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P R O C E E D I N G

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All right. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Michael Iacopino. And, I am Counsel to the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. And, we are here tonight in Docket Number 2015-06, the Joint Application of Northern Pass Transmission and Public Service Company of New Hampshire for a Certificate of Site and Facility for the project commonly referred to as "Northern Pass". I am the outside counsel to the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee, and I was appointed to run this meeting by our Chairman, Martin Honigberg. Thank you all for coming out.

In this hearing, this hearing is considered to be a "public information session". This is a time for the public to learn about the Site Evaluation Committee and its processes. And, I will put on a little presentation about the Site Evaluation Committee in a moment. It's also time for you to learn about the Project as presented by the Applicant. And, they will be provided the opportunity to make a presentation as well. And, when I say "the Applicant", I mean "Northern Pass".

If any time during the pendency of this
Application anybody needs information or has questions, I would suggest that the first place that you go to is the Site Evaluation Committee's website. It's up there on the screen, www.nhsec.nh.gov. At our website, we have posted the Application, the filings, the pleadings, and we get them up on the website as quickly as we can.

Also, you see there Pamela Monroe's e-mail. Pamela is the Administrator for the Site Evaluation Committee. She is to my left here. And, if you have questions, you can e-mail her at that e-mail address, or you can call the office at 271-2435.

Our agenda tonight is going to be similar to what, and I see many familiar faces here tonight, it's going to be similar to what many of you have seen before. Essentially, we're going to start off with a presentation about the Site Evaluation Committee. Once I have completed that presentation, we'll allow the Northern Pass to make a presentation about their Project.

We will then take questions from the public. And, those questions should be written out, please, on the green sheets. If you don't have a green sheet, you should probably get one. And, some folks...
will be walking around with them, they're also available out front.

What we try to do up here is we try to categorize all of the questions. So that, for instance, this one that I just happened to randomly pull off the table is about public health and safety. We try to categorize them so that, to the extent there are similar questions, we only need to ask the question once. Questions can be addressed to me, to answer about the process at the Site Evaluation Committee, or you can address questions to the Applicant about their Project.

I can tell you there are certain questions that you won't get answers to, such as "What will the Site Evaluation Committee do?" I cannot tell you what they will do. There is a whole process that's going to go on before they make up -- before they make their decision.

And, again, in your questions, please ask questions. You know, there is also blue sheets available, if you wish to make a written comment. Or, if you wish to make an oral statement, fill out one of the yellow cards to make an oral statement. But the questioning part of the process is so that people can
get their questions answered and the public can get the
information that they need.

    After we go through the questions, and I
will try to go through them all, of course, except for
those that are repetitive, we will then move on to the
portion of this meeting where we hear from you, the
public. And, like I say, if you want to make a public
statement, please fill out one of the yellow little
cards that look like this [indicating]. With one
exception, we're going to call everybody in the order
in which we get their yellow card.

    So, and again, your statements should be
statements. It's not a time to get up and try to ask
me a question or the Applicant a question. And, if you
do do that, you probably won't get an answer, okay?

    Please remember that everything that
goes on in this meeting is being recorded by our court
reporters here. They will not take down anything
shouted from the audience out-of-order, they will not
be able to take down any singing. So, please, when
you, if you make an oral statement, please make sure
that you identify yourself, tell us how to spell your
name, and speak clearly.

    So, that's the process that we're going
to use tonight. As I said, this is a public
information session. We are holding one of these in
each county where the Project is proposed. This is the
fourth out of five. And, tomorrow night we're holding
the final one in Lincoln, New Hampshire, for Grafton
County.

There will also be what we call "joint
public hearings" that will held in each county. And,
at those hearings, the Subcommittee that's hearing this
case will actually be present to hear from the public
and from the Applicant.

So, at this point, I'm going to go into
the presentation about the New Hampshire Site
Evaluation Committee and explain a little bit about our
process. And, after that, I'll turn it over to the
Applicant to explain their Project.

As I stated before, there's our website,
and the important e-mail address, as well as the phone
number for the Site Evaluation Committee.

The Site Evaluation Committee is created
by RSA 162-H. RSA 162-H has a number of purposes that
the Legislature has published. The first is to balance
the impacts and the benefits of site selection on very
important considerations: The welfare of the
population, private property, the location and growth
of industry, the economic growth of the state, the
environment, historic sites, aesthetics, air and water
quality, natural resources, and public health and
safety.

In addition, another purpose of the
statute and of the Site Evaluation Committee is to
avoid undue delay in the construction of new
facilities. And, as you'll hear later in the
presentation, there are timeframes that are contained
within the statute that do that. And, also, to provide
full and timely consideration of the environmental
consequences of any transmission line or energy
project. And, finally -- not "finally", but, in
addition, one of the purposes of the Committee is to
provide full and complete public disclosure about
projects that are proposed within the state.

And, finally, to ensure that the
construction and operation of energy facilities are
treated as a significant aspect of land use planning,
in which all environmental, economic, and technical
issues are resolved in an integrated fashion. In
essence, the Site Evaluation Committee is a statewide
planning board for energy projects. It's designed to
take all the various permitting that a energy project
would otherwise require if there was not a Site
Evaluation Committee, and to integrate it into a single
process. And, that process will include environmental,
ecological, and technical issues.

