

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

January 13, 2016 - 6:06 p.m.
Londonderry High School
295 Mammoth Road
Londonderry, New Hampshire
(Rockingham County)

IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-06
Joint Application of Northern
Pass Transmission, LLC, and
Public Service Company of
New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource
Energy for a Certificate
of Site and Facility.
(Public Information Session held
pursuant to RSA 162-H:10, I-a.)

*[Consisting of a presentation by
the SEC, a presentation by the
Applicants, followed by a
Question-and-Answer Session, and
comments received from the public]*

PRESIDING: Michael J. Iacopino, Esq. (Brennan...)
(Presiding as the Presiding Officer)

Pamela G. Monroe, SEC Administrator

ALSO PRESENT: Iryna N. Dore, Esq. (Brennan, Lenehan...)

COURT REPORTER: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
Susan J. Robidas, LCR No. 44

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

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

NOTED AS PRESENT:

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

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

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

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

William Quinlan

James Muntz

Samuel Johnson

Kevin Bowes

Jerry Fortier

Lee Carbonneau

Bob Varney

Terry DeWan

Cherilyn Widell

Mark Hodgdon

Chris Soderman

Jessica Kimball

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

I N D E X

PAGE NO.

PRESENTATION BY THE SEC (<i>by Pres. Officer Iacopino</i>)	6
PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT (<i>by Mr. Quinlan</i>)	34
QUESTION-AND-ANSWER SESSION	46
PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY:	
Andrew Robertson	109
Tiler Eaton	111
Claude Levesque	112
Joe Casey	113
Lynn Woodard	114
Jeanne Menard	117
Michael Speltz	120
Peter Lion	122
Erick Berglund	123
Rebecca Harris	124
Neil Hitter	125
Suzanne Steele	129
Bill Saunders	132
Eric Porter	132
Bill Powers	133
Laura Bonk	134

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All right.
3 Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Michael
4 Iacopino. I am Counsel to the New Hampshire Site
5 Evaluation Committee, and we are here tonight in Docket
6 Number 2015-06, the Joint Application of Northern Pass
7 Transmission, LLC, and Public Service Company of New
8 Hampshire doing business as Eversource Energy for a
9 Certificate of Site and Facility for the project
10 commonly referred to as the "Northern Pass". The
11 purpose of our meeting tonight is to put on a public
12 information session.

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

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

22 We will start off with a presentation
23 that I will present to you all, just explaining you a
24 little bit about the Site Evaluation Committee, how

1 it's composed, how it works, and some of the features
2 of RSA 162-H, which is the statute that governs the
3 Site Evaluation Committee. After that, we will then
4 have a presentation by the Applicant put on, so that
5 the Applicant can explain its Project to you.

6 Once the Applicant has completed its
7 presentation, we will take questions from the audience.
8 If you have a question, you should write it down on a
9 green sheet that you can get out at the table out
10 front, and maybe somebody could bring some of these in
11 here as well, in case people come up with questions
12 while they're seated here and they don't have to run
13 outside. But, if you have a question for either the
14 Site Evaluation Committee or the Applicant, it should
15 be written on a green sheet like this *[indicating]*.
16 And, what we do up here, you can see we've already
17 started doing it, we try to categorize them, so that we
18 can talk in an organized fashion about different issues
19 that may come up. So, if you have a question, either
20 for the Applicant or the Site Evaluation Committee,
21 please write it down on a green sheet.

22 Once we have gone through the questions
23 and answered them hopefully, both from the Site
24 Evaluation Committee and from the Applicants, we will

1 then go into a public comment session. And, in front
2 of me, there is a dais. If you wish to make a public
3 comment or a public statement about the proposed
4 Project, you should fill out a yellow sheet, and bring
5 that up to the front table here, or hand it to any one
6 of the workers who are here in the facility, or my
7 associate, Iryna Dore, right behind you there with her
8 hand raised, and we will make sure that you get put in
9 line to speak at the time for public comment.

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

22 And, with that, we'll begin. To my left
23 is Pamela Monroe. She is the Administrator of the New
24 Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. As I said before,

1 my associate, Iryna Dore, is in the back. I am Counsel
2 to the Committee. There are no Committee members here
3 tonight. And, the reason why that is is because this
4 is a session where information is provided to you
5 primarily.

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

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

24 So, the New Hampshire Site Evaluation

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

9 The Site Evaluation Committee is a
10 creature of statute. RSA 162-H is the statute, the New
11 Hampshire statute that creates the Committee. And, RSA
12 162-H has several purposes. It has a purpose of
13 balancing the impacts, the benefits and impacts of the
14 selection of sites for energy facilities and
15 transmission facilities. And, it balances those
16 benefits and impacts on various things, such as the
17 welfare of the population, the effects on private
18 property, the location and growth of industry, economic
19 growth of the state, the environment of the state,
20 historic sites, aesthetics, air and water quality,
21 public health and safety, natural resources, and,
22 generally, the public interest.

23 The second purpose of the statute is to
24 avoid undue delay in the construction of new

1 facilities.

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

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

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

20 In essence, the Site Evaluation
21 Committee is the statewide planning board for energy
22 projects. And, when I say "energy projects", that
23 includes transmission lines. The Site Evaluation
24 Committee is designed to integrate all of the various

1 permitting processes, as well as environmental,
2 economic and technical issues, into a single permitting
3 process.

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

12 When I say that we are a "statewide
13 planning board", the Site Evaluation Committee, RSA
14 162-H preempts, that's a fancy lawyer word, for it
15 nullifies the responsibility and authority of your
16 local planning board, zoning board, and local
17 ordinances.

18 Now, the Site Evaluation Committee, by
19 statute, is required to take your local ordinances into
20 consideration in making any decision that it's called
21 upon to make. However, that authority will no longer
22 rest with the local planning board or zoning board. We
23 call this the "supermarket theory" or the "one-stop one
24 shop" -- "one-stop shop theory" of permitting.

1 I am not the person who will make the
2 decision on the Northern Pass Application. That
3 decision will be made by the Site Evaluation Committee
4 members. I am only counsel to that Committee. But
5 that Committee consists of a number of important people
6 in the state. And, up on the wall I have who those
7 officers are. Each of the three Public Utilities
8 Commissioners for the State of New Hampshire sit on the
9 Site Evaluation Committee, as does the Commissioner of
10 the Department of Environmental Services, the
11 Commissioner of the Department of Transportation, the
12 Commissioner of the Department of Resources and
13 Economic Development, and the Commissioner of the
14 Department of Cultural Resources or the Director of the
15 Division of Historical Resources, and, usually, it's
16 the Director of the Historical Resources Division that
17 sits on the Site Evaluation Committee. In addition, we
18 have two public members. One of whom, by statute, is
19 required to be an attorney. Both of whom are required
20 to have expertise in this area. And, there is one
21 alternate member, one alternate public member.

22 At present, one of our public member's
23 seats is vacant. Unfortunately, our member, Roger
24 Hawk, passed away last weekend. So, our alternate

1 member, Rachel Whitaker, has recently been appointed to
2 sit on the Committee.

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

20 Now, those are the members of the
21 Committee. Each one of those state agency members have
22 the authority to have somebody from their agency sit in
23 their place. The statute says that it must be either a
24 staff attorney or a senior administrator within their

1 agency. In this particular case, a Subcommittee has
2 been appointed, and people have been designated to sit
3 on that Subcommittee.

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

22 There's another very important part of
23 our process. And, that is, who represents you, the
24 members of the public? Under RSA 162-H, Section 9,

1 there is Counsel to the Public, appointed by the
2 Attorney General, represents the public in seeking to
3 protect the environment and in seeking to assure that
4 there is an adequate supply of energy. Counsel for the
5 Public is involved in our cases just like any other
6 party. He has all of the rights, responsibilities, and
7 privileges of a party in a formal proceeding.

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

13 MR. ROTH: Okay.

14 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

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

22 My job is to represent the interests of
23 the public. And, I don't represent the people who are
24 against the Project, but I do, and I don't represent

1 the people who are for the Project, but I do. I
2 represent the overall public interest. And, while that
3 sounds confusing, it's fairly straightforward.

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

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

20 If you have questions or concerns, you
21 can reach me at the Department of Justice. I'll give
22 you my direct-dial telephone number and my e-mail
23 address. But please be aware that I cannot represent
24 anybody individually or any organization. So, I can't

1 give you legal advice or counsel. I can provide you
2 information and some insights here and there. But my
3 telephone number is 271-1270, and my e-mail address is
4 *peter.roth, R-o-t-h, @doj.nh.gov*.

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

9 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
10 Peter.

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

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

1 least 30 days before filing their application.

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

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

22 In this particular case, the Site
23 Evaluation Committee met and voted to accept this
24 Application, finding that it contained sufficient

1 information, and hearing from each of the state
2 agencies that it contains sufficient information for
3 their purposes. And, an order accepting the
4 Application was issued by the Committee on December
5 18th, 2015. And, that is the date that all of the
6 other deadlines run -- runs from.

