of generation, whether
it's nuclear, coal, gas, oil, largely carbon-emitting,
other than nuclear. So, there's a true need for new
supplies. And, ideally, you know, to the extent
possible and economic, they will be renewable. So, a
large amount of hydro, coupled with some wind, and
solar, plenty of room for all of those sources of
electricity that, hopefully, will drive our economy in
the future.

The other thing this is referring to is,
up in the North Country there is an area where there's
quite a bit of existing small-scale renewable
generation, some biomass plants, some small hydro
plants, wind plants, and the transmission grid is
constrained. I mean, there are times when not all that
generation can run, because it's an undersized grid.
As part of Northern Pass, we are going to unlock that
grid, and allow the small-scale renewables to operate
more frequently and become more viable, and also
potentially allow additional investment in small-scale renewables up in that area of the state where it's pretty accepted. You know, most of the towns in that North Country area look forward to that investment. So, that's what that's referring to. Okay?

So, that's an overview of Northern Pass, what it means to Merrimack -- I'm sorry, to Rockingham County, where the benefits are from our ForwardNH Plan. And, with that, I'll look forward to your questions. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All right. Everyone want to take a minute and stretch? We've been going about an hour. Take one minute, stretch.

(Recess taken at 7:08 p.m. and the public information session resumed at 7:11 p.m.)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The first of set questions that we have really are towards the SEC, so I'm going to take a crack at answering them, okay.

The first one is: "Has the Site Evaluation Committee determined what specific information Northern Pass must still submit under the new SEC rules to comply with those rules?"
What's happened is the Site Evaluation Committee actually promulgated rules that have specific requirements in them, and we have -- well, Northern Pass is on notice of what those requirements are, and we've told them to provide that information no later than January 22nd, 2016. So they have to go into the rules. Anything that they've not already included in their application that is now required by the rules will have to be provided to the Committee.

And then there are two questions about other applications before the Site Evaluation Committee. One says: "Are there any other applications in front of the SEC that have the potential to create over 2,000 construction jobs?"

And the other one is: "Are there currently any other energy proposals or applications in front of the SEC that could have a positive impact on New Hampshire ratepayers?"

Well, I'm not going to make a determination about how many jobs any particular application might create or whether the impacts or benefits are positive or negative. However, presently pending at the Site Evaluation Committee, we have four other projects. Not all of them -- the applications
haven't been filed in all of them. There is a wind project slated for Antrim, New Hampshire, which is a 28-megawatt wind facility; there is the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project, which is a transmission-line project that runs from Scobie Pond Substation here in Londonderry down to Tyngsboro, Massachusetts, and that's a reliability project; and there's the Seacoast Reliability Project, which is another transmission line. These are all on our website, by the way. The application has not been filed in the Seacoast Reliability Project yet. And then there's the Northeast Direct Tennessee Gas Pipeline, which we have a docket open for that. And that is pending before the Committee, although we do not yet have an application. So we have two other applications before the Committee right now, including Northern Pass, and then we have two other ones that are in prefiling status. As to whether any of them will contribute more than 2,000 construction jobs or have a positive or negative impact, I can't really decide that. That's a decision that the Committee will make. And I can't make that decision for the Committee.

The next question for the SEC is that -- is as follows: "Given that there are many landowners
who question Northern Pass's right to use their land for the Project, does the SEC's written decision to accept the application as complete mean that the SEC has determined that Northern Pass in fact has all the legal rights they need to build the Project as proposed?"

And the answer to that question is no. The acceptance of the application is only that there is sufficient information for the Site Evaluation Committee to move forward with the application.

The next question -- actually, this is addressed to both the Site Evaluation Committee and the Company. So I'll give you a chance after I answer the Site Evaluation Committee's portion, Mr. Quinlan.

"The federal draft EIS says that New Hampshire will use approximately 10 percent of the power delivered by Northern Pass, but will sustain 100 percent of the environmental impacts. Given that New Hampshire is a net exporter of electricity, how will the SEC decide whether Northern Pass is a net benefit to New Hampshire?"

So the part that's addressed to the Site Evaluation Committee here is how will the Site Evaluation Committee decide. They will decide whether
there are net benefit -- actually, they don't have to
derive whether there's net benefits. That's not part
of the statute. As you recall, the determinations that
I went over in the presentation that the Subcommittee
must consider, that's how they decide whether or not to
grant or deny a Certificate of Site and Facility in
this particular case. They will go through those
determinations and determine whether or not the
Applicant has demonstrated, by a preponderance of the
evidence, that they meet each of those criteria. One
of those criteria is in the public interest. Is the
Project in the public interest? And the Site
Evaluation Committee itself will consider that. And
ultimately, that comes down to an individual
determination made by each member of the Site
Evaluation Committee based upon the evidence that they
hear. And I can't speak for them. So what I can tell
you to do, though, is to look at R.S.A. 162-H, Section
16. That lays out the criteria that the Site
Evaluation Committee will use and is required by
statute to use.

Mr. Quinlan, if you want to address the
rest of this, about the 10 percent of the power
delivered --
MR. QUINLAN: Sure.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- but will sustain 100 percent of the environmental impacts.

MR. QUINLAN: So what the question's referring to is a Power Purchase Agreement that exists between Eversource, my company, and our partner, Hydro Quebec. Hydro Quebec owns and operates the hydro facilities in Canada that are going to essentially send power south. As I said during the opening, 100 percent of the power is being delivered here in New Hampshire, into the Deerfield substation. There is a Power Purchase Agreement, again, between us and Hydro Quebec for 10 percent of that power, which means they are contractually obligated to reserve 10 percent of that power for Eversource New Hampshire's customers. The balance of the power, the 90 percent, to my knowledge, has not been contracted for. So, to the extent New Hampshire is interested in procuring more of that power, I'm certain they'll have an opportunity to do so. What we wanted to ensure was that New Hampshire at least received its fair share. So, New Hampshire is about 9 percent of the total load in New England, and we've reserved 10 for our customers. So we've got more than our fair share. We have the opportunity to
procure more if we care to. And probably underlying that question, and maybe more importantly, is the cost of building this transmission project will not be borne by New Hampshire customers. So none of the costs associated with this project, the $1.6 billion that I'm referring to, will be paid for by customers here in New Hampshire, Eversource or otherwise. It will be paid for by others, okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next question is for the SEC.

"Will the SEC be investigating the arsenic potentials from buried transmission lines?"

Both the state agencies and the SEC will likely engage in an analysis of that. And that is through the various permits that have to be complied with through the Department of Environmental Services. There's a wetlands permit, quality certification permit, and various permits that -- environmental permits that the Site Evaluation Committee -- that the Department of Environmental Services will review in the first instance and advise the Site Evaluation Committee on what conditions, if any, should be imposed, or if the Project can even go forward under their criteria.

The next question for the -- is also for
the Site Evaluation Committee and the Company. Very similar to the last one.

"The federal draft Environmental Impact Statement says New England ratepayers will see a one-percent rate savings if Northern Pass is implemented and two other major projects come online. How will the SEC decide whether this savings justifies the impacts in the draft EIS."

That is a determination that will be made by the Site Evaluation Committee after they hear all of the evidence. They will hear the evidence and weigh and consider, as I indicated before, the potential impacts and benefits of the Project with respect to all of those various areas: Public welfare, effects on private property, location, economics. All of those issues will be considered as the Site Evaluation Committee determines whether or not to grant a certificate in this particular case. So I can't tell you what they will do, and I can't tell you the exact thinking that each member of the Site Evaluation Committee will engage in. But I can tell you they will follow the statute and consider the matters that are required by the statute.

Did you want to address the one-percent
MR. QUINLAN: Yeah. We have filed --
first of all, we have prepared, through our experts,
London Economics, an analysis that looks at the cost of
electricity in New England without Northern Pass and
then with Northern Pass. It's a very traditional way
of looking at economic benefits. When they run their
analysis, they conclude that there's approximately
$800 million a year in energy cost savings for New
England. New Hampshire is 9 percent of New England's
load. That's the $80 million figure that we showed
earlier. It's based on a very well-established
methodology for looking at effects on energy markets.
They're one of the leading experts in this field. And,
you know, I'm sure this will be a topic of discussion
at the SEC. But we're very confident in our energy
cost savings analyses.

And I will say, you know, we talked
about the Power Purchase Agreement which reserves for
New Hampshire 10 percent of the power. There are
additional cost savings above and beyond what I was
just referring to that will reside here in New
Hampshire. So, that $800 million is really what
happens to the overall market. We're going to see some
incremental savings that we haven't included in our numbers right here in New Hampshire because the power will be beneficially priced. So I expect to be able to prove that out very significantly.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next question, also addressed to the Committee, and that is: "The federal draft Environmental Impact Statement assumes no other influences on their pricing models" -- assuming Northern Pass's pricing models -- "such as smaller generators, wind projects and community solar, et cetera, which would further reduce savings from Northern Pass. Will the Site Evaluation Committee take a broader view when it models the future of electric rates?"

The site Evaluation Committee, as I said, will consider the benefits and impacts on the economics of the Project. Will they actually model future electric rates? I don't know. However, they will consider those impacts and -- the impacts and benefits from this project and what effect it will have on New Hampshire.

I guess implicit in here, Mr. Quinlan, is a question as to whether your pricing model takes into account smaller generators, wind projects,
community solar, and that by the development of those will reduce savings from Northern Pass. Do you agree with that?