7 We already had a Subcommittee appointed
8 in this particular case, and we showed you who's on
9 that Subcommittee. The next step in the process is
10 what we're doing right here right now, and that is to
11 hold a public information session in each county in
12 which the site -- in which the Project is proposed to
13 be developed. Rockingham County is one of those
14 counties. That's why we are here tonight. There are
15 five of those sessions scheduled. We had one in
16 Franklin earlier this week. There is the one that we
17 are doing tonight, I believe tonight's the 13th, if
18 I'm correct. There will be one on the 14th, on the
19 20th, and on the 21st. And, I don't have those, where
20 they are, but I know that they are in Laconia this
21 week, --

22 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Whitefield.

23 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Laconia,
24 Whitefield, --

1 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: And Lincoln.

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

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

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

22 At the Joint Public Hearings, we will
23 have all of the members of the Subcommittee, as well as
24 representatives from state agencies who have regulatory

1 authority, and that's also their opportunity to sort of
2 hear from the public. Those are in the process of
3 being scheduled. And, if you're interested in
4 attending those, you should keep your eye on our
5 website, because there will be a notice published on
6 the website, as well in the Manchester Union Leader.

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

20 Once we have the final input of the
21 state agencies, the Site Evaluation Committee then
22 meets in what we call an "adjudicative" session. And,
23 that is very much like a trial. We will probably meet
24 in Concord. There will be witnesses that will be

1 called, they will be cross-examined, there will be
2 evidence presented. And, there will be, after all of
3 the evidence has been presented, there will be
4 deliberations in public by the Subcommittee. And,
5 then, within 365 days after the acceptance of the
6 application, the Subcommittee must issue a decision
7 either granting or denying a Certificate.

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

17 During that period leading up to the
18 adjudicative process, our state agencies play a very
19 important role. There are state agencies that have
20 what we call "permitting or other regulatory
21 authority". Those are agencies that, if this was a
22 Walmart, and not an energy facility, they would have to
23 issue a permit. I'll give you an example. The
24 Department of Environmental Services, if you're going

1 to impact wetlands, requires you to get a permit in
2 order to do that. And, you have to satisfy certain
3 regulatory requirements. So that the -- that is an
4 agency that has "permitting or regulatory authority".

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

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

22 When there are issues of concern for a
23 state agency, and this is something new that's only
24 come into the statute last year, the state agency can

1 participate as a party, basically, call witnesses and
2 designate a liaison to actually participate in that
3 adjudicative process that I discussed previously.

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

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

22 But, even before we start this process,
23 a lot of things go on. And, I'm sure that the
24 Applicant will talk more about these things. But,

1 before any Application is filed before the Committee,
2 you should understand that there are a number of things
3 that applicants will generally do. They will make
4 arrangements or contract for studies to be performed
5 with ISO-New England, which is our grid operator,
6 especially if they are a transmission company or
7 electric generating company. ISO is very important to
8 them. They're the folks who control where -- how
9 electricity gets on the grid and how it gets
10 transmitted.

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

19 If you're before the Site Evaluation
20 Committee and you want to build a power plant,
21 obviously, you're going to be talking to transmission
22 companies about how you're going to get the power out
23 on the grid. If you're a power generator, you're going
24 to be talking about who you're going to sell your power

1 to, who's going to buy it.

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

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

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

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

1 Department of Transportation.

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

8 In addition to those applications, the
9 Site Evaluation Committee application also has to
10 contain, by statute, some very important information.
11 Obviously, it has to have details about the type and
12 size of each major portion of the facility; has to
13 identify the choice of the site and each alternative
14 choice that was considered for each major part of the
15 facility; the application must describe in detail the
16 effect of each major part of the proposed facility on
17 the environment; it must describe in detail any
18 proposals for studying and solving environmental
19 problems that the project may pose; it must describe in
20 reasonable detail the applicant's financial, technical,
21 and managerial capabilities, so that the Site
22 Evaluation Committee can be assured that the developer
23 has the financial wherewithal to site -- properly site,
24 construct and operate the facility; the application

1 must document that written notice of the project,
2 including copies of the application, have been provided
3 to each community in which the facility is proposed to
4 be located; it must have a decommissioning plan, with
5 detail -- detailing the elements and financial
6 assurances for decommissioning; and it must provide
7 such additional information as the Committee may
8 require to carry out its purposes.

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

21 And, in this particular case, the
22 Applicants have been informed of that obligation, a
23 letter has gone out to them, and we expect that they
24 will comply and provide any additional information

1 that's not already contained in the Application. And,
2 if you're interested in seeing that when it comes in,
3 keep your eye on our website, because it will be posted
4 on the website as it comes in.

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

17 In addition, there were Pre-Filing
18 Public Information Sessions in each county, which were
19 open to the public and were noticed in the newspapers.
20 There are these sessions that we are doing now. And,
21 as I said, this is the second one of five. There will
22 be three more after tonight. There will be the Joint
23 Public Hearings. And, those -- there will be five of
24 those, one in each county. Now, both tonight and at

1 the Joint Public Hearings, where the Subcommittee is
2 actually there, the public gets to ask questions and
3 also make public statements. So, these are all ways in
4 which you can participate.

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

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

16 And, finally, and this is something that
17 is unusual for administrative agencies, we accept
18 written comment from the public right up until the day
19 that we issue a decision. There will be no cut-off,
20 other than the date of the decision -- the date -- I'm
21 sorry -- the date of the vote for the decision, there
22 will be no cut-off. You can come in three days before
23 the hearing and say "Here's my written public comment."
24 And, by statute, as I said, the Committee must consider

1 that written comment.

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

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

21 What ultimately must the Subcommittee
22 do? The Subcommittee must give due consideration to
23 the relevant information regarding the potential siting
24 or routing of a proposed facility. The Subcommittee

1 must give due consideration to the significant impacts
2 and benefits, as I discussed earlier. And, the
3 Subcommittee must determine whether the issuance of a
4 certificate will serve the objectives of RSA 162-H,
5 which are those objectives that were on that very first
6 slide that I showed to you. In doing that, the
7 Subcommittee cannot issue a Certificate of Site and
8 Facility, in other words, they cannot permit the
9 Northern Pass Project, if they cannot find that the
10 Applicant has adequate financial, technical, and
11 managerial capability to ensure that construction and
12 operation of the facilities is in compliance with terms
13 and conditions of a certificate. In other words, in
14 order to grant the certificate, the Site Evaluation
15 Committee must find that the Applicant has that
16 capability.

17 The second thing that the Committee must
18 find is that the project will not unduly interfere with
19 the orderly development of the region, with due
20 consideration being given to the views of municipal and
21 regional planning commissions and municipal governing
22 bodies. That's where your local authorities come in.
23 If they send comments or if they intervene, the Site
24 Evaluation Committee is required to consider their

1 views. And, oftentimes, for instance, the master plan
2 for towns will be submitted, as will zoning ordinances
3 or planning ordinances, and all of those types of
4 ordinances and local planning criteria will be
5 considered by the Site Evaluation Committee. Now, that
6 doesn't mean the Site Evaluation Committee is going to
7 go along with whatever a local planning board wants,
8 but it has to be considered.

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

20 And, the final consideration that the
21 Committee must determine is whether or not the
22 project -- the issuance of a certificate for the
23 project, the permitting of the project will serve the
24 public interest. If each of those criteria are met by

1 a preponderance of the evidence, in other words, the
2 applicant, who has the burden of proof, has
3 demonstrated these things through our year-long process
4 to the Committee, then the Committee should issue a
5 Certificate of Site and Facility. If the Committee
6 fails -- if the Committee feels that the applicants
7 have failed to demonstrate any one of those criteria,
8 then the Committee will deny a Certificate of Site and
9 Facility.

10 So, that's how the Committee works.

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

15 Once again, the procedure that we're
16 going to use for the rest of tonight is this: Once I
17 sit down, the Applicant, through, I believe,
18 Mr. Quinlan, will make a presentation to the public
19 about the Project and tell you some of the details
20 about it. We will then take questions. And, again, if
21 you have a question, write it down on the green
22 question card and drop it off up here. And, like I
23 say, we're going to categorize these by category and
24 ask them in an organized fashion. Once we have asked

1 all the questions, we will then take public statements
2 and comments. And, if you want to make a public
3 statement or comment, we need you to fill out a yellow
4 card. And, please, as I said, let's do questions
5 during the question segment and comments during the
6 comment segment.

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

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

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

23 I'm going to keep these introductory
24 remarks brief. The first thing we're going to do is

1 we're going to show you a short video, just to remind
2 you of what the Northern Pass Project is, share with
3 you a little bit of what we refer to as the "ForwardNH
4 Plan", which is an attempt to articulate the benefits
5 of this Project to the State of New Hampshire. I'm
6 then going to briefly drill down into Rockingham
7 County. And, then, probably most importantly, we'll
8 take questions and answers, and that's we look forward
9 to your feedback.

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

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

22 *[Video presentation provided on the*
23 *Northern Pass Project.]*

24 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, hopefully, you

1 found that to be a useful kind of overview of the
2 Project and some of the benefits here in New Hampshire.