MR. QUINLAN: So, any form of generation that is within the, what's referred to as the "queue," the ISO-New England queue -- ISO being the regional independent systems operator. So, any form of generation that has been proposed as significant enough to make that queue is considered, along with future retirements. So we know that recently the Pilgrim Nuclear Station in Massachusetts announced its retirement. Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station in Vermont has already retired. Brayton Point Coal Plant in Massachusetts has retired. So, all of those retirements are factored into the model. Any additions that are significant enough to make the queue are certainly factored into the model. It's a very thorough and comprehensive model that looks at both additions and subtractions.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The next question is just for the Committee. "I would like to intervene on behalf of my family as we jointly own property on the right-of-way. Do I need to file an affidavit to speak
Then there's a second question: "I would like to speak on behalf of my brother and sister-in-law with regards to Northern Pass's impacts on their property. What form do I need in order to facilitate me doing that?"

In order to file a Motion to Intervene, you would send a letter to the Site Evaluation Committee, addressed to Pamela Monroe, our administrator, and explain to her what rights, title, substantial interest that you may have -- one potential one is what you say here, I own property on the right-of-way -- and explain that in your letter, and explain that you would -- why you would not impair the orderly disposition of the proceedings, and file it by --

MS. MONROE: February 5th.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: February 5th, 2016, and it will be considered by the Site Evaluation Committee. If you want to speak on behalf of somebody else, you should provide us with some proof, usually something signed by that person, that they, in fact, want you to speak for them. It doesn't have to be a formal affidavit, as far as I know. But
also, before you file that, you should also check our new rules, which are on our web site. And it's Rule 301.11 which lays out what needs to be in a letter seeking intervention before the Committee.

So those are the questions that are, or at least in part, addressed to the Site Evaluation Committee. The rest of these should go to the Applicant, I think, if I did it right.

We have a whole group of them here that deal with different aspects of your company, Mr. Quinlan. The first one is actually four questions.

"Will Northern Pass help remove existing structures, such as obsolete transmission lines?"

MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to defer that one to the engineer.

So, are there any structures that we're removing that are obsolete?

MR. JOHNSON: Not that I know.

I think the short answer to that is no.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next question --

MR. QUINLAN: And I will say there are portions of this route -- and this is particularly up in the North Country, which I alluded to them...
earlier -- we will actually be re-conductoring some existing transmission facilities to allow that small-scale renewables get to market. So there are some modifications to existing transmission infrastructure. I don't think we're going to be replacing the actual physical structures. But the wire will be increased in diameter to allow more power to flow.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Second question on this sheet is: "Can you guarantee that a New Hampshire company will be contracted to do the work; and if not, how will new jobs benefit New Hampshire?"

MR. QUINLAN: So one of the things we have announced and we're firmly committed to is a "New Hampshire First" approach to sourcing this project. So, in all instances we're going to look first to in-state resources, whether it's physical workers who are doing the electrical work or pouring foundations or delivering gravel or clearing right-of-ways, we're going to source it locally. And, you know, we have some national contractors that are going to oversee this work for us. But they, too, are committed to our "New Hampshire First" requirement, and they're
contractually bound by it.

So the short answer is, in all instances where possible, we're going to exhaust our in-state labor first and only go outside of the state where necessary. We expect the vast majority of this work to be done by New Hampshire residents.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And the final question on this sheet is: "Can you quantify the impacts to natural resources?"

MR. QUINLAN: So I'm going to defer that to our natural resources expert.

MS. CARBONNEAU: Thank you, Bill. That's a pretty broad question.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Why don't you tell us your name, first.

MS. CARBONNEAU: My name is Lee Carbonneau. I'm with Normandeau Associates, and we have done the environmental surveys on the Project. And as of the submittal of our SEC application and all of the underlying natural resource permit applications that are included in that, we have quantified impacts to natural resources. So, they come in many categories. Obviously, wetlands, streams and vernal pools are important, and they have been quantified.
can tell you that the permanent fill in those resources is about two and a half acres. And considering we had delineated over 870 acres within the Project area, that permit impact is less than 1 percent. There are additional temporary and secondary impacts that we've also quantified for those resources. We've done vernal pool surveys. We've done wildlife surveys. We've evaluated, for example, the impacts to deer wintering areas, moose concentration areas, other wildlife habitat impacts that we have found throughout our surveys which has spanned five years now. We have done rare plant surveys. And so we have quantified the effects of the Project footprint on plant communities where we have found them. Happy to say there will be no impacts in Rockingham County on rare plants. We've been able to avoid that.

So, we actually have done quite a lot. I can't tell you all of the impact quantities, off the top of my head. But these are all included in our technical reports which are appended to our SEC application. And I think mostly in Appendix 31 through 36 or 37 is where you'll find most of those. So they're in the technical reports and where applicable, they're also in our application documents.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And again, that application is available on our web site.

Okay. The next series of questions is also for the Company.

"Mr. Quinlan, you said in Franklin that to completely bury Northern Pass it would cost $1 billion, more than $1.6 billion of project as proposed. I have three questions: No. 1, is this based on a written assessment and specific assumptions that you will share with the public?"

MR. QUINLAN: It's based on the analysis by our engineers and cost estimators. So, one of the things we've been hard at work doing over the last several months is firming up our project cost estimates. So when I mentioned some of the national contractors that we are working with, we are actually in the market bidding portions of this project. So we now have a second data point. We have our own experience in building transmission infrastructure which we've built, an extensive amount. But now we know what the market is, both above-ground and underground construction confirmed. And that's the basis for the $1 billion estimate that we're using.
question from this person is: "How much of that $1 billion is allocated to burying the HVDC line between Pittsburg and Franklin, and how much to the AC line from Franklin to Deerfield?"

MR. QUINLAN: Yeah, so the -- there is a range. It's approximately $5- to $10 million of additional costs per mile of underground construction when you go from above ground to below ground. The $1 billion, it's a estimate. It's the midpoint of the range, basically. It's about 7-1/2 million dollars a mile that we use to get to the approximately $1 billion number.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And the third question from this questioner is: "Is the $1 billion figure predicated on burial on the current right-of-way that's proposed in the SEC application?"

MR. QUINLAN: It's based on the linear distance in using the roughly 7-1/2 million dollars of incremental cost per mile.

Is there anything we would like to add to that?

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I'll just add that the total billion dollars of incremental cost is on roadways and not in the right-of-way, the overhead
right-of-way that's available today. Eversource does
not have the rights to put underground facilities in
those existing overhead right-of-ways.

MR. QUINLAN: So that's a good
clarification. Sam Johnson is one of our engineers.
He's with Burns & McDonnell. So they're a national
ing engineering and project management contractor.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm going
to ask if you pass it off anyone, please tell us your
name first so we have a good record, okay.

The next question is: "Can Eversource
produce the signed Power Purchase Agreement? If so,
where can I find it in the application to the Site
Evaluation Committee?"

MR. QUINLAN: The short answer is no,
we're not in a position to produce it. It's not in the
Site Evaluation Committee. We have not yet executed a
Power Purchase Agreement with Hydro Quebec. We do,
however, have a fairly detailed Memorandum of
Understanding with our partner that outlines all the
principal terms, which we will ultimately turn into a
Power Purchase Agreement.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next
question is similar to the one you've already answered,
but I'm going to ask it anyway.

"A key feature of the ForwardNH Plan is that 10 percent of Northern Pass power will be allocated to New Hampshire. Given that New Hampshire continues to be a net exporter of power, and once electrons are on the grid they are untraceable, what, if any, significance does this have on ratepayers, and how would you fulfill it? Can you guarantee you will be able to enter into a Power Purchase Agreement, and will the terms of any Power Purchase Agreement be made public during the SEC process? What if other generators offer a better deal to New Hampshire ratepayers?"

MR. QUINLAN: I think I just shared, you know, we are at a Memorandum of Understanding stage with our partner. We feel pretty confident that we'll be able to turn that into a Power Purchase Agreement. I think there's a mutual interest in doing so. Can I absolutely guarantee that it will be a Power Purchase Agreement? That's difficult. Like all agreements, they're bilateral, and it takes both parties to sign it. But we have a high degree of confidence right now that we're going to be successful.

Why do I think it's going to yield
benefits to New Hampshire? I know the terms. I understand how it's going to be priced. I understand the products that it's going to deliver to us, and I think it will be a very beneficial Power Purchase Agreement for a clean source of energy into this region. Ultimately, the New Hampshire Public Utility Commission will determine whether it's in our best interest for Eversource New Hampshire customers. We will fully negotiate it. We will sign it. We'll present it to the Public Utility Commission, and they will have to approve it. So it's not something we do unilaterally without approval from a regulator looking at it from a customer perspective. They say, "Is this in the best interest of Eversource customers?" So they will have the ultimate say.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And what's your response to that last question, "What if other generators offer a better deal to New Hampshire ratepayers?"

MR. QUINLAN: Yeah, so we're always open to beneficial contracts if they're going to deliver significant benefits to our customers. Again, it's the same process. It would have to be approved ultimately by the Public Utility Commission. It's not something
we do unilaterally.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Next question: "Have you directly requested the New Hampshire Department of Transportation to use" -- "of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation to use I-93 to bury your transmission line? If no, why not? You should not be interpreting their manual for them."

MR. QUINLAN: So I'm going to refer this question to probably Mark Hodgdon. He's one of our experts.

Mark, perhaps you could introduce yourself and explain your background, please.

MR. HODGDON: Hi, my name is Mark Hodgdon. I'm a private attorney in Concord who's been consulting with Northern Pass. For 24 years I represented the Department of Transportation within the Attorney General's Office.

We have been consulting with DOT for three, four years, on and off, and have had extensive discussions with them. And as I've said at previous meetings -- and it sounds like somebody, this questioner, has heard this before -- but the DOT requirements are very simply that, with regard to I-93, we -- well, initially we asked DOT, "Where would you
prefer it?" And DOT said, "We would prefer it on roads other than I-93. However, if you comply with our manual, we'll look at whatever you want." They have adopted rules and regulations in a manual regarding utility usage of highways, all highways. And a section in that applies to interstates, particularly I-93.