3 Now, specific to Rockingham County.

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

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

20 Now, the reason we're showing this
21 purple line *[indicating]*, essentially runs from
22 Deerfield down to Londonderry, is that there are some
23 modifications to existing structures on an existing
24 power line that we need to make along that current

1 route. And, that's summarized down here *[indicating]*,
2 and we refer to them as "related system upgrades". Of
3 the 343 existing structures that are carrying a
4 transmission line, approximately ten of them have to be
5 elevated roughly five feet each. Okay? So, that's the
6 only impact in that purple area.

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

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

23 In the areas that are of visual
24 significance, we're going with a more streamlined

1 structure that looks more like a conventional telephone
2 pole or electric pole. It's referred to as a
3 "monopole", which means that it's a single leg. And,
4 I'll show you an example of that. So, where necessary
5 and appropriate, we are continuing to work on the
6 design to address visual impacts. But we do understand
7 we have additional work to do.

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

22 And, I'll show you in a minute what
23 Northern Pass will look like. You'll see it in this
24 area *[indicating]*, among the trees. Okay? So, you see

1 that one structure. It's a monopole structure, which
2 means it's a single pole, and you'll see some
3 conductors. So, if you just focus on that, you'll see
4 the change.

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

7 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. We can do that.
8 That might help. And, again, this is illustrative.
9 So, this is the area *[indicating]*. And, one structure
10 will become visible once it's built. Do you see?
11 Okay. That's from a distance of about two-tenths of a
12 mile. So, it's relatively close. It is a large pole,
13 it's a tall pole. It's one of the taller poles on the
14 route. Okay?

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

19 We do recognize, however, that visual
20 impacts remains a principal concern. You know, when
21 we -- when the Department of Energy, and Attorney
22 Iacopino mentioned their role, the Department of Energy
23 is the federal agency responsible for permitting this
24 Project, looked at it, issued their Draft Environmental

1 Impact Statement, this was their conclusion around
2 scenic impact and visual impact. And, this was several
3 months ago. This was before we made some fairly
4 significant changes to the Project.

5 Now, since that point, we've added
6 52 miles of underground construction in and around the
7 White Mountain National Forest, really to address areas
8 of significant visual impact. So, the point being is
9 that, you know, the Department of Energy views this as
10 a "modest visual impact". We think we have taken
11 further steps to address some of the principal areas.
12 But our work is not done. And, these are some of the
13 techniques down below that we intend to continue
14 working on to address this key issue. Okay? And, they
15 range from some of the structure designs, locations.
16 You know, is there screening that we could create to
17 improve view impacts or reduce impacts? So, we
18 understand that it remains a significant issue, and we
19 continue to work on it.

20 Beyond the -- I'll say the "design
21 impacts" on Rockingham County, this is what it means
22 from a tax perspective. You saw the introduction, it's
23 roughly a \$30 million annual tax benefit to
24 municipalities and counties within the State of New

1 Hampshire. Here, the municipal portion really is just
2 Deerfield. That's where the new line will run
3 *[indicating]*, and that's where the substation is being
4 upgraded *[indicating]*.

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

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

24 The video talked about the "\$80 million

1 a year in energy cost savings". That's for businesses
2 and residential customers across the State of New
3 Hampshire. This is at a time where, you know, this
4 region is struggling with very high electricity rates.
5 So, this is a very significant issue for businesses.

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

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

24 We've done some other things to further

1 create job opportunities. In the North Country, we've
2 created a discrete job creation fund. The sole purpose
3 of that, and it's going to be not managed by the
4 Company, but managed by key business leaders in the
5 North Country, is to invest money, over \$8 million
6 worth of the Company's funds in job creation
7 opportunities in the North Country that they will
8 identify. And, I mentioned the tax revenues.

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

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

19 So, that's the economic side. I tried
20 to identify some of the environmental benefits of the
21 Project down below. You know, first and foremost is
22 the impact on carbon. You know, we're talking about a
23 clean, renewable source of electricity. There's no
24 source that you can visualize right now that's going to

1 have that kind of carbon emission reduction, over 3
2 million tons a year from a single source across the
3 region. So, a very significant carbon emissions
4 reductions.

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

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

19 So, some fairly significant
20 environmental benefits. I would call them, in many
21 instances, unique. And, the last one, I'll just hit it
22 quickly. Because one of the things that we hear often
23 is "Well, you're going to bring in a very large amount
24 of hydropower into the region, over a thousand

1 megawatts. What about all the small-scale renewable
2 that we're trying to develop, whether it's wind or
3 solar?" You know, there's a couple answers to that.
4 One, as the video showed, there's about a quarter of
5 New England's generation fleet has or will be retiring.
6 Okay? Almost 8,000 megawatts of generation, whether
7 it's nuclear, coal, gas, oil, largely carbon-emitting,
8 other than nuclear. So, there's a true need for new
9 supplies. And, ideally, you know, to the extent
10 possible and economic, they will be renewable. So, a
11 large amount of hydro, coupled with some wind, and
12 solar, plenty of room for all of those sources of
13 electricity that, hopefully, will drive our economy in
14 the future.

15 The other thing this is referring to is,
16 up in the North Country there is an area where there's
17 quite a bit of existing small-scale renewable
18 generation, some biomass plants, some small hydro
19 plants, wind plants, and the transmission grid is
20 constrained. I mean, there are times when not all that
21 generation can run, because it's an undersized grid.
22 As part of Northern Pass, we are going to unlock that
23 grid, and allow the small-scale renewables to operate
24 more frequently and become more viable, and also

1 potentially allow additional investment in small-scale
2 renewables up in that area of the state where it's
3 pretty accepted. You know, most of the towns in that
4 North Country area look forward to that investment.
5 So, that's what that's referring to. Okay?

6 So, that's an overview of Northern Pass,
7 what it means to Merrimack -- I'm sorry, to Rockingham
8 County, where the benefits are from our ForwardNH Plan.

9 And, with that, I'll look forward to
10 your questions. Thank you.

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

14 *(Recess taken at 7:08 p.m. and the*
15 *public information session resumed at*
16 *7:11 p.m.)*

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

21 The first one is: "Has the Site
22 Evaluation Committee determined what specific
23 information Northern Pass must still submit under the
24 new SEC rules to comply with those rules?"

1 What's happened is the Site Evaluation
2 Committee actually promulgated rules that have specific
3 requirements in them, and we have -- well, Northern
4 Pass is on notice of what those requirements are, and
5 we've told them to provide that information no later
6 than January 22nd, 2016. So they have to go into the
7 rules. Anything that they've not already included in
8 their application that is now required by the rules
9 will have to be provided to the Committee.

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

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

19 Well, I'm not going to make a
20 determination about how many jobs any particular
21 application might create or whether the impacts or
22 benefits are positive or negative. However, presently
23 pending at the Site Evaluation Committee, we have four
24 other projects. Not all of them -- the applications

1 haven't been filed in all of them. There is a wind
2 project slated for Antrim, New Hampshire, which is
3 28-megawatt wind facility; there is the Merrimack
4 Valley Reliability Project, which is a
5 transmission-line project that runs from Scobie Pond
6 Substation here in Londonderry down to Tyngsboro,
7 Massachusetts, and that's a reliability project; and
8 there's the Seacoast Reliability Project, which is
9 another transmission line. These are all on our web
10 site, by the way. The application has not been filed
11 in the Seacoast Reliability Project yet. And then
12 there's the Northeast Direct Tennessee Gas Pipeline,
13 which we have a docket open for that. And that is
14 pending before the Committee, although we do not yet
15 have an application. So we have two other applications
16 before the Committee right now, including Northern
17 Pass, and then we have two other ones that are in
18 prefiling status. As to whether any of them will
19 contribute more than 2,000 construction jobs or have a
20 positive or negative impact, I can't really decide
21 that. That's a decision that the Committee will make.
22 And I can't make that decision for the Committee.

23 The next question for the SEC is that --
24 is as follows: "Given that there are many landowners

1 who question Northern Pass's right to use their land
2 for the Project, does the SEC's written decision to
3 accept the application as complete mean that the SEC
4 has determined that Northern Pass in fact has all the
5 legal rights they need to build the Project as
6 proposed?"

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

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

15 "The federal draft EIS says that New
16 Hampshire will use approximately 10 percent of the
17 power delivered by Northern Pass, but will sustain
18 100 percent of the environmental impacts. Given that
19 New Hampshire is a net exporter of electricity, how
20 will the SEC decide whether Northern Pass is a net
21 benefit to New Hampshire?"