I don't have to tell anybody down in this area of the state how important I-93 is to the state of New Hampshire. In Londonderry, it's well known. With regard to the interstates, an essential purpose of the interstates are to provide optimum safety and mobility for the traveling public and through traffic. And DOT zealously guards that purpose. That's what they're there for. That's why they don't have driveways on them, and they are what's called "controlled access" or "limited access." The manual prohibits longitudinal -- meaning along the highway -- utility installations. As a general rule, they are prohibited. DOT will consider -- consider -- longitudinal installations if you can meet certain criteria, primarily, quote, extreme hardship, meaning you have to have no other viable alternative. And Northern Pass's proposal, by definition in this instance, is a viable alternative.
And if you think about why they are concerned about protecting I-93, think about these things: The speeds that we're talking about on the sections of 93 that we're -- that are relevant to this project are mostly 70 miles an hour posted. Anybody that drives it knows that the actual speeds are higher than that. The volume of traffic is tens of thousands. It's got a high percentage of truck traffic, heavy truck traffic. The roads we're proposing to use have, in most instances, 30 or 40, maybe in a few instances 50 miles an hour posted speeds, and speeds substantially less than the interstate. Their volumes range from a few hundred cars a day rather than tens of thousands, to several thousand, at the most. And the truck traffic is less. That's why DOT prefers you to be on those roads. Then, if you think of the -- you know, in the North Country, I-93 isn't an option, anyways, because I-93 essentially goes over into Vermont and Littleton. So the North Country section doesn't apply. In Bethlehem, where we go down Route 18, 116 and 112, that's to bypass Franconia Notch. In a separate requirement, if anybody knows Franconia Notch down here -- I don't know if anybody driven it, but most people have -- you will note that that road is
very different. The parkway is very different than the
rest of the interstate. That's because when it was
built, because of the high environmental and cultural
sensitivity of that area, they prohibited traditional
interstate construction. That's why it's only two
lanes undivided. And that is -- at the time and I
think it still is nationally -- the only exception on
the interstate system where that's true. I think
that's still true, but I'm not a hundred percent sure.
But at the time it was. And that was because of that
incredibly environmentally sensitive and culturally
important area. There is -- there was litigation
regarding that, and there is a Memorandum of Agreement
in federal court that prohibits any additional
construction in that area. So if you have to bypass --
and I think it's wise to from an environmental point of
view -- the Notch, you're on those roads anyways. So,
those roads -- 118, 116 and 112 -- are going to be
required anyways. So, I-93, from a practical point of
view, isn't available to us in that area, from a
practical and legal point of view.

Now, even if we could have showed
extreme hardship for I-93, what DOT envisions, if
you're going to use I-93, they want you to create
essentially what they call a "utility corridor" outside, at the edge of the right-of-way where the fence line is. If you drive on the interstate, you'll notice off to the right or left, you'll see a fence off in the woods. That's the edge of the right-of-way. That's where DOT wants you to be. And you can't access that area. DOT won't allow you to access it from the interstate. So it means you have to build a access road parallelling I-93. That's going to take down enormous amounts of trees. You're going to impact ledge. You're going to impact wetlands. And you're going to change the character of that road in a way that I don't think New Hampshire people would find acceptable, because DOT prohibits, under all circumstances, construction in the median or underneath the roadway itself. And that's their policies. That's their rules. And they've asked us to comply with them.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. The next question is: "Is the expansion and raising of the Eversource line running from the Scobie Pond Substation into Hudson needed only because of Northern Pass, or is there some other reason?"

I think they're talking about the Merrimack Valley project.
MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, that is true, that is the Merrimack Valley Project. The expansion that Northern Pass will impact would be the Deerfield substation corridor down to Scobie Pond.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: But the question is, is the expansion and raising of the line running from Scobie Pond into Hudson needed only because of Northern Pass or for some other reason?

MR. JOHNSON: No, that's a reliability project. That's completely different.

MR. QUINLAN: Yeah, and just so we're clear, that's referring to the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project that Attorney Iacopino mentioned earlier. That's referred to as a "reliability project" in the eyes of the Independent System Operator, as something that is needed to keep the lights on. In essence, you need it to ensure we have a stable grid throughout New England, including New Hampshire.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question: "Eversource has said that Northern Pass is an unregulated utility. Why is Eversource petitioning the PUC for Northern Pass to do business as a public utility?"

MR. QUINLAN: Jim Muntz, who is
president of our transmission business.

MR. MUNTZ: Yeah, to put infrastructure in the public right-of-way, you need to be a public utility. Many businesses, you know, request that status: Cable TV providers, telephone companies. You know, so that's the purpose of Northern Pass becoming a public utility.

MR. QUINLAN: And just so you're clear -- so we're clear, I think the question says that Northern Pass is an unregulated company. I think in that context it means that the rates are not governed by the Public Utility Commission. We are not intending to pass any of the costs associated with this project on to retail customers here in New Hampshire, so there is no need for Public Utility Commission regulation.

MR. MUNTZ: And Bill, I would just add that Northern Pass will be a FERC-regulated entity in the end.

MR. QUINLAN: Yeah, FERC being the federal regulation body. So, any costs that are recovered by Northern Pass Transmission will be done pursuant to a federal approval.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The next question is: "Northern Pass has promoted better
electric rates for New Hampshire as a result of this project. Could you please outline in detail the estimated savings, and also address if this project will have any impact on the transmission fees and other fees that are included in our monthly bill."

MR. QUINLAN: Take the second question first. The short answer is no, none of the costs of this project will be borne through transmission rates.

The first question is, you know, what are the energy cost savings and why -- how are they derived? Again, you're taking a new energy supply which is affordably priced, 100 megawatts, and injecting it into New Hampshire. That new power supply drives down energy costs, electricity costs across all of New England. The $80 million per year reduction is our estimation of what that effect will be for New Hampshire customers only. When you extrapolate that to all of New England, it's roughly $800 million a year, and it's due to the injection of a new power supply into the market.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question is about your slide show.

"What does the illustrative slide for Deerfield Center mean? Is the representation of the
actual new pole heights correct? Is this the actual or just a rendition of a drawing?"

MR. QUINLAN: Yeah, so, again, it was illustrative. It was intended to demonstrate that we have done a lot of visual simulation work, something that we know there's a keen interest in. Terry DeWan, our visual simulation expert, could answer the specific question.

MR. DEWAN: My name is Terry DeWan, and I was responsible for the visual impact assessment work.

To get back to the Deerfield example, this is one of 30 different simulations that we did to give people an understanding of what it would look like, showing both the existing conditions and what it would look like with the proposal in place. And what we do is model it in a computer software that's based upon very accurate information from the design engineers. So we know the exact height of the structures. We know the spans of the -- the conductors of the wires. We know the spacing. And so we then combine the computer model with the photograph to make sure that they're properly registered and then produce a final, what we call a "photo simulation." If you go
to the document that was submitted for the visual impact assessment, you'll be able to find that very slide, plus what we call a "panoramic view" that provides a little bit more of the context. So you see that image in the context of that particular situation in Deerfield Village.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. The next, I don't know, 10 or 12 sheets of questions deal primarily with economics. So, just to give you a heads-up, the first sheet has four separate questions on it. I'll take them one at a time, I guess.

"In an earlier session" -- I assume somebody from Eversource "...stated that approximately 2400 job opportunities will be created during the Project. How many will be retained after the Project is complete?"

MR. QUINLAN: So I'm going to refer this to Bob Varney, who's another expert. He's with Normandeau. You know, we do differentiate in our expert analysis between construction jobs and jobs that will continue post-construction. You know, in the context of construction jobs, however, we are talking about a relatively long-duration project. This is a two- to three-year construction window. And in that...
space, that's a long-duration project -- meaning
collection workers, as you know, move on a monthly
basis perhaps.

So, Bob, can you add to this, as to the
differentiation?

MR. VARNEY: Sure. The ongoing
operation of the system would be similar to any other
power line that currently exists within the state. As
you know, there are transmission lines and distribution
lines across New Hampshire currently, and it would be
Eversource workers who would continue to maintain that
system, periodic maintenance of the line, of the
structures, the vegetation, in accordance with Best
Practices.

In terms of the construction, there
obviously would be a large number of jobs that would be
generated during that construction process. There
would be direct jobs associated with construction.
There would be indirect jobs with suppliers and other
services that are provided in association with that
construction effort. And then there would be induced
jobs and induced economic benefits associated with
construction workers and delivery people and others who
are purchasing meals, purchasing hotel stays and things
like that throughout the regional economy. So there's a huge benefit associated with the Project over 20 years, a wide range, depending on a number of factors associated with it. But it would be in the $400- to $600 million range in terms of benefit.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And Mr. Varney or Mr. Quinlan, can either of you recall what appendix of the application this information can be found in?

MR. QUINLAN: I don't know the exact appendix number. We'll get that to you. But if you look at the London Economics analysis, not only did they model energy production costs, they also modeled economic impacts. They quantified direct jobs, meaning construction jobs, indirect jobs, and those other jobs that Mr. Varney was just referring to that would continue on post-construction. The GDP effects, the Gross Domestic Product effects, extend well beyond the Project construction window. There are hundreds of millions of dollars in continued economic benefit to the state of New Hampshire that go well beyond the three, the two- to three-year construction window. We'll get you the exact appendix number, but it's the London Economics analysis.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question on the sheet is: "Why does there need to be a switch from DC to AC?"

MR. QUINLAN: So the --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's not economics, that's engineering.