22 So the part that's addressed to the Site
23 Evaluation Committee here is how will the Site
24 Evaluation Committee decide. They will decide whether

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

22 Mr. Quinlan, if you want to address the
23 rest of this, about the 10 percent of the power
24 delivered --

1 MR. QUINLAN: Sure.

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

4 MR. QUINLAN: So what the question's
5 referring to is a Power Purchase Agreement that exists
6 between Eversource, my company, and our partner, Hydro
7 Quebec. Hydro Quebec owns and operates the hydro
8 facilities in Canada that are going to essentially send
9 power south. As I said during the opening, 100 percent
10 of the power is being delivered here in New Hampshire,
11 into the Deerfield substation. There is a Power
12 Purchase Agreement, again, between us and Hydro Quebec
13 for 10 percent of that power, which means they are
14 contractually obligated to reserve 10 percent of that
15 power for Eversource New Hampshire's customers. The
16 balance of the power, the 90 percent, to my knowledge,
17 has not been contracted for. So, to the extent New
18 Hampshire is interested in procuring more of that
19 power, I'm certain they'll have an opportunity to do
20 so. What we wanted to ensure was that New Hampshire at
21 least received its fair share. So, New Hampshire is
22 about 9 percent of the total load in New England, and
23 we've reserved 10 for our customers. So we've got more
24 than our fair share. We have the opportunity to

1 procure more if we care to. And probably underlying
2 that question, and maybe more importantly, is the cost
3 of building this transmission project will not be borne
4 by New Hampshire customers. So none of the costs
5 associated with this project, the \$1.6 billion that I'm
6 referring to, will be paid for by customers here in New
7 Hampshire, Eversource or otherwise. It will be paid
8 for by others, okay.

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

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

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

24 The next question for the -- is also for

1 the Site Evaluation Committee and the Company. Very
2 similar to the last one.

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

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

24 Did you want to address the one-percent

1 savings?

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

18 And I will say, you know, we talked
19 about the Power Purchase Agreement which reserves for
20 New Hampshire 10 percent of the power. There are
21 additional cost savings above and beyond what I was
22 just referring to that will reside here in New
23 Hampshire. So, that \$800 million is really what
24 happens to the overall market. We're going to see some

1 incremental savings that we haven't included in our
2 numbers right here in New Hampshire because the power
3 will be beneficially priced. So I expect to be able to
4 prove that out very significantly.

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

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

22 I guess implicit in here, Mr. Quinlan,
23 is a question as to whether your pricing model takes
24 into account smaller generators, wind projects,

1 community solar, and that by the development of those
2 will reduce savings from Northern Pass. Do you agree
3 with that?

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

20 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The
21 next question is just for the Committee.

22 "I would like to intervene on behalf of
23 my family as we jointly own property on the
24 right-of-way. Do I need to file an affidavit to speak

1 on their behalf?"

2 Then there's a second question: "I
3 would like to speak on behalf of my brother and
4 sister-in-law with regards to Northern Pass's impacts
5 on their property. What form do I need in order to
6 facilitate me doing that?"

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

17 MS. MONROE: February 5th.

18 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: February
19 5th, 2016, and it will be considered by the Site
20 Evaluation Committee. If you want to speak on behalf
21 of somebody else, you should provide us with some
22 proof, usually something signed by that person, that
23 they, in fact, want you to speak for them. It doesn't
24 have to be a formal affidavit, as far as I know. But

1 also, before you file that, you should also check our
2 new rules, which are on our web site. And it's Rule
3 301.11 which lays out what needs to be in a letter
4 seeking intervention before the Committee.

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

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

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

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

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

18 MR. JOHNSON: Not that I know.

19 I think the short answer to that is no.

20 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next
21 question --

22 MR. QUINLAN: And I will say there are
23 portions of this route -- and this is particularly up
24 in the North Country, which I alluded to them

1 earlier -- we will actually be re-conductoring some
2 existing transmission facilities to allow that
3 small-scale renewables get to market. So there are
4 some modifications to existing transmission
5 infrastructure. I don't think we're going to be
6 replacing the actual physical structures. But the wire
7 will be increased in diameter to allow more power to
8 flow.

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

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

1 contractually bound by it.

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

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

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

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

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

16 MS. CARBONNEAU: My name is Lee
17 Carbonneau. I'm with Normandeau Associates, and we
18 have done the environmental surveys on the Project.
19 And as of the submittal of our SEC application and all
20 of the underlying natural resource permit applications
21 that are included in that, we have quantified impacts
22 to natural resources. So, they come in many
23 categories. Obviously, wetlands, streams and vernal
24 pools are important, and they have been quantified. I

1 can tell you that the permanent fill in those resources
2 is about two and a half acres. And considering we had
3 delineated over 870 acres within the Project area, that
4 permit impact is less than 1 percent. There are
5 additional temporary and secondary impacts that we've
6 also quantified for those resources. We've done vernal
7 pool surveys. We've done wildlife surveys. We've
8 evaluated, for example, the impacts to deer wintering
9 areas, moose concentration areas, other wildlife
10 habitat impacts that we have found throughout our
11 surveys which has spanned five years now. We have done
12 rare plant surveys. And so we have quantified the
13 effects of the Project footprint on plant communities
14 where we have found them. Happy to say there will be
15 no impacts in Rockingham County on rare plants. We've
16 been able to avoid that.

17 So, we actually have done quite a lot.
18 I can't tell you all of the impact quantities, off the
19 top of my head. But these are all included in our
20 technical reports which are appended to our SEC
21 application. And I think mostly in Appendix 31 through
22 36 or 37 is where you'll find most of those. So
23 they're in the technical reports and where applicable,
24 they're also in our application documents.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And again,
2 that application is available on our web site.

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

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

11 MR. QUINLAN: It's based on the analysis
12 by our engineers and cost estimators. So, one of the
13 things we've been hard at work doing over the last
14 several months is firming up our project cost
15 estimates. So when I mentioned some of the national
16 contractors that we are working with, we are actually
17 in the market bidding portions of this project. So we
18 now have a second data point. We have our own
19 experience in building transmission infrastructure
20 which we've built, an extensive amount. But now we
21 know what the market is, both above-ground and
22 underground construction confirmed. And that's the
23 basis for the \$1 billion estimate that we're using.

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Second

1 question from this person is: "How much of that \$1
2 billion is allocated to burying the HVDC line between
3 Pittsburg and Franklin, and how much to the AC line
4 from Franklin to Deerfield?"

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

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

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

20 Is there anything we would like to add
21 to that?

22 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I'll just add that
23 the total billion dollars of incremental cost is on
24 roadways and not in the right-of-way, the overhead

1 right-of-way that's available today. Eversource does
2 not have the rights to put underground facilities in
3 those existing overhead right-of-ways.

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

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

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

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

23 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next
24 question is similar to the one you've already answered,

1 but I'm going to ask it anyway.

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

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

24 Why do I think it's going to yield

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

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

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

1 we do unilaterally.

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

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

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

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

18 We have been consulting with DOT for
19 three, four years, on and off, and have had extensive
20 discussions with them. And as I've said at previous
21 meetings -- and it sounds like somebody, this
22 questioner, has heard this before -- but the DOT
23 requirements are very simply that, with regard to I-93,
24 we -- well, initially we asked DOT, "Where would you

1 prefer it?" And DOT said, "We would prefer it on roads
2 other than I-93. However, if you comply with our
3 manual, we'll look at whatever you want." They have
4 adopted rules and regulations in a manual regarding
5 utility usage of highways, all highways. And a section
6 in that applies to interstates, particularly I-93.

7 I don't have to tell anybody down in
8 this area of the state how important I-93 is to the
9 state of New Hampshire. In Londonderry, it's well
10 known. With regard to the interstates, an essential
11 purpose of the interstates are to provide optimum
12 safety and mobility for the traveling public and
13 through traffic. And DOT zealously guards that
14 purpose. That's what they're there for. That's why
15 they don't have driveways on them, and they are what's
16 called "controlled access" or "limited access." The
17 manual prohibits longitudinal -- meaning along the
18 highway -- utility installations. As a general rule,
19 they are prohibited. DOT will consider -- consider --
20 longitudinal installations if you can meet certain
21 criteria, primarily, quote, extreme hardship, meaning
22 you have to have no other viable alternative. And
23 Northern Pass's proposal, by definition in this
24 instance, is a viable alternative.

1 And if you think about why they are
2 concerned about protecting I-93, think about these
3 things: The speeds that we're talking about on the
4 sections of 93 that we're -- that are relevant to this
5 project are mostly 70 miles an hour posted. Anybody
6 that drives it knows that the actual speeds are higher
7 than that. The volume of traffic is tens of thousands.
8 It's got a high percentage of truck traffic, heavy
9 truck traffic. The roads we're proposing to use have,
10 in most instances, 30 or 40, maybe in a few instances
11 50 miles an hour posted speeds, and speeds
12 substantially less than the interstate. Their volumes
13 range from a few hundred cars a day rather than tens of
14 thousands, to several thousand, at the most. And the
15 truck traffic is less. That's why DOT prefers you to
16 be on those roads. Then, if you think of the -- you
17 know, in the North Country, I-93 isn't an option,
18 anyways, because I-93 essentially goes over into
19 Vermont and Littleton. So the North Country section
20 doesn't apply. In Bethlehem, where we go down Route
21 18, 116 and 112, that's to bypass Franconia Notch. In
22 a separate requirement, if anybody knows Franconia
23 Notch down here -- I don't know if anybody driven it,
24 but most people have -- you will note that that road is

1 very different. The parkway is very different than the
2 rest of the interstate. That's because when it was
3 built, because of the high environmental and cultural
4 sensitivity of that area, they prohibited traditional
5 interstate construction. That's why it's only two
6 lanes undivided. And that is -- at the time and I
7 think it still is nationally -- the only exception on
8 the interstate system where that's true. I think
9 that's still true, but I'm not a hundred percent sure.
10 But at the time it was. And that was because of that
11 incredibly environmentally sensitive and culturally
12 important area. There is -- there was litigation
13 regarding that, and there is a Memorandum of Agreement
14 in federal court that prohibits any additional
15 construction in that area. So if you have to bypass --
16 and I think it's wise to from an environmental point of
17 view -- the Notch, you're on those roads anyways. So,
18 those roads -- 118, 116 and 112 -- are going to be
19 required anyways. So, I-93, from a practical point of
20 view, isn't available to us in that area, from a
21 practical and legal point of view.