MR. QUINLAN: It is. So, the electric grid, the New England electric grid, the alternating current grid, at some point you need to convert it to a compatible, essentially, source; so you convert from direct current into alternating current. The reason we're running a direct current line is it's a more efficient way to transmit electricity. There are fewer line losses in a direct current system than there are in an alternating current. Mr. Muntz can --

MR. MUNTZ: Yeah, the other reason that direct current link is required is the electric system in Canada is inherently different than the electric system down here. In Canada, 96 percent is hydro-powered, which is generated by what are basically slow-moving machines, okay. They're all big hydro turbines. They run at relatively slow speeds. The U.S. electric grid is largely powered by fast-moving machines that are steam-driven, combustion turbines,
that type of thing. And so if you directly ran an AC line from Canada to the U.S., the systems would tend to fight each other and oscillate as they sought to operate at 60 cycles. Those systems operate at 60 cycles. So, whenever you couple one of the slow-moving systems like Canada, particularly Quebec, with another system, you have a DC link. That DC link can be, you know, 10 yards long. A lot of places have -- you know, all along the New York border. Quebec has several sets of what they call "back-to-back converters," where converters are right next to each other, but they provide that electrical isolation between the systems. When you're going to take the power, in the case of New Hampshire, a long distance, it is also more beneficiary to use a DC link.

And we did look at a back-to-back converter up near the north border of New Hampshire. We looked at that situation. The only problem with that is then you end up needing to run two AC lines up there to ensure that the system reliability remains in effect. So we looked at numerous configurations and the best optimal delivery point on the electric grid when we designed Northern Pass.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Back
"In a prior information session, it was stated that there may be limited reduction, if any, to our electric bills, possibly up to 5 percent, and no concrete percentage of the use that our state would get from this project. Are there better real figures available now to state that New Hampshire will actually use or need this power, and if we will see savings of more than 5 percent?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, our estimate is that there's $90 million a year of energy cost savings for New Hampshire. That is not a insignificant number. What does that equate to? If you look across every residential customer and every business across New Hampshire, it's approximately 5 percent. You know, the questioner suggests that's a modest amount. When you talk to a business owner who is a large user of electricity, or a residential customer who is focused on their electric bill, having a stable bill and a reduced bill is significant. Five percent is not insignificant to those customers. I've spoken to hundreds of them across this state. So, you know, $80 million, in my mind, is also not an insignificant number.
And as to the other question, our Power Purchase Agreement will assure at least 10 percent of the power flowing over this line will be reserved for New Hampshire customers.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And then the last question on this sheet is: "How will it" -- and I assume they mean the Project -- "increase the state's gross domestic product after the Project is done?"

MR. QUINLAN: Yeah, so, for -- again, we're talking about a $1.7, $1.6 billion infrastructure project. So the effect of that on local businesses up and down the line, whether it's restaurants, hotels, dry cleaners, you know, this will be a very significant opportunity that will allow those companies to certainly be profitable, hopefully, and also continue to grow their business. When you look at the second- and third-order effect on that, that's what extends the benefit stream. You create opportunities that are going to hopefully allow these businesses to continue to be successful and moving forward. And, you know, there's a very detailed analysis as to what that looks like, and it's not purely theoretical. There have been many significant infrastructure projects, including
transmission infrastructure projects in New England, that provide a good basis for assessing these effects. We've built several of them ourselves, as have others. So there's confirmation that these analyses are accurate.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question: "Is it true that New Hampshire workers are being trained in order to help build Northern Pass?"

MR. QUINLAN: Well, what this is probably referring to is our apprenticeship program. We were very pleased to announce that program last year in collaboration with the IBEW. We think it's a wonderful way of creating job opportunities for New Hampshire residents interested in, you know, a highly skilled, high-demand profession which is that of the electrical worker. So we're working jointly with the IBEW to create these opportunities for New Hampshire residents. We are using many of our projects across the state for purposes of providing the on-the-job training portion of that. It's also coupled with classroom training and skills training that the IBEW delivered. It's a wonderful training opportunity. You know, we've been pleased that's it's been so, you know, in high demand from New Hampshire residents. We have
no problem bringing folks into it. It's really a career path for many of these folks. You know, when we move into construction on Northern Pass, we intend to expand the apprentice program through the opportunities on Northern Pass and create many more opportunities.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The next question is along the same lines.

"The jobs that Northern Pass will create are low wage, and very little skills are needed is what I have been told. Is this true?"

MR. QUINLAN: No. So, as I said, I think these are very highly skilled craft positions. They're in very high demand. You know, the wages that an electrical worker in particular receives I think are very competitive. It's reflective of the skill of the craft. You know, we have had no shortage of applicants for these programs, and we have no difficulty filling the electrical worker programs. So I think these are great opportunities. You know, we're getting widespread interest across the state of New Hampshire in them, and we look forward to continuing that.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next three questions are all along the same lines. First one is: "If there are a significant number of
construction workers who will be working on this project along the proposed route, is it typical for the employer to house and feed these workers, or will they be looking for housing and spending money within the communities of the Project?"

And then the next one is: "Do you have any information on how I can become a line worker?"

MR. QUINLAN: There you go. Perfect. So, yes, we do have information on how you can become a line worker. You can speak to Joe Purington here, who's our Vice-president of Electric Operations here in New Hampshire. He can talk with you about opportunities within the Eversource family. And also, I know there are members of the IBEW here as well today. So if you truly have an interest, I would say contact either of them and they can share with you some insights on what it is to be a line worker and how you can -- and where are the opportunities.

You know, as to the first question, no, Eversource does not house and feed workers on our projects. However, there will be many local businesses, motels, restaurants and otherwise who will. These folks will, in essence, be working on this project for two to three years. They're going to need
They're going to need a place to stay. They're going to need to go do laundry. All of this creates the "GDP effect" I was referring to earlier. There are literally hundreds of workers who will be in the communities up and down this line, and I think that will offer a significant economic benefit to those communities.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry?

MR. VARNEY: Would you like the number?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh, sure.

MR. VARNEY: Just had an opportunity to check the application. And Julia Frayer's testimony is Appendix 43, in which during the four-year construction period it estimates $130 million in the economy, in terms of jobs and induced economic generation.

Also in the tax testimony and in the narrative in the application, it explains that over a 20-year period, about $600 million in local property taxes, state property taxes, county property taxes, will be generated, and about $80 million in reduced energy costs within the state, and overall about a $3.8 billion economic stimulus in New Hampshire. Thank you.

MR. QUINLAN: Julia Frayer is one of our experts with London Economics I was referring to
earlier.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next question appears to be about tax assessments.

"Mr. Quinlan, in Franklin you stated that the assessment method to be used by Northern Pass is industry-accepted. What does that mean? Who approves this method for the industry? To what extent are customers of the industry involved in establishing this method? And what is the name of the methodology?"

MR. QUINLAN: So what I'm referring to is an industry-accepted methodology, which means it's in wide use nationally and regionally. It basically looks at the value of the investment and then depreciates it over the useful life of the asset. In this case, these transmission assets are referred to as "long-lived assets." So they're depreciated over a 40-year life. That's the methodology that's commonly used. There's no national governing body to set that. But it's the most common methodology that at least I'm aware of in the industry.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Do you know if it has a name?

MR. QUINLAN: No, I don't know if it has a name.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All right.
Move on to the next question.

MR. QUINLAN: But it is a "straight line depreciation method," if you're looking for an accounting term.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question is, and you might want to address the premise of the question as well: "Considering that New Hampshire gets most of its electricity from the Seabrook Nuclear Power Plant, wouldn't New Hampshire ratepayers be affected if Seabrook entered to an agreement to sell its power elsewhere?"

MR. QUINLAN: I'm not familiar with the Seabrook Nuclear Power Station, as to where the output of that facility goes, whether it's used here in New Hampshire or it's used and contracted for other states. So I really can't speak to that generator's use of the power. It's certainly generated here in this state. But the location of the generation facility is irrelevant for purposes of, you know, use of the power. You know, Seabrook, like any other power plant, injects its power into the regional grid, and the electrons flow throughout the region. The question of contractually who gets the benefit of the power, I
can't speak for Seabrook.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next question is: "Does the application from Northern Pass mention passing on the cost of the Project to the New Hampshire ratepayer?"

MR. QUINLAN: Can you repeat that question, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Does the application from Northern Pass" -- I assume they mean the application before the Site Evaluation Committee -- "mention passing on the cost of the Project to the New Hampshire ratepayer?"

MR. QUINLAN: Could be a trick question. I would say no because it's not our intention to pass any of the costs associated with this project on to New Hampshire ratepayers.

So, is anyone else on the Project team aware of that?

No. So I think the answer is no. As I said earlier, this Project is going to be paid for by others. New Hampshire is going to get $3.8 billion worth of benefits I referred to earlier; yet, it's not going to bear the cost of building this transmission facility.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "What will be the annual revenue generated when the Northern Pass project is fully online? By that I mean what is the revenue to Eversource and/or Northern Pass, LLC?"

MR. QUINLAN: Jim, can you answer that?

MR. MUNTZ: Could you repeat that?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sure.

"What is the annual revenue that will be generated when Northern Pass is fully online?" And by that, the questioner means revenue to both Eversource and/or Northern Pass.

MR. MUNTZ: I believe when Northern Pass comes online, the revenue requirements that will be paid are nominally $300 million a year. That covers all the debt service, all operation and maintenance, all the taxes. The actual earnings for Eversource I believe are in the $90 million a year range in the first year and decline steadily as the rate base is amortized over the 40-year life of the Project.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next few questions deal with the prospect of burying the Northern Pass transmission line.

"Several Department of Energy alternatives reviewed burial of the transmission lines."
Has the cost analysis for complete burial in Deerfield, including our historic center and along our scenic routes, in particular, the Pawtuckaway Mountain viewshed, been determined? Please provide precise cost analysis to the public if this particular area and others along" -- of this -- I'm sorry -- "of this particular area and others along your route."

I think the question is asking if the burial in the area of Deerfield historic center and scenic routes, has the cost of that been determined, and please share it, basically.

MR. QUINLAN: So we have not done a specific, detailed cost estimate around underground construction in Deerfield. You know, we have, however, looked at what the cost of an all-underground route would be, but not a town- or region-specific cost estimate.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And the next question is about burying the lines, but to the Site Evaluation Committee, so I'll take a crack at it.