22 Now, even if we could have showed
23 extreme hardship for I-93, what DOT envisions, if
24 you're going to use I-93, they want you to create

1 essentially what they call a "utility corridor"
2 outside, at the edge of the right-of-way where the
3 fence line is. If you drive on the interstate, you'll
4 notice off to the right or left, you'll see a fence off
5 in the woods. That's the edge of the right-of-way.
6 That's where DOT wants you to be. And you can't access
7 that area. DOT won't allow you to access it from the
8 interstate. So it means you have to build a access
9 road parallelling I-93. That's going to take down
10 enormous amounts of trees. You're going to impact
11 ledge. You're going to impact wetlands. And you're
12 going to change the character of that road in a way
13 that I don't think New Hampshire people would find
14 acceptable, because DOT prohibits, under all
15 circumstances, construction in the median or underneath
16 the roadway itself. And that's their policies. That's
17 their rules. And they've asked us to comply with them.

18 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

19 The next question is: "Is the expansion and raising of
20 the Eversource line running from the Scobie Pond
21 Substation into Hudson needed only because of Northern
22 Pass, or is there some other reason?"

23 I think they're talking about the
24 Merrimack Valley project.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, that is true, that
2 is the Merrimack Valley Project. The expansion that
3 Northern Pass will impact would be the Deerfield
4 substation corridor down to Scobie Pond.

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

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

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

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

24 MR. QUINLAN: Jim Muntz, who is

1 president of our transmission business.

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

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

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

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

23 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The
24 next question is: "Northern Pass has promoted better

1 electric rates for New Hampshire as a result of this
2 project. Could you please outline in detail the
3 estimated savings, and also address if this project
4 will have any impact on the transmission fees and other
5 fees that are included in our monthly bill."

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

9 The first question is, you know, what
10 are the energy cost savings and why -- how are they
11 derived? Again, you're taking a new energy supply
12 which is affordably priced, 1090 megawatts, and
13 injecting it into New Hampshire. That new power supply
14 drives down energy costs, electricity costs across all
15 of New England. The \$80 million per year reduction is
16 our estimation of what that effect will be for New
17 Hampshire customers only. When you extrapolate that to
18 all of New England, it's roughly \$800 million a year,
19 and it's due to the injection of a new power supply
20 into the market.

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

23 "What does the illustrative slide for
24 Deerfield Center mean? Is the representation of the

1 actual new pole heights correct? Is this the actual or
2 just a rendition of a drawing?"

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

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

12 To get back to the Deerfield example,
13 this is one of 30 different simulations that we did to
14 give people an understanding of what it would look
15 like, showing both the existing conditions and what it
16 would look like with the proposal in place. And what
17 we do is model it in a computer software that's based
18 upon very accurate information from the design
19 engineers. So we know the exact height of the
20 structures. We know the spans of the -- the conductors
21 of the wires. We know the spacing. And so we then
22 combine the computer model with the photograph to make
23 sure that they're properly registered and then produce
24 a final, what we call a "photo simulation." If you go

1 to the document that was submitted for the visual
2 impact assessment, you'll be able to find that very
3 slide, plus what we call a "panoramic view" that
4 provides a little bit more of the context. So you see
5 that image in the context of that particular situation
6 in Deerfield Village.

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

12 "In an earlier session" -- I assume
13 somebody from Eversource "...stated that approximately
14 2400 job opportunities will be created during the
15 Project. How many will be retained after the Project
16 is complete?"

17 MR. QUINLAN: So I'm going to refer this
18 to Bob Varney, who's another expert. He's with
19 Normandeau. You know, we do differentiate in our
20 expert analysis between construction jobs and jobs that
21 will continue post-construction. You know, in the
22 context of construction jobs, however, we are talking
23 about a relatively long-duration project. This is a
24 two- to three-year construction window. And in that

1 space, that's a long-duration project -- meaning
2 construction workers, as you know, move on a monthly
3 basis perhaps.

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

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

15 In terms of the construction, there
16 obviously would be a large number of jobs that would be
17 generated during that construction process. There
18 would be direct jobs associated with construction.
19 There would be indirect jobs with suppliers and other
20 services that are provided in association with that
21 construction effort. And then there would be induced
22 jobs and induced economic benefits associated with
23 construction workers and delivery people and others who
24 are purchasing meals, purchasing hotel stays and things

1 like that throughout the regional economy. So there's
2 a huge benefit associated with the Project over 20
3 years, a wide range, depending on a number of factors
4 associated with it. But it would be in the \$400- to
5 \$600 million range in terms of benefit.

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

10 MR. QUINLAN: I don't know the exact
11 appendix number. We'll get that to you. But if you
12 look at the London Economics analysis, not only did
13 they model energy production costs, they also modeled
14 economic impacts. They quantified direct jobs, meaning
15 construction jobs, indirect jobs, and those other jobs
16 that Mr. Varney was just referring to that would
17 continue on post-construction. The GDP effects, the
18 Gross Domestic Product effects, extend well beyond the
19 Project construction window. There are hundreds of
20 millions of dollars in continued economic benefit to
21 the state of New Hampshire that go well beyond the
22 three, the two- to three-year construction window.
23 We'll get you the exact appendix number, but it's the
24 London Economics analysis.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next
2 question on the sheet is: "Why does there need to be a
3 switch from DC to AC?"

4 MR. QUINLAN: So the --

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

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

16 MR. MUNTZ: Yeah, the other reason that
17 direct current link is required is the electric system
18 in Canada is inherently different than the electric
19 system down here. In Canada, 96 percent is
20 hydro-powered, which is generated by what are basically
21 slow-moving machines, okay. They're all big hydro
22 turbines. They run at relatively slow speeds. The
23 U.S. electric grid is largely powered by fast-moving
24 machines that are steam-driven, combustion turbines,

1 that type of thing. And so if you directly ran an AC
2 line from Canada to the U.S., the systems would tend to
3 fight each other and oscillate as they sought to
4 operate at 60 cycles. Those systems operate at 60
5 cycles. So, whenever you couple one of the slow-moving
6 systems like Canada, particularly Quebec, with another
7 system, you have a DC link. That DC link can be, you
8 know, 10 yards long. A lot of places have -- you know,
9 all along the New York border. Quebec has several sets
10 of what they call "back-to-back converters," where
11 converters are right next to each other, but they
12 provide that electrical isolation between the systems.
13 When you're going to take the power, in the case of New
14 Hampshire, a long distance, it is also more beneficiary
15 to use a DC link.

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

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Back

1 to economics.

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

10 MR. QUINLAN: So, our estimate is that
11 there's \$90 [sic] million a year of energy cost savings
12 for New Hampshire. That is not a insignificant number.
13 What does that equate to? If you look across every
14 residential customer and every business across New
15 Hampshire, it's approximately 5 percent. You know, the
16 questioner suggests that's a modest amount. When you
17 talk to a business owner who is a large user of
18 electricity, or a residential customer who is focused
19 on their electric bill, having a stable bill and a
20 reduced bill is significant. Five percent is not
21 insignificant to those customers. I've spoken to
22 hundreds of them across this state. So, you know, \$80
23 million, in my mind, is also not an insignificant
24 number.

1 And as to the other question, our Power
2 Purchase Agreement will assure at least 10 percent of
3 the power flowing over this line will be reserved for
4 New Hampshire customers.

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

10 MR. QUINLAN: Yeah, so, for -- again,
11 we're talking about a \$1.7, \$1.6 billion infrastructure
12 project. So the effect of that on local businesses up
13 and down the line, whether it's restaurants, hotels,
14 dry cleaners, you know, this will be a very significant
15 opportunity that will allow those companies to
16 certainly be profitable, hopefully, and also continue
17 to grow their business. When you look at the second-
18 and third-order effect on that, that's what extends the
19 benefit stream. You create opportunities that are
20 going to hopefully allow these businesses to continue
21 to be successful and moving forward. And, you know,
22 there's a very detailed analysis as to what that looks
23 like, and it's not purely theoretical. There have been
24 many significant infrastructure projects, including

1 transmission infrastructure projects in New England,
2 that provide a good basis for assessing these effects.
3 We've built several of them ourselves, as have others.
4 So there's confirmation that these analyses are
5 accurate.

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

9 MR. QUINLAN: Well, what this is
10 probably referring to is our apprenticeship program.
11 We were very pleased to announce that program last year
12 in collaboration with the IBEW. We think it's a
13 wonderful way of creating job opportunities for New
14 Hampshire residents interested in, you know, a highly
15 skilled, high-demand profession which is that of the
16 electrical worker. So we're working jointly with the
17 IBEW to create these opportunities for New Hampshire
18 residents. We are using many of our projects across
19 the state for purposes of providing the on-the-job
20 training portion of that. It's also coupled with
21 classroom training and skills training that the IBEW
22 delivered. It's a wonderful training opportunity. You
23 know, we've been pleased that's it's been so, you know,
24 in high demand from New Hampshire residents. We have

1 no problem bringing folks into it. It's really a
2 career path for many of these folks. You know, when we
3 move into construction on Northern Pass, we intend to
4 expand the apprentice program through the opportunities
5 on Northern Pass and create many more opportunities.

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

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

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

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next
23 three questions are all along the same lines. First
24 one is: "If there are a significant number of

1 construction workers who will be working on this
2 project along the proposed route, is it typical for the
3 employer to house and feed these workers, or will they
4 be looking for housing and spending money within the
5 communities of the Project?"

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

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

19 You know, as to the first question, no,
20 Eversource does not house and feed workers on our
21 projects. However, there will be many local
22 businesses, motels, restaurants and otherwise who will.
23 These folks will, in essence, be working on this
24 project for two to three years. They're going to need

1 a place to stay. They're going to need a place to eat.
2 They're going to need to go do laundry. All of this
3 creates the "GDP effect" I was referring to earlier.
4 There are literally hundreds of workers who will be in
5 the communities up and down this line, and I think that
6 will offer a significant economic benefit to those
7 communities.

8 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry?

9 MR. VARNEY: Would you like the number?

10 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh, sure.

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

16 Also in the tax testimony and in the
17 narrative in the application, it explains that over a
18 20-year period, about \$600 million in local property
19 taxes, state property taxes, county property taxes,
20 will be generated, and about \$80 million in reduced
21 energy costs within the state, and overall about a \$3.8
22 billion economic stimulus in New Hampshire. Thank you.

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

1 earlier.

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

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

10 MR. QUINLAN: So what I'm referring to
11 is an industry-accepted methodology, which means it's
12 in wide use nationally and regionally. It basically
13 looks at the value of the investment and then
14 depreciates it over the useful life of the asset. In
15 this case, these transmission assets are referred to as
16 "long-lived assets." So they're depreciated over a
17 40-year life. That's the methodology that's commonly
18 used. There's no national governing body to set that.
19 But it's the most common methodology that at least I'm
20 aware of in the industry.

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

23 MR. QUINLAN: No, I don't know if it has
24 a name.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All right.
2 Move on to the next question.

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

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

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

1 can't speak for Seabrook.

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

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

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

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

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

19 No. So I think the answer is no. As I
20 said earlier, this Project is going to be paid for by
21 others. New Hampshire is going to get \$3.8 billion
22 worth of benefits I referred to earlier; yet, it's not
23 going to bear the cost of building this transmission
24 facility.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "What will
2 be the annual revenue generated when the Northern Pass
3 project is fully online? By that I mean what is the
4 revenue to Eversource and/or Northern Pass, LLC?"

5 MR. QUINLAN: Jim, can you answer that?

6 MR. MUNTZ: Could you repeat that?

7 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sure.

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

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

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

23 "Several Department of Energy
24 alternatives reviewed burial of the transmission lines.

1 Has the cost analysis for complete burial in Deerfield,
2 including our historic center and along our scenic
3 routes, in particular, the Pawtuckaway Mountain
4 viewshed, been determined? Please provide precise cost
5 analysis to the public if this particular area and
6 others along" -- of this -- I'm sorry -- "of this
7 particular area and others along your route."

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

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

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

21 The question is: "Will the SEC be
22 investigating the impact that this project will have on
23 traffic during the construction if the developer is
24 forced to bury all the line on state highways?"

1 And the answer to the question is that
2 the Site Evaluation Committee, as one of the
3 determining factors that it must undertake, is to
4 determine whether or not there will be an impact on the
5 orderly development of the region. So, yes,
6 construction and traffic is one of many of the various
7 things that would likely be considered by the Site
8 Evaluation Committee when they address that determining
9 factor.

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

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

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

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. This

1 question goes both to the Company, and I suppose to the
2 Site Evaluation Committee.

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

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

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

20 And then, which has the greater
21 environment impact, I'll throw that out to the Company.
22 I don't know. From the Site Evaluation Committee's
23 standpoint, that's a determination that has yet to be
24 made, based upon the evidence that they hear.

1 But from the Company's standpoint, which
2 has the greater environmental impact, burial or
3 overhead?

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

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

20 "The towers coming into Deerfield are
21 supposed to be approximately 135 feet tall. After the
22 power leaves Deerfield, how tall will the towers be
23 then, and what path through southern New Hampshire will
24 the towers go? What towns will they go through?"

1 MR. QUINLAN: So, the Northern Pass
2 Project, as I indicated earlier, terminates in
3 Deerfield, so there are no -- there's not a new line
4 being built south or any other direction from Deerfield
5 associated with Northern Pass.

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

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

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

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

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Let me
23 change that question around a little bit 'cause I think
24 I know what's -- you mentioned before there would be

1 upgrades on what's been referred to as the Merrimack
2 Valley Reliability Project. And I guess the question
3 is: Will all the power from Northern Pass go down that
4 corridor, or are there other lines?

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

19 MR. MUNTZ: Yeah, and just to add to
20 that, the specific line upgrade that we were required
21 to do because of Northern Pass is a result of applying
22 to ISO-New England and saying we'd like to connect this
23 project to Deerfield. What do we have to do to the
24 system so we do no harm to the system, we do no harm to

1 the existing generators, and that we're able to connect
2 to the system and cause no problem under a myriad of
3 conditions? They take the system, and they run, you
4 know, high-powered computers. They run numerous
5 scenarios. They simulate all kinds of system
6 conditions, generation patterns, future retirements.
7 And they blend all that together and come back and tell
8 us, you know, very specific, this line occasionally
9 will get up to such-and-such a power level, and you're
10 going to need to raise five of the poles, you know,
11 another 5 feet to ensure that on the hottest summer day
12 when that line is running at its highest power because
13 Seabrook just tripped off and the system's loaded in
14 such-and-such a manner, you want to make sure you have
15 safety clearance on that line. So, you know, it's very
16 specific and precise and analyzed by ISO. And they
17 give us the system upgrades that we need to connect.
18 Any generator which looks like to ISO gets that same
19 analysis, and you get the list of things you have to do
20 to the system that are beyond your project. And this
21 line is one.

22 MR. QUINLAN: The upgrades that Mr.
23 Muntz is referring to, those are the 10 structures that
24 I was alluding to you in the presentation that has to

1 be raised an average of about 5 feet. So in the scheme
2 of things, for a project this size, with this large a
3 delivery of electricity, those are very modest, which
4 is why we chose Deerfield. It's a very robust delivery
5 point on the New England electric grid.

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

9 MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Muntz.

10 MR. MUNTZ: This hydro power is coming
11 from the Hydro Quebec system power. They've got
12 40,000 megawatts of power. We're not getting power
13 from any specific asset that they have up there.
14 They've just completed one large project. They don't
15 have any under construction or in near-term planning
16 horizon that we're aware of. So it's hard to specify
17 that this power comes from, you know, a particular dam
18 or set of dams that change the course of said river.
19 And it's really system power from HQ will be hydro
20 power. Their system is 96 percent hydro, and we'll get
21 a certification for each megawatt that says it came
22 from a hydro station.

23 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Will,
24 quote, danger trees, unquote, be cut along the

1 Deerfield right of way beyond the limits of the right
2 of way?"

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

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

21 "Is the design intent of the Project to
22 support a second DC line and additional AC line? The
23 buried X section shows two each of 8-inch buried line
24 in Easton, and the towers shown for Deerfield are able

1 to be fitted with an additional three arms to support a
2 second 345KV circuit. Please explain."

3 MR. QUINLAN: Sam Johnson.

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

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

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

22 MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to refer this
23 question to Ken Bowes. Ken is Eversource's
24 Vice-president of Engineering.

1 MR. BOWES: Thank you, Bill. The
2 application is very specific on the details of this.
3 It's Appendix 37 and 38. Those are sponsored by
4 Dr. William Bailey. He's also prefiled testimony in
5 this case, and he goes into great detail, several
6 hundred pages of evidence being supplied. And his
7 conclusion is that it is not an adverse health impact
8 from either the DC portion of the line or the AC
9 portion of the line. He goes into a lot of details
10 about the measurements that are taken, both directly
11 under the lines and at the right-of-way edge, and that
12 data is available in there. So, without a specific
13 location, it's difficult to answer any specific level
14 of magnetic fields. But he's done a very detailed and
15 comprehensive analysis.