The question is: "Will the SEC be investigating the impact that this project will have on traffic during the construction if the developer is forced to bury all the line on state highways?"
And the answer to the question is that the Site Evaluation Committee, as one of the determining factors that it must undertake, is to determine whether or not there will be an impact on the orderly development of the region. So, yes, construction and traffic is one of many of the various things that would likely be considered by the Site Evaluation Committee when they address that determining factor.

Okay. Now, the next series of questions is more about the routes and the poles and things like that. We try to keep these in categories, to keep them organized, and that way the repetitive questions come one right after the other.

"Can you please provide more details on the number and location of the larger-size transmission poles? You assert the number has been reduced, but more specifics need to be provided."

MR. QUINLAN: So I’m going to refer this questioner out to our Open House. The Open House has lots of details as to structure heights, structure locations, the number of structures. I think that's the best source for information on this point.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. This
question goes both to the Company, and I suppose to the
Site Evaluation Committee.

"Will the Site Evaluation Committee be
comparing the environmental impacts of the Project and
make comparisons between overhead and underground
construction?"

And the next question is: "Which has
the greater environmental impact?"

I am sure that the Site Evaluation
Committee will consider all of the environmental
impacts that's in their charge of what they're supposed
to do. And to the extent that that involves overhead
and underground, they will do that. Obviously, I don't
sit on the Committee, so I can't tell you how they will
do it or what will be more important or less important
to individual members of the Committee. But I can tell
you that consideration of the environmental impacts of
the Project is one of the core requirements that the
Site Evaluation Committee must consider.

And then, which has the greater
environment impact, I'll throw that out to the Company.
I don't know. From the Site Evaluation Committee's
standpoint, that's a determination that has yet to be
made, based upon the evidence that they hear.
But from the Company's standpoint, which has the greater environmental impact, burial or overhead?

MR. QUINLAN: So I think Ms. Carbonneau described some of the environmental impacts of our currently proposed route. You know, when we looked at, for example, underground construction in our existing right-of-way and compared that to overhead construction in our existing right-of-way, you know, it's clear to us what the environmental impacts are of that -- meaning the underground construction are much more significant than overhead, in terms of wetlands impacts, the need to blast through the White Mountain National Forest, the number of trees that would have to come down, et cetera. So, in that instance, we believe our current route has fewer environmental impacts than an all-underground route in our existing right-of-way.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question's about the route and towers as well.

"The towers coming into Deerfield are supposed to be approximately 135 feet tall. After the power leaves Deerfield, how tall will the towers be then, and what path through southern New Hampshire will the towers go? What towns will they go through?"
MR. QUINLAN: So, the Northern Pass Project, as I indicated earlier, terminates in Deerfield, so there are no -- there's not a new line being built south or any other direction from Deerfield associated with Northern Pass.

And I think the question is correct. I think, you know, the tower I showed in the view simulation, I believe that was 130 feet.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question is similar. "Where does the route go after Deerfield?"

MR. QUINLAN: Northern Pass terminates at the Deerfield substation.

MR. MUNTZ: Yeah, I just would add to that, that Deerfield is a strong point on the network where there are enough lines leading away from Deerfield that power can be taken away and distributed across New England under a myriad of system conditions, you know, weather conditions, other generation on and off. And that's one of the reasons that we wanted that to be the delivery point.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Let me change that question around a little bit 'cause I think I know what's -- you mentioned before there would be
upgrades on what's been referred to as the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project. And I guess the question is: Will all the power from Northern Pass go down that corridor, or are there other lines?

MR. QUINLAN: No, the upgrades that I was referring to earlier also are not related to the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project. These are on an existing line that runs between Deerfield and Londonderry. But as Mr. Muntz just indicated, you know, we chose Deerfield because there are numerous paths for this power to take in multiple directions. So, you know, the power flows into Deerfield, enters the grid and flows in many different directions depending on system conditions. Some instances it might flow into Massachusetts, and other instances power flows from Massachusetts into New Hampshire. Power can flow to Maine, could flow elsewhere. So it's one interconnected grid.

MR. MUNTZ: Yeah, and just to add to that, the specific line upgrade that we were required to do because of Northern Pass is a result of applying to ISO-New England and saying we'd like to connect this project to Deerfield. What do we have to do to the system so we do no harm to the system, we do no harm to
the existing generators, and that we're able to connect
to the system and cause no problem under a myriad of
conditions? They take the system, and they run, you
know, high-powered computers. They run numerous
scenarios. They simulate all kinds of system
conditions, generation patterns, future retirements.
And they blend all that together and come back and tell
us, you know, very specific, this line occasionally
will get up to such-and-such a power level, and you're
going to need to raise five of the poles, you know,
another 5 feet to ensure that on the hottest summer day
when that line is running at its highest power because
Seabrook just tripped off and the system's loaded in
such-and-such a manner, you want to make sure you have
safety clearance on that line. So, you know, it's very
specific and precise and analyzed by ISO. And they
give us the system upgrades that we need to connect.
Any generator which looks like to ISO gets that same
analysis, and you get the list of things you have to do
to the system that are beyond your project. And this
line is one.

MR. QUINLAN: The upgrades that Mr.
Muntz is referring to, those are the 10 structures that
I was alluding to you in the presentation that has to
be raised an average of about 5 feet. So in the scheme of things, for a project this size, with this large a delivery of electricity, those are very modest, which is why we chose Deerfield. It's a very robust delivery point on the New England electric grid.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Please discuss if the course of three rivers were changed to make hydro power."

MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Muntz.

MR. MUNTZ: This hydro power is coming from the Hydro Quebec system power. They've got 40,000 megawatts of power. We're not getting power from any specific asset that they have up there. They've just completed one large project. They don't have any under construction or in near-term planning horizon that we're aware of. So it's hard to specify that this power comes from, you know, a particular dam or set of dams that change the course of said river. And it's really system power from HQ will be hydro power. Their system is 96 percent hydro, and we'll get a certification for each megawatt that says it came from a hydro station.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Will, quote, danger trees, unquote, be cut along the
Deerfield right of way beyond the limits of the right of way?"

MR. QUINLAN: So this refers to our kind of vegetation management program, which is critically important in insuring the reliability of our system. You know, as you're probably aware, trees, when they come down on power systems, you know, cause interruption. And we typically stay at the bounds of our right-of-way. To the extent there is a tree outside of our right-of-way that is a so-called "danger tree" because it's diseased or dying or poses an immediate threat to the grid, we will work with the local property owner to hopefully seek removal of that before it comes down and creates a power outage. So, you know, "danger trees" are those that really do create risk for customers who are served by the electric infrastructure.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question is about the route. It appears really to go to the engineers.

"Is the design intent of the Project to support a second DC line and additional AC line? The buried X section shows two each of 8-inch buried line in Easton, and the towers shown for Deerfield are able
to be fitted with an additional three arms to support a second 345KV circuit. Please explain."

MR. QUINLAN: Sam Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: The answer is no. This will be a single-circuit DC and a single-circuit AC. The ducts that you're referring to in Easton, there's a -- there's two conductors, a positive and a negative conductor. In essence, it's a single circuit made up of two conductors. In the southern portion, in Deerfield, the way that the design is configured does not allow for any extension of those towers due to clearance limits from an electrical standpoint. So the answer is no.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The next few questions are on various subject matters. The first deals with public health and safety.

"Please explain whatever research and resulting evidence was conducted to assure that those living in close proximity to the transmission lines are not exposed to increased levels of radiation or other impacts on their health."

MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to refer this question to Ken Bowes. Ken is Eversource's Vice-president of Engineering.
MR. BOWES: Thank you, Bill. The application is very specific on the details of this. It's Appendix 37 and 38. Those are sponsored by Dr. William Bailey. He's also prefilled testimony in this case, and he goes into great detail, several hundred pages of evidence being supplied. And his conclusion is that it is not an adverse health impact from either the DC portion of the line or the AC portion of the line. He goes into a lot of details about the measurements that are taken, both directly under the lines and at the right-of-way edge, and that data is available in there. So, without a specific location, it's difficult to answer any specific level of magnetic fields. But he's done a very detailed and comprehensive analysis.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question is for the Committee, so I'll answer it.

"Why was Londonderry High School chosen as a site to hold tonight's meeting? After all, the Northern Pass does not affect this town; it ends in Deerfield."

Well, we chose it because we have to have a certain -- we have to have five separate public information sessions, one in each county. And we then
have to have five public hearings, one in each county. And as you will see if you go to both the public information session and the public hearing, a lot of the same thing goes on. There will be an opportunity for public statements, an opportunity for questions, and there will be presentation provided from the Applicant. So, in order to accommodate as many people as we can for each county, we try to have the meetings in places, No. 1, that can accommodate a significant number of people, and, No. 2, are accessible to folks. So in this particular case for Rockingham County, our choice was to do this particular meeting here and then the public hearing in Deerfield. We are doing similar things in the other counties. Just imagine what Coos County must be like, or Grafton County. So we're doing similar things. We're trying to hold public hearings where we can for public information session and public hearings in separate places to allow as much access to all members of the public in those counties as possible.

Next question goes to historic resources, and it's a long one.

"The consultants for" -- and actually, some of this has to be answered by the Site Evaluation
Committee as well, so I'll take that part.

"The consultants for the Section 106 review of the National Historic Preservation Act have not yet completed the identification phase of the review, and there is no guaranty that this will be complete before the Site Evaluation Committee's deadline or decision on Northern Pass. Word is that the Site Evaluation Committee is going to rely primarily on the historic and cultural resource information provided by the consultants working on the Section 106 review rather than the information prepared by the consultants hired to compile it for the SEC. Is this in fact the case?"

Let me answer that first part of the question for the SEC first. The SEC will consider all information that is provided to it by historic resource consultants, whether it comes from the Section 106 process or whether it was prepared specifically for the Site Evaluation Committee's review. The Site Evaluation Committee is not cabined by the Section 106 process. The Site Evaluation Committee does appreciate that process, and in other dockets that process has been, in some cases, the only method for the review of the historic resources. But in this case, to the
extent that there are two separate studies, and they are submitted to the Site Evaluation Committee, the Site Evaluation Committee will consider whatever is submitted to them. I suspect that other parties to the Project may have their own historic reviews to submit. Counsel for the Public may choose to address this issue. Other intervenors may choose to address this issue. And the Site Evaluation Committee will consider all of the evidence that's put in on historic resources or any other factor that the Site Evaluation Committee is required to consider.

Now the question goes on. "If so, given the slow pace of the Section 106 review, can you comment on how the public can be assured that the Site Evaluation Committee will have the information they need on the impacts on historic places and landscapes to make an informed decision?"

I'm going to let somebody from the Company answer that in a moment. But I'll just tell you one thing that the Site Evaluation Committee has done in the past. It doesn't mean they will do that in this particular case, but they are authorized by statute to do that. The Site Evaluation Committee can issue conditions that are -- that require the
Applicant, in order to maintain its certificate, to continue in processes for other state or federal agencies. And in the past, in other dockets, we have made a condition of the granting of a certificate the requirement that the Applicant continue in the review process. Sometimes it's required reports back to the Site Evaluation Committee. In other cases it's required, a couple years down the road, actually, a mitigation meeting to determine the final mitigation requirements. So there is a process where some studies can go beyond the issuance of a certificate, if the Site Evaluation Committee determines to issue a certificate.

And I guess somebody from the Company should address the whole Section 106 process. There's a suggestion in here that it's so slow, that it's not going to be completed. And that's probably an answer that the public wants: What's going on with that?

MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to refer this question to Cherilyn Widell. She's our historic resources expert.

MS. WIDELL: Good evening. My name is Cherilyn Widell. I'm with Widell Preservation Services. The Department of Energy, as the federal
agency issuing the presidential permit, is responsible for the Section 106 process. We have been working with the consultants on the survey that has been completed for Northern Pass with the Division of Historical Resources. And Northern Pass has committed to doing an inventory of the properties that the Department of Energy, in consultation with Division of Historical Resources, determines need to be done for this project, for all 192 miles that need to be considered. That's in a Memorandum of Understanding that was signed just a few weeks ago between Northern Pass and the Division of Historical Resources.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. And the last question that I have here is: "Will the Northern Pass benefit only Eversource customers?"

MR. QUINLAN: No. Hopefully it's clear from some of the materials I shared earlier that the benefits to this project extend well beyond simply the Eversource customers. There are many different aspects of benefits that, you know, extend throughout New Hampshire, whether it's tax benefits, job opportunities, energy cost savings. These are all spread throughout New Hampshire. Many of them are
benefits locally for communities up and down the route that are hosting the line. So there's widespread benefits, both economically and environmentally. So it's not true that it's just Eversource customers. All New Hampshire customers will see the energy cost savings benefit. Not just New Hampshire customers, but New England customers. So, widespread benefits, multiple facets to them, and they extend throughout New Hampshire, and in many instances elsewhere in New England.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
We're now going to move to the part of our meeting where we hear from you, the public. We have approximately 20 people signed up, so I'm going ask that folks limit their public statements and comments to three minutes. But before we do that, why don't we take a five-minute break so that folks can stretch out. So let's be back here at 8:39.

(Recess taken at 8:33 p.m. and the public information session resumed at 8:40 p.m.)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
We're going to get going here, if somebody can maybe let the folks out the back now.
This is the part of our meeting where we get to hear from the public. The part where we've asked questions has already occurred. So, please don't try to use this as an opportunity to ask questions, because you're not going to get answers during this section. This is where we want to hear from you. We have approximately 20 people who have signed up to speak. We ask that you keep your comments to three minutes or so. I will be keeping time. But, if you go a little over, I'm not going to stop you. But, if you go on forever, I'm going to have to interrupt.

And, please, when you speak, please come to the podium in front of me here. Please tell us your name and where you're from, and spell it. And, if you are going to read from a prepared statement of some sort, it would be really great if you handed it to one of our court reporters when you're done with your statement. It makes it easier for them to prepare the final transcript. As you may have noticed, they have been here working diligently. Every word that is spoken here tonight will be included in a written transcript. And, once that transcript is prepared, guess where it will be? On the Site Evaluation website, the Site Evaluation Committee's website.
Okay? And, so, it will be available, and it will be reviewed by the Committee during the course of their review of this Application.

So, we're going to go with speakers in the order in which we received your yellow cards. And, first up is Andrew Robertson, from Deerfield.

Would you please tell us your name and spell it for us. Thank you.

MR. ROBERTSON: Sure. My name is Andrew Robertson, A-n-d-r-e-w, R-o-b-e-r-t-s-o-n. As mentioned, my name is Andrew Robertson. I come before you as a Selectman from the Town of Deerfield, New Hampshire. In March of 2013, the Town of Deerfield voted in favor of two warrant articles voicing opposition to the Northern Pass Project in its proposed form. Both articles were approved by near two to one margins. I offer the language of these articles as Deerfield's stated position on the project.

The first: "The Town of Deerfield shall state its opposition to any new overhead development of alternating current and direct current high voltage transmission lines within its borders; and in turn manifest the Town's strong preference for the burial of such lines, in a manner consistent with state and
federal requirements, under rights of way and power
line corridors now existing or to be established.
Although burial in all instances is preferred, this
statement of opposition shall not apply to distribution
lines carrying electrical power and other utility
lines, such as telephone and cable television, for Town
residential or commercial use."

The second article: "The Town of
Deerfield shall state its opposition to the Northern
Pass transmission project as currently proposed, which,
as currently proposed, will cause the significant
expansion of existing power line rights-of-way; the
installation of steel towers with heights up to
135 feet, well above the tree height, resulting in the
further impairment of Deerfield's rural, small town
character and the further degradation of Deerfield's
scenic vistas and natural scenic beauty; the
development of the Town in a manner inconsistent with
the Deerfield Master Plan; the diminishment of the
value of private property and assets for residents in
proximity to the towers; the corresponding loss of
property tax revenue for the Town; and the strong
possibility of negative health impacts."

It is my belief as a Selectman that
opposition to the project in Deerfield would disappear if the proposed overhead lines were instead buried.

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

If you could provide a copy? Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Tiler Eaton, of Nottingham.

MR. EATON: Hi. My name is Tiler Eaton, T-i-l-e-r, E-a-t-o-n. I'm a lifelong resident of New Hampshire. I am also a journeyman lineman, and I'm a representative of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

I'd like to first commend Eversource on coming to and giving 60 plus miles of underground. I commend you on that. This Project is a great project. And, clean energy is what everybody has been seeking. We have an opportunity here to get it, and with a savings to everybody. I don't know anybody that doesn't take advantages of when you can get savings or some kind of discount.

It's time for this Project to happen. These will be good-paying jobs. These will also lead to outstanding careers for New Hampshire workers.

Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.
Next speaker is Claude Levesque, Deerfield.

MR. LEVESQUE: I'm Claude Levesque, C-l-a-u-d-e, L-e-v-e-s-q-u-e. I've been a resident in New Hampshire for 40 years. I came down from northern Maine. Worked as a lineman on the original 345s at a time there was a number of people were complaining, but now it's like "It's there", you know, "who cares?"

But the biggest reason is that a clean energy. You know, we are losing a lot of the power plants. We have to get the power somewheres. This is the best alternative right now.

Maybe down the road, you know, we'll be able to have solar in every town, so we won't have these transmission lines. But now — but, right now, it's not possible. Well, you know, that moneywise it got too expensive.

So, my biggest concern is the clean energy, and the availability of having enough extra power. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.
Next is Joe Casey, Rochester.

MR. CASEY: Hello. My name is Joe Casey, J-o-e, C-a-s-e-y. And, I'm from Rochester, also a lifelong resident of the State of New Hampshire. I am a representative from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. And, I just want to state that New Hampshire already has a number of trained electrical workers that work on this type of -- these types of projects. And, they, you know, they currently reside in the State of New Hampshire, not necessarily work here, due to the nature of the construction industry, and transmission and electrical installations, you have to go where the work is. A lot of them are really excited about these opportunities, and being able to possibly sleep in their own beds for a change to go to work.

But what's real exciting to us, in the industry, in this "New Hampshire first" proposal by Eversource, is the opportunities that we're going to be able to offer a number of New Hampshire's kids and people that want to work in the electrical industry.

We currently have two state-of-the-art training centers located in the State of New Hampshire, one in Barrington, New Hampshire and one in Concord,
New Hampshire, that is specifically designed to train electrical workers, both to become licensed New Hampshire electricians and line workers.

A project like this, and being able to train people in the industry, comes hand-in-hand with having the work. And, we have -- in a project like this, we'll be able to bring in a number of kids and give them the opportunity to enter into our workforce, become licensed electricians, and carry on with a future career that they can derive a really good living from. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

Next speaker is Lynn Woodard, of Concord.

MR. WOODARD: My name is Lynn Woodard, L-y-n-n, W-o-o-d-a-r-d, 13 Edward Drive, Concord, New Hampshire. Sorry I didn't make the Franklin meeting, I had another meeting to go to.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: They're all public.

MR. WOODARD: There you go. I should state right off, I am in opposition to the proposed Northern Pass submittal for the issuance of a
certificate by the SEC for the construction of the above towers and power lines for the following reason: The submitted proposal does not properly address health and safety issues for New Hampshire citizens that abut the established right-of-way. Residential homes and private property will be in the immediate fall zone if a tower were to collapse.