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

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

22 Well, we chose it because we have to
23 have a certain -- we have to have five separate public
24 information sessions, one in each county. And we then

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

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

23 "The consultants for" -- and actually,
24 some of this has to be answered by the Site Evaluation

1 Committee as well, so I'll take that part.

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

14 Let me answer that first part of the
15 question for the SEC first. The SEC will consider all
16 information that is provided to it by historic resource
17 consultants, whether it comes from the Section 106
18 process or whether it was prepared specifically for the
19 Site Evaluation Committee's review. The Site
20 Evaluation Committee is not cabined by the Section 106
21 process. The Site Evaluation Committee does appreciate
22 that process, and in other dockets that process has
23 been, in some cases, the only method for the review of
24 the historic resources. But in this case, to the

1 extent that there are two separate studies, and they
2 are submitted to the Site Evaluation Committee, the
3 Site Evaluation Committee will consider whatever is
4 submitted to them. I suspect that other parties to the
5 Project may have their own historic reviews to submit.
6 Counsel for the Public may choose to address this
7 issue. Other intervenors may choose to address this
8 issue. And the Site Evaluation Committee will consider
9 all of the evidence that's put in on historic resources
10 or any other factor that the Site Evaluation Committee
11 is required to consider.

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

18 I'm going to let somebody from the
19 Company answer that in a moment. But I'll just tell
20 you one thing that the Site Evaluation Committee has
21 done in the past. It doesn't mean they will do that in
22 this particular case, but they are authorized by
23 statute to do that. The Site Evaluation Committee can
24 issue conditions that are -- that require the

1 Applicant, in order to maintain its certificate, to
2 continue in processes for other state or federal
3 agencies. And in the past, in other dockets, we have
4 made a condition of the granting of a certificate the
5 requirement that the Applicant continue in the 106
6 review process. Sometimes it's required reports back
7 to the Site Evaluation Committee. In other cases it's
8 required, a couple years down the road, actually, a
9 mitigation meeting to determine the final mitigation
10 requirements. So there is a process where some studies
11 can go beyond the issuance of a certificate, if the
12 Site Evaluation Committee determines to issue a
13 certificate.

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

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

22 MS. WIDELL: Good evening. My name is
23 Cherilyn Widell. I'm with Widell Preservation
24 Services. The Department of Energy, as the federal

1 agency issuing the presidential permit, is responsible
2 for the Section 106 process. We have been working with
3 the consultants on the survey that has been completed
4 for Northern Pass with the Division of Historical
5 Resources. And Northern Pass has committed to doing an
6 inventory of the properties that the Department of
7 Energy, in consultation with Division of Historical
8 Resources, determines need to be done for this project,
9 for all 192 miles that need to be considered. That's
10 in a Memorandum of Understanding that was signed just a
11 few weeks ago between Northern Pass and the Division of
12 Historical Resources.

13 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

14 And the last question that I have here
15 is: "Will the Northern Pass benefit only Eversource
16 customers?"

17 MR. QUINLAN: No. Hopefully it's clear
18 from some of the materials I shared earlier that the
19 benefits to this project extend well beyond simply the
20 Eversource customers. There are many different aspects
21 of benefits that, you know, extend throughout New
22 Hampshire, whether it's tax benefits, job
23 opportunities, energy cost savings. These are all
24 spread throughout New Hampshire. Many of them are

1 benefits locally for communities up and down the route
2 that are hosting the line. So there's widespread
3 benefits, both economically and environmentally. So
4 it's not true that it's just Eversource customers. All
5 New Hampshire customers will see the energy cost
6 savings benefit. Not just New Hampshire customers, but
7 New England customers. So, widespread benefits,
8 multiple facets to them, and they extend throughout New
9 Hampshire, and in many instances elsewhere in New
10 England.

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

19 *(Recess taken at 8:33 p.m. and the*
20 *public information session resumed at*
21 *8:40 p.m.)*

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
23 We're going to get going here, if somebody can maybe
24 let the folks out the back now.

1 This is the part of our meeting where we
2 get to hear from the public. The part where we've
3 asked questions has already occurred. So, please don't
4 try to use this as an opportunity to ask questions,
5 because you're not going to get answers during this
6 section. This is where we want to hear from you. We
7 have approximately 20 people who have signed up to
8 speak. We ask that you keep your comments to three
9 minutes or so. I will be keeping time. But, if you go
10 a little over, I'm not going to stop you. But, if you
11 go on forever, I'm going to have to interrupt.

12 And, please, when you speak, please come
13 to the podium in front of me here. Please tell us your
14 name and where you're from, and spell it. And, if you
15 are going to read from a prepared statement of some
16 sort, it would be really great if you handed it to one
17 of our court reporters when you're done with your
18 statement. It makes it easier for them to prepare the
19 final transcript. As you may have noticed, they have
20 been here working diligently. Every word that is
21 spoken here tonight will be included in a written
22 transcript. And, once that transcript is prepared,
23 guess where it will be? On the Site Evaluation
24 website, the Site Evaluation Committee's website.

1 Okay? And, so, it will be available, and it will be
2 reviewed by the Committee during the course of their
3 review of this Application.

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

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

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

19 The first: "The Town of Deerfield shall
20 state its opposition to any new overhead development of
21 alternating current and direct current high voltage
22 transmission lines within its borders; and in turn
23 manifest the Town's strong preference for the burial of
24 such lines, in a manner consistent with state and

1 federal requirements, under rights of way and power
2 line corridors now existing or to be established.
3 Although burial in all instances is preferred, this
4 statement of opposition shall not apply to distribution
5 lines carrying electrical power and other utility
6 lines, such as telephone and cable television, for Town
7 residential or commercial use."

8 The second article: "The Town of
9 Deerfield shall state its opposition to the Northern
10 Pass transmission project as currently proposed, which,
11 as currently proposed, will cause the significant
12 expansion of existing power line rights-of-way; the
13 installation of steel towers with heights up to
14 135 feet, well above the tree height, resulting in the
15 further impairment of Deerfield's rural, small town
16 character and the further degradation of Deerfield's
17 scenic vistas and natural scenic beauty; the
18 development of the Town in a manner inconsistent with
19 the Deerfield Master Plan; the diminishment of the
20 value of private property and assets for residents in
21 proximity to the towers; the corresponding loss of
22 property tax revenue for the Town; and the strong
23 possibility of negative health impacts."

24 It is my belief as a Selectman that

1 opposition to the project in Deerfield would disappear
2 if the proposed overhead lines were instead buried.

3 Thank you.

4 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

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

6 Our next speaker is Tiler Eaton, of
7 Nottingham.

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

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

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

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
2 sir.

3 Next speaker is Claude Levesque,
4 Deerfield.

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

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

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

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

23 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
24 sir.

1 Next is Joe Casey, Rochester.

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

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

22 We currently have two state-of-the-art
23 training centers located in the State of New Hampshire,
24 one in Barrington, New Hampshire and one in Concord,

1 New Hampshire, that is specifically designed to train
2 electrical workers, both to become licensed New
3 Hampshire electricians and line workers.

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

12 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
13 sir.

14 Next speaker is Lynn Woodard, of
15 Concord.

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

20 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: They're all
21 public.

22 MR. WOODARD: There you go. I should
23 state right off, I am in opposition to the proposed
24 Northern Pass submittal for the issuance of a

1 certificate by the SEC for the construction of the
2 above towers and power lines for the following reason:
3 The submitted proposal does not properly address health
4 and safety issues for New Hampshire citizens that abut
5 the established right-of-way. Residential homes and
6 private property will be in the immediate fall zone if
7 a tower were to collapse.

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

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

23 And, I've heard people say "well, these
24 structures are safe." But I can tell you, lately, the

1 way the weather has been, we've had microbursts of over
2 100 miles an hour just leveling trees in its path. If
3 you remember the -- if you've driven up Route 4 a few
4 years ago, you saw what happened in Northwood. We have
5 potential tornadoes, we have earthquakes in this state.
6 So, I think you can say "if it will happen" -- "if it
7 can happen, it probably will happen sooner or later."

8 It is my -- for example, the proposed
9 proposal requires existing distribution poles and
10 lines, that are currently approximately 30 -- or,
11 43 feet towers, to be relocated to the western edge of
12 the right-of-way and installed on 80 to 125 foot
13 monopoles. Those proposed transmission lines can then
14 be -- I mean, the proposed transmission lines can then
15 be installed on an H-structure in the center of the
16 right-of-way, they also will be 85 to 125 feet high.

17 Now, I've walked this area within the
18 Concord -- the City of Concord, and have found
19 residential homes will be adversely affected if these
20 structures are allowed to be constructed. In some
21 cases, homes are located directly in the fall zone.
22 Just imagine a 125-foot tower, carrying high-voltage
23 power lines, located within, say, 50 feet, which is
24 approximately correct in some of these cases, or less,

1 of your property line. The structure would crush the
2 home, not to mention the danger due to the electric
3 current carried by the distribution or transmission
4 lines.

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

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

16 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
17 sir.

18 Our next speaker will be Jeanne Menard.

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

21 MS. ROBIDAS: Thank you.

22 MS. MENARD: Thank you. Several years
23 ago I had a conversation with a then 90 year old
24 Deerfield native as to what it was like when the power

1 lines were first cut through Deerfield. She said that
2 there was "great excitement", as it meant bringing
3 electricity to their home for the first time. I can't
4 imagine that. But I can imagine that it being just
5 revolutionary for that generation in the '50s.