Title XII, Public Safety and Welfare, Chapter 162-H:16, IV(c), "Findings and Certificate Issuance", states that "Before a certificate can be issued the Committee shall find that: The site and facility will not have an unreasonable adverse effect", remember those three words, "on aesthetics, historic sites, air, water quality, and the natural environment and public health and safety", remember those three words.

It is my contention the intent in establishing the width of the original right-of-ways was to account for the failure of the distribution poles to safely land within the right-of-way. If the proposed structures are allowed, this safety zone will no longer exist.

And, I've heard people say "well, these structures are safe." But I can tell you, lately, the
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way the weather has been, we've had microbursts of over 100 miles an hour just leveling trees in its path. If you remember the -- if you've driven up Route 4 a few years ago, you saw what happened in Northwood. We have potential tornadoes, we have earthquakes in this state. So, I think you can say "if it will happen" -- "if it can happen, it probably will happen sooner or later."

It is my -- for example, the proposed proposal requires existing distribution poles and lines, that are currently approximately 30 -- or, 43 feet towers, to be relocated to the western edge of the right-of-way and installed on 80 to 125 foot monopoles. Those proposed transmission lines can then be -- I mean, the proposed transmission lines can then be installed on an H-structure in the center of the right-of-way, they also will be 85 to 125 feet high.

Now, I've walked this area within the Concord -- the City of Concord, and have found residential homes will be adversely affected if these structures are allowed to be constructed. In some cases, homes are located directly in the fall zone. Just imagine a 125-foot tower, carrying high-voltage power lines, located within, say, 50 feet, which is approximately correct in some of these cases, or less,
of your property line. The structure would crush the home, not to mention the danger due to the electric current carried by the distribution or transmission lines.

Now, there's an old saying, and being an engineer myself, we've used it many, many times, "It is prudent to plan for the worse and hope for the best." Let's not wait for a disaster to happen here. It seems like we're proposing to hope for the best, and not worry about the worst.

It is the New Hampshire SEC's duty to consider the public health and safety of the citizens of New Hampshire. Let's make sure they do their job and require these proposed lines to be buried. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

Our next speaker will be Jeanne Menard.

MS. MENARD: Good evening. I'm Jeanne Menard, from Deerfield. J-e-a-n-n-e, M-e-n-a-r-d.

MS. ROBIDAS: Thank you.

MS. MENARD: Thank you. Several years ago I had a conservation with a then 90 year old Deerfield native as to what it was like when the power...
lines were first cut through Deerfield. She said that there was "great excitement", as it meant bringing electricity to their home for the first time. I can't imagine that. But I can imagine that it being just revolutionary for that generation in the '50s.

The local Deerfield and regional benefits were clearly evident, and the project was readily embraced. Compare the project of June 11th, 1926, when the first 100-foot swath strip of land was deeded to PSNH. And, then, in March 17th, in 1956, when the second 100-foot strip of land was deeded to PSNH, to today's Northern Pass proposed project.

In my office in Deerfield, I have a large conference table that was made from the white pine that was cut off of the right-of-way. If you are to come and sit around this table, it just might take you back to a time when PSNH served the needs of New Hampshire's customers exclusively. I do not believe that Eversource's partnership with Hydro-Quebec, a for-profit company, will be managing their affairs that are in New Hampshire's best interests.

I understand and I do support the grid system, that concept of being a part of a grid, but not at New Hampshire's expense. One example of my concern
about a conflict of interest has to do with Northern Pass’s representation, I should say, a grossly exaggerated and misrepresentation of estimated tax revenues for the Town of Deerfield. Reading from "New Hampshire Plan Forward", a Deerfield handout, the actual local tax payments would depend on actual final costs of the project in each community and its fair market value.

Come back to the table for a minute. My grandparents granted PSNH the right-of-way in 1956. The consideration for this transaction was one dollar. What is the value of the right-of-way today? I think it is preposterous to shortchange New Hampshire from a tax revenue standpoint by profits from this Project being siphoned off by Eversource and Hydro-Quebec, and having a decreasing value scale, as evidenced in the plan, of fair market value over a 40-year period. The details of how this fair market value of the line is determined, and the correct local tax payments have been obscure at best, in my opinion, the need for this Project is not clearly evident. The negatives far outweigh any estimated tax benefit. And, I do not embrace it.

I do look forward to the SEC process. I
look forward to having real numbers, and information
that is clear and truly a representation of the
cost/benefits and the analysis information of this
Project. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Next speaker will be Michael Speltz.

MR. SPELTZ: I'm Michael Speltz,
M-i-c-h-a-e-l, S-p-e-l-t-z. I'm a Londonderry
resident, have been for 25 years.

I have two things that I would like to
urge the Site Evaluation Committee to do in their
deliberation. One is to consider the old engineering
adage about "the difference between precision and
accuracy". "Accuracy" being a number that's close to
the truth, and "precision" being a number that's
carried out into many accurate-looking decimal places,
to the gnat's eyelash, but not necessarily reflecting
the truth.

I'll give one example, and you've just
heard one from the previous speaker. According to the
Draft EIS done by the Department of Energy, under
Alternative 7, which I believe is what's before the
Committee now, the annual reduction in wholesale
electric costs in New Hampshire is 18.3 million. Now,
that's wholesale, apparently. We heard a number tonight of "80 million", and I assume that's at retail. That's a really wonderful markup, 450 percent or so.

So, I suspect that we really do need to take a hard look at these numbers. And, that's why I would urge the Committee to look at the difference between accuracy and precision in all of the data that they have been given.

That leads directly to my second request. You showed us a slide at the very beginning that talked about "the purpose of the Site Evaluation Committee", and said, in part, "it's going to be a decision which all environmental, economic, and technical issues are resolved in an integrated fashion." So, I'd emphasize "all issues" and "in an integrated fashion".

The folks that work for Eversource work in stovepipes of engineering and transmission and natural resources. The folks that are going to support the Committee, from the Department of Transportation, Environmental Services, Fish & Game, work in their stovepipes. So, I urge you to find a way to fulfill this purpose of looking at this "in an integrated fashion". Finding someone as a consultant independent
of the Applicant, that can pull all of these various
facts together and help you make that ultimate decision
that you have to make, where you answer the question
"is this Project going to result in greater benefit or
greater impacts to the state and the people of New
Hampshire?"

And, I do thank you for coming to
Londonderry.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Next speaker is -- I think it's Peter Lion, from
Deerfield.

MR. LION: Yes. Can't read my writing,
huh? So, --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Just that
one letter.

MR. LION: That's fine. I just have a
short -- so, Peter Lion, L-i-o-n, like the animal.
Just have a short statement. As a former -- as the
former Public Service of New Hampshire, could you
provide New Hampshire with one last public service and
bring the total Project -- and bury the total Project,
or, I hope you didn't change your public commitment
with your name.

That's all I have to say. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir. Next speaker is Erick Berglund, from Deerfield.

MR. BERGLUND: Good evening. It's Erick Berglund, E-r-i-c-k, B-e-r-g-l-u-n-d. I have two, two comments I'd like to make.

First, I want to correct the record on a statement that we've heard tonight several times, I heard it in Franklin the other day, the other night. I heard it last year at the Fairgrounds in Deerfield, and that's that "none of the cost will be borne by New Hampshire, as the line is paid for by Hydro-Quebec". That is one piece of the cost, the line and the money paid for it. The real cost, which is what I object to and many other people do in New Hampshire, is the cost to the environment, to conservation lands, and to historical and cultural assets to this state.

So, please don't use that statement, unless it's qualified to mean just what I said, "the cost is not borne by the citizens of New Hampshire", if we're talking just about the line.

The other comment I have is, there was a question posed tonight, which compared -- I think the question was "to compare the environmental impact with the project of Northern Pass as proposed with its full
burial." And, I was curious to hear what the answer was. And, it was a correct answer. The answer that, at least in my view, that "burial of the line in the right-of-way would be more costly environmentally."

But I think the real answer is, is Alternative 4a. And, my reading of the Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the Department of Energy is very clear, in that the environmental impact of that buried line following I-93 and the other -- and that route as laid out in 4a is very much less than it is with towers down the right-of-way.

That's all I have to say. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir. Next speaker is Rebecca Harris.

MS. HARRIS: Hi. Thank you. My name is Rebecca Harris, R-e-b-e-c-c-a, H-a-r-r-i-s. And, I am -- work for the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the Boston Field Office. And, you may probably guess, I was the long question. And, we are working in partnership with the New Hampshire Preservation Alliance and others to ensure that historic resources, including historic and cultural landscapes, that could be impacted by Northern Pass are given full consideration in both the federal and the
state review processes.

And, I appreciate the clarification that you provided today, regarding the fact that the SEC will consider all information that's provided to them. Because many advocates feel that they have not been heard sufficiently during these processes, probably more for the federal process than the SEC. And, we want to make sure that they can provide the information that they feel is necessary to the SEC.

So, we'll be working with advocates so that they will get you the information that is needed for the assessment of the Application, and we'll be doing the same. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. Our next speaker is David Love. Mr. Love?

[No verbal response]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Apparently not here. Next is Neil Hitter?

MR. HITTER: That's right. Couldn't read it, huh?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It's getting late.

MR. HITTER: Yes. My name is Neil Hitter, N-e-i-l, H-i-t-t-e-r. Well, I certainly...
appreciated tonight and the things that you folks have
done for the apprenticeship, and those are some really
good ideas. And, I like all of that, but here comes
the "but". I am really curious, as I look at this
room, how many people have traveled north of the
notches. And, probably, with this agenda, maybe many
have, but a lot of people in the south here do not know
what it's like up there, and what a special place the
Great North Woods is. So, my family, my wife and my
kids, we've been traveling up there, going on vacation
for years.

And, in about 2010, this thing started
to come up. Now, I kind of appreciate alternative
power. I like the clean energy idea. So, it certainly
attracted my attention. Then, I started to watch the
story unfold. And, frankly, it was kind of aggressive.
I don't think Northern Pass was cooperating. I saw how
the buy-up of the land occurred, how families were torn
apart, the strong-arm attempt for eminent domain. And,
it just didn't seem like it was going to be a
cooperative event.