6 The local Deerfield and regional
7 benefits were clearly evident, and the project was
8 readily embraced. Compare the project of June 11th,
9 1926, when the first 100-foot swath strip of land was
10 deeded to PSNH. And, then, in March 17th, in 1956,
11 when the second 100-foot strip of land was deeded to
12 PSNH, to today's Northern Pass proposed project.

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

22 I understand and I do support the grid
23 system, that concept of being a part of a grid, but not
24 at New Hampshire's expense. One example of my concern

1 about a conflict of interest has to do with Northern
2 Pass's representation, I should say, a grossly
3 exaggerated and misrepresentation of estimated tax
4 revenues for the Town of Deerfield. Reading from "New
5 Hampshire Plan Forward", a Deerfield handout, the
6 actual local tax payments would depend on actual final
7 costs of the project in each community and its fair
8 market value.

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

24 I do look forward to the SEC process. I

1 look forward to having real numbers, and information
2 that is clear and truly a representation of the
3 cost/benefits and the analysis information of this
4 Project. Thank you very much.

5 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.
6 Next speaker will be Michael Speltz.

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

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

19 I'll give one example, and you've just
20 heard one from the previous speaker. According to the
21 Draft EIS done by the Department of Energy, under
22 Alternative 7, which I believe is what's before the
23 Committee now, the annual reduction in wholesale
24 electric costs in New Hampshire is 18.3 million. Now,

1 that's wholesale, apparently. We heard a number
2 tonight of "80 million", and I assume that's at retail.
3 That's a really wonderful markup, 450 percent or so.

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

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

17 The folks that work for Eversource work
18 in stovepipes of engineering and transmission and
19 natural resources. The folks that are going to support
20 the Committee, from the Department of Transportation,
21 Environmental Services, Fish & Game, work in their
22 stovepipes. So, I urge you to find a way to fulfill
23 this purpose of looking at this "in an integrated
24 fashion". Finding someone as a consultant independent

1 of the Applicant, that can pull all of these various
2 facts together and help you make that ultimate decision
3 that you have to make, where you answer the question
4 "is this Project going to result in greater benefit or
5 greater impacts to the state and the people of New
6 Hampshire?"

7 And, I do thank you for coming to
8 Londonderry.

9 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.
10 Next speaker is -- I think it's Peter Lion, from
11 Deerfield.

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

14 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Just that
15 one letter.

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

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

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
2 sir. Next speaker is Erick Berglund, from Deerfield.

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

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

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

21 The other comment I have is, there was a
22 question posed tonight, which compared -- I think the
23 question was "to compare the environmental impact with
24 the project of Northern Pass as proposed with its full

1 burial." And, I was curious to hear what the answer
2 was. And, it was a correct answer. The answer that,
3 at least in my view, that "burial of the line in the
4 right-of-way would be more costly environmentally."

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

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

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

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

1 state review processes.

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

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

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

16 *[No verbal response]*

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

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

21 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: It's
22 getting late.

23 MR. HITTER: Yes. My name is Neil
24 Hitter, N-e-i-l, H-i-t-t-e-r. Well, I certainly

1 appreciated tonight and the things that you folks have
2 done for the apprenticeship, and those are some really
3 good ideas. And, I like all of that, but here comes
4 the "but". I am really curious, as I look at this
5 room, how many people have traveled north of the
6 notches. And, probably, with this agenda, maybe many
7 have, but a lot of people in the south here do not know
8 what it's like up there, and what a special place the
9 Great North Woods is. So, my family, my wife and my
10 kids, we've been traveling up there, going on vacation
11 for years.

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

22 In addition, the other sides come in,
23 you got this hodgepodge of events trying to occur.

24 And, then, just this week, comes out in the paper that

1 you're suing local communities for the assessments.
2 And, that certainly doesn't sound like a good
3 relationship-building situation.

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

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

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

24 So, in essence, Northern Pass doesn't

1 get its route. And, suddenly, some big changes occur.
2 I have never seen such a quick and slick advertising
3 campaign come this summer, my Facebook page blew up; it
4 was beautiful.

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

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

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

19 So, if the target is to get clean power,
20 clean hydropower to southern New England, a route's
21 there. So, why do we need the towers, at a great cost
22 to the Great North Woods? I don't see the towers being
23 any benefit, if the target is to get it to southern
24 New Hampshire -- southern New England. And, frankly, I

1 don't want to see the towers when I'm on the Percy
2 Peaks or on the back roads in Cohas [sic] County.

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

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

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

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

24 I am also a Wellness Consultant, and I

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

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

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

22 One thing that was shared at -- another
23 thing that was shared at the forum was the potential
24 savings, as it was talked about tonight as well.

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

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

14 One of the biggest reasons why I don't
15 support Northern Pass is that this electricity is not
16 really going to be used or benefited by our residents.
17 It is going to be used by southern New England, just
18 like the existing Northeast Utilities transmission line
19 that runs through our state already. We are just being
20 used by Hydro-Quebec and Eversource to help them earn
21 more money, now we know a little bit more about that,
22 90 to \$300 million a year. And, it will just scar our
23 state, our beautiful state, that I've lived in since
24 1976.

1 Please do not allow this to happen.

2 Thank you for your time and consideration.

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

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

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

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

20 I know a lot of people had a problem
21 with the new towers. But, now that the line is going
22 to be buried underground for the scenic part of the
23 state, I don't understand how anybody can oppose this.
24 We ought to be thinking about what's best for

1 everybody's interest in New Hampshire, and think about
2 clear energy and the ongoing of this Project.

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

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

9 MR. POWERS: Hello. It's Bill, B-i-l-l,
10 Powers, P-o-w-e-r-s. I'm a member of the IBEW Local
11 104, a proud supporter of the Northern Pass. I've
12 actually been on a few of these projects throughout New
13 England, large projects like this. I've seen small
14 businesses flourish. I've lived on the road for years.
15 And, the look on these people's faces when you go into
16 their business and support their small businesses, and
17 they just grow and grow, and the appreciation is there.

18 I am very happy to see that Eversource
19 is making a deal with my local to bring in these
20 apprentices to get more qualified workers out there.
21 This is a growing industry that, you know, we need more
22 qualified help for. I'm glad to see that the Northern
23 Pass come through in New Hampshire where these, you
24 know, the families, my family, and a lot of other

1 families can, you know, can flourish through this. I
2 just -- I hope everything works out. Thank you.

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

5 *[No verbal response]*

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

8 MS. BONK: We can all go home.

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

11 MS. BONK: Yes. L-a-u-r-a, B-o-n-k.
12 The proposed high-voltage line, Northern Pass, will
13 pass through a few thousand feet of Bear Brook State
14 Park. In doing so, it will have an unreasonable
15 adverse effect on the aesthetics and the natural
16 environment, as well as violate the original deed from
17 the federal government.

18 A little bit about the Park. Bear Brook
19 State Park is the second largest park in the State of
20 New Hampshire. It's approximately 10,000 acres today.
21 It's in four towns: Allenstown, Hooksett, Deerfield,
22 and Candia. Allenstown and Hooksett are Merrimack
23 County, Deerfield and Candia are Rockingham County.

24 For the history of the Park, on April 6,

1 1943, in the middle of World War 2, the federal
2 government didn't want the Park anymore. They gave it
3 to the State of New Hampshire with the express
4 conditions written in the original deeds, and I will
5 quote from this: Provided always that this deed is
6 made upon the express condition that the State of New
7 Hampshire shall use this property exclusively for a
8 public park, recreation, and conservation purposes." I
9 believe that 135-foot high voltage towers violate that
10 original deed from the federal government.

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

20 Within Bear Brook State Park, there is a
21 hill called "Catamount Hill". There's a very popular
22 hiking trail to the top of this hill. From the top of
23 that hill, you will clearly see the new towers. They
24 are well above the treeline. You'll see the towers as

1 they pass through the few thousand feet of the Park, as
2 they go across Allenstown and into Deerfield. They'll
3 be also visible in Deerfield. I looked at all the
4 images on the Northern Pass website, as well as I am
5 just familiar with that hill, and I can tell that I can
6 judge that we will see 135 feet of those towers, which
7 violate, again, the deed, as well as creates this
8 unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics.

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

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

16 I just want to remind everybody that, if
17 you believe that you have a substantial interest in
18 this Project, you should file a motion to intervene in
19 the proceedings before February 5. We're also having
20 another public information session tomorrow night, in
21 --

22 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Laconia.

23 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- Laconia.
24 Lake Opechee?

1 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Lake Opechee.

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

4 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I do.

5 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: But Pam
6 does.

7 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I do.

8 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.
9 Sixty-two (62) Doris Ray Court, in Laconia. And, then,
10 next week we are in Whitefield, at the Mountain View
11 Grand Resort, on January 20th, and, at the Mountain
12 Club on Loon, at Loon Mountain, on January 21.

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

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

22 ***(Whereupon the Public Information***

23 ***Session was adjourned at 9:19 p.m.)***

24