In addition, the other sides come in,
you got this hodgepodge of events trying to occur.
And, then, just this week, comes out in the paper that
you're suing local communities for the assessments.
And, that certainly doesn't sound like a good
relationship-building situation.

So, it's been a long ordeal. I don't
think Northern Pass has really been too cooperative.
As a matter of fact, I sense it's pretty aggressive.
And, in its desire to put overhead lines through the
Great North Woods and the White Mountain. So, people
fought back. And, it comes to a head in July of 2015,
with the Department of Energy reporting on the routes
and alternatives. Your preferred route is not
favorable.

Alternatives were suggested, including a
complete bury. The report indicates that bury would be
like 1.7 times cost of your other alternative, which
came in a lot less than the 5 times that you touted so
loudly throughout the five years heading into that.
So, it went from 5 times to 1.7 times to bury the
lines.

And, then, again, I heard tonight that
the cost of this Project will not be paid for by the
ratepayers and will be paid by others. So, that's fine
with me, let it cost 1.7 times more.

So, in essence, Northern Pass doesn't
get its route. And, suddenly, some big changes occur. I have never seen such a quick and slick advertising campaign come this summer, my Facebook page blew up; it was beautiful.

So, now -- so, we now have 60 miles of lines that will be buried through the White Mountains, which wasn't going to happen before. We also get power at a reduced rate. And, there's now development money that will be spent for local agencies. None of that was ever there. It was very adversarial until you got turned down.

So, why have I reviewed this history? Just because there seemed to be a huge change in tone. And, I, frankly, didn't like being played, and that's the way it felt, that New Hampshire was played.

So, now, we're at it again. And, next door, Vermont has a project approved, all underground/all underwater.

So, if the target is to get clean power, clean hydropower to southern New England, a route's there. So, why do we need the towers, at a great cost to the Great North Woods? I don't see the towers being any benefit, if the target is to get it to southern New Hampshire -- southern New England. And, frankly, I
don't want to see the towers when I'm on the Percy Peaks or on the back roads in Cohas [sic] County.

So, I ask Eversource to become a cooperative partner by keeping the natural beauty of New Hampshire and the Great North Woods. Bury the lines. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir. Next speaker, Suzanne Steele.

MS. STEELE: Good evening. Suzanne Steele, S-u-z-a-n-n-e, S-t-e-e-l-e, and I live in Deerfield.

There are many reasons why I am not in favor of the Northern Pass Project. New Hampshire is known for its beautiful countryside, lakes and mountains, and this beauty is imperative for hundreds of thousands of dollars flowing into our economy through tourism. This tourism creates jobs for thousands of people in our state as well. This Project, if it goes through, would forever scar our great state. Hundreds of miles would change with many vistas that are currently free from 100 plus foot towers. Not only in the North Country, but, as we know, all the way down to my town, in Deerfield.

I am also a Wellness Consultant, and I
am very concerned about the health impacts of Northern Pass. The electromagnetic pollution from these proposed lines should be reviewed more critically than has been to this point. I'd like to ask the Committee to research Europe's findings and their perspective on limiting this type of energy within their borders.

I moved to Deerfield in 1993 because of the beauty of the area, as well as the history of the town. We are currently celebrating our 250th anniversary this year; a community steeped in history. We have a number of important centers in our town, several very near this new proposed expand lines -- expanded lines.

This Project would threaten our historic places. During the open forum this fall with Eversource, it was asked a number of times how much larger the Deerfield terminal would be and how much more electromagnetic power would surge from this building? Neither Mr. Quinlan or the other spokesmen answered any of these questions. As a Deerfield resident, that raised a red flag for me.

One thing that was shared at -- another thing that was shared at the forum was the potential savings, as it was talked about tonight as well.
Mr. Quinlan said, when asked directly, that the savings "may be 3 to 5 percent", but he also said "it was undetermined whether or not there would be any savings at all". While the 100 -- the $80 million estimate that was talked about tonight is a lot of money, from a resident's perspective, a 3 to 5 percent, or even less, is definitely not a big benefit for me to support the downsides of this Project.

Burying the lines seems to be a better option, however, according to Eversource, not feasible due to the cost. And, I really appreciated the prior speaker's comment that, if we're not paying for it, why not have it buried totally?

One of the biggest reasons why I don't support Northern Pass is that this electricity is not really going to be used or benefited by our residents. It is going to be used by southern New England, just like the existing Northeast Utilities transmission line that runs through our state already. We are just being used by Hydro-Quebec and Eversource to help them earn more money, now we know a little bit more about that, 90 to $300 million a year. And, it will just scar our state, our beautiful state, that I've lived in since 1976.
Please do not allow this to happen.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.
Next speaker will be Bill Saunders.

MR. SAUNDERS: Hi. I'm Bill Saunders, B-i-l-l, S-a-u-n-d-e-r-s, Barrington, New Hampshire. I've worked in all the surrounding states. I currently work out-of-state. I'd like to come back here and finish my career in New Hampshire. So, I support it. Nice job.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir. Eric Porter.

MR. PORTER: My name is Eric Porter. E-r-i-c, P-o-r-t-e-r. I think the Northern Pass is a great thing for New Hampshire. We get a thousand megawatts of clean power, 2 billion in local economic activities, 2,000 new jobs, 80 million in savings on our power bill every year. That seems like a no-brainer to me.

I know a lot of people had a problem with the new towers. But, now that the line is going to be buried underground for the scenic part of the state, I don't understand how anybody can oppose this. We ought to be thinking about what's best for
everybody's interest in New Hampshire, and think about clear energy and the ongoing of this Project.

I came here tonight, I thought I knew about the Northern Pass, but it was very enlightening, the presentation. And, the more that I hear about it, the more I hope that it presses forward. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir. Next speaker will be Bill Powers.

MR. POWERS: Hello. It's Bill, B-i-l-l, Powers, P-o-w-e-r-s. I'm a member of the IBEW Local 104, a proud supporter of the Northern Pass. I've actually been on a few of these projects throughout New England, large projects like this. I've seen small businesses flourish. I've lived on the road for years. And, the look on these people's faces when you go into their business and support their small businesses, and they just grow and grow, and the appreciation is there.

I am very happy to see that Eversource is making a deal with my local to bring in these apprentices to get more qualified workers out there. This is a growing industry that, you know, we need more qualified help for. I'm glad to see that the Northern Pass come through in New Hampshire where these, you know, the families, my family, and a lot of other...
families can, you know, can flourish through this. I just -- I hope everything works out. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir. Steven -- Steve Locke. Mr. Locke?

[No verbal response]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, our last speaker, Laura Bonk.

MS. BONK: We can all go home.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It's almost like winning the Power Ball, huh?

MS. BONK: Yes.  L-a-u-r-a, B-o-n-k.

The proposed high-voltage line, Northern Pass, will pass through a few thousand feet of Bear Brook State Park. In doing so, it will have an unreasonable adverse effect on the aesthetics and the natural environment, as well as violate the original deed from the federal government.

A little bit about the Park. Bear Brook State Park is the second largest park in the State of New Hampshire. It's approximately 10,000 acres today. It's in four towns: Allenstown, Hooksett, Deerfield, and Candia. Allenstown and Hooksett are Merrimack County, Deerfield and Candia are Rockingham County.
1943, in the middle of World War 2, the federal government didn't want the Park anymore. They gave it to the State of New Hampshire with the express conditions written in the original deeds, and I will quote from this: Provided always that this deed is made upon the express condition that the State of New Hampshire shall use this property exclusively for a public park, recreation, and conservation purposes." I believe that 135-foot high voltage towers violate that original deed from the federal government.

This is a very popular park year-round. And, I will tell you, my past 20 years, I explore this Park every month of the year, as a hunter, a hiker, cross-country skier, and mountain biker. I am intimately familiar with the Park. There are people in this Park at all times. And, it would not surprise me if our total numbers were substantially high. To the best of my knowledge, DRED does not track usage beyond the summer season. And, it is used year-round.

Within Bear Brook State Park, there is a hill called "Catamount Hill". There's a very popular hiking trail to the top of this hill. From the top of that hill, you will clearly see the new towers. They are well above the treeline. You'll see the towers as
they pass through the few thousand feet of the Park, as they go across Allenstown and into Deerfield. They'll be also visible in Deerfield. I looked at all the images on the Northern Pass website, as well as I am just familiar with that hill, and I can tell that I can judge that we will see 135 feet of those towers, which violate, again, the deed, as well as creates this unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics.

This is a park owned by our state. It is very important to the citizens of this state. And, I believe the towers, although I support electricity, should be buried, as they pass through this Park and the viewshed of this Park. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Bonk was our last speaker.

I just want to remind everybody that, if you believe that you have a substantial interest in this Project, you should file a motion to intervene in the proceedings before February 5. We're also having another public information session tomorrow night, in --

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Laconia.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- Laconia.

Lake Opechee?
ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Lake Opechee.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: At the Lake Opechee Inn. I don't know the answer, but --

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I do.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: But Pam does.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I do.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Sixty-two (62) Doris Ray Court, in Laconia. And, then, next week we are in Whitefield, at the Mountain View Grand Resort, on January 20th, and, at the Mountain Club on Loon, at Loon Mountain, on January 21.

And, again, we take written comments throughout our proceedings. If you have written comments, please feel free to mail or e-mail them to Ms. Monroe, our Administrator.

Again, the website for the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee is the place where you should be able to find almost everything filed in this docket, and that is at www.nhsec.nh.gov, nhsec.nh.gov. And, I think we're adjourned for the evening. Thank you.

(Whereupon the Public Information Session was adjourned at 9:19 p.m.)