The Site Evaluation Committee's
authority preempts the local authority of your zoning
boards and planning boards by statute. It's
considered, sometimes referred to as a "supermarket
theory" of permitting, or "one-stop" shopping. It
provides an integrated process for the consideration of
how energy facilities and transmission lines will be
sited, constructed, and operated in the State of New
Hampshire. In essence, the State Legislature has
determined that the operation of -- well, the siting,
construction, and operation of energy facilities and
transmission lines is a statewide --

[Audio interruption.]

MR. IACOPINO: It's not me. Is a
statewide issue. So, that is what the Legislature has
provided to us and the process they have provided to
us.

Today, the Site Evaluation Committee is
made up of the folks that are up on the screen right
now. Our Chairman is the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission, Martin Honigberg; our Vice Chairman is the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Services, Thomas Burack; Robert Scott and Kathryn Bailey, who are both PUC Commissioners, sit on the Site Evaluation Committee; as does our Commissioner of the Department of Transportation, Victoria Sheehan; as does our DRED Commissioner, Department of Resources & Economic Development, Jeffrey Rose; also, the Site Evaluation Committee includes either the Commissioner of Cultural Resources or the Director of Historic Resources, and usually it's the Director of Historic Resources, and that's either -- in that case, it would be either Van McCloud or Elizabeth Muzzey. And, We have two public members, although there is a vacancy in one spot. One of our public members died a couple weeks ago, Roger Hawk. Our other public member is Patricia Weathersby. And, we have an alternate public member, Rachel Whitaker. That's the Committee.

Each member of the Committee that's a state official has the authority to substitute somebody in his or her place to sit on a subcommittee that considers either a transmission line or an energy facility before the Committee. And, in this particular
case, there has been a Subcommittee appointed, and there have been some designations made.

Chairman Honigberg will Chair this Committee, this Subcommittee. Commissioner Burack has appointed Craig Wright, who is a Department Air Resources Division Director to sit in his place on the Committee. Commissioner Bailey, from the PUC will sit. Commissioner Rose has designated the Director of Economic Development, Christopher Way, to sit in his place. And, Commissioner Sheehan has appointed William Oldenburg, from the -- Assistant Director of Project Development at the Department of Transportation to sit in her place. And, of course, our public member, Patricia Weathersby, will sit. And, also now, recently appointed, our alternate member, Rachel Whitaker, will sit on this Subcommittee as well.

So, those are the folks who will be charged with the very important obligation of determining whether or not the Certificate, as applied for, should be granted or denied.

In every case before the Site Evaluation Committee where there is an application to site or construct an energy facility or a transmission line, Counsel for the Public is appointed. He or she is
appointed by the Attorney General, and has the
obligation to represent the public in seeking to
protect the quality of the environment and in seeking
to assure an adequate supply of energy.

Counsel for the Public has all the
rights of any party. Same rights as the applicant in a
proceeding. Same rights as any party in a court of law
would have. Counsel for the Public can cross-examine
witnesses, present witnesses, present evidence, and
partake in the proceedings just as if they were a party
in a formal action.

In this case, Senior Assistant Attorney
General Peter C.L. Roth has been appointed, and he is
here, and I'm going to give the floor to him in just a
second. But there is his contact information.

So, Peter, if you'd like to introduce
yourself to the folks and tell them about your role,
what you can do.

MR. ROTH: Good evening, everybody. I'm
Peter Roth. I am a Senior Assistant Attorney General,
just like the slide said. I was appointed by the
Attorney General, Joseph Foster, in this case. I've
been appointed in this position as Counsel for the
Public in a number of other cases since approximately
2006, including the Laidlaw plant, which was built here, and the Granite Reliable Wind Farm, also in Coos County, in Dummer.

I take these engagements very seriously, and I will hire experts to analyze the evidence in this case, and to present evidence of our own about this case and about this Project. We will look at -- take a very hard look at it, and evaluate it on behalf of the public.

Now, I want everybody to understand that I do not represent any particular person or any particular organization. So, I can't provide any of you legal advice or counsel, even though my name is "Counsel for the Public".

That doesn't mean that I don't want to hear from you and that I won't listen to you; quite the contrary. I very much want to hear from everybody, and that's why I've given my direct-dial telephone number and my e-mail address. So, feel free to give me a call or send me an e-mail and let me know what you think about this. It's important to me to understand what people think. But, as I said, don't be surprised if I won't give you legal advice or counsel.

I have, in this case, already engaged
attorneys to assist me, because the scope and scale of this Project is unprecedented in New Hampshire, at least in my career. And, so, we have engaged the Primmer law firm, which has an office in Littleton and Manchester, although I think they're primarily based in Burlington, Vermont. And, with me this evening is Eli Emerson, whose office is in Littleton, although I think he lives in Vermont. Boo.

[Math]

MR. ROTH: So, his -- Eli has a great deal of utility law experience, essentially, you know, really working for the business in Vermont. But he brings those talents here for our benefit.

And, we have another attorney from the firm, Tom Pappas, who couldn't come tonight, and he's an experienced litigator. So, it's going be a very interesting and long project.

But, again, if anybody has any questions, I'll be here this evening. I'll also be around tomorrow night. You can approach me after this or during a break, or you can call me or send me an e-mail. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, Peter.
As many of you in this room probably know, there's a lot that goes on before the application ever gets to the Site Evaluation Committee, particularly in a case like this, in a docket like this, that is relatively large. And, what I've done on this slide is just sort of laid out a number of things that are undertaken by applicants and the Committee, and required, before an application can actually be filed with the Site Evaluation Committee.

Anybody who's looking to put power into the grid or to contribute to the grid through transmission, obviously, has to deal with ISO-New England, which is the independent operator who operates the electricity grid in New England.

They have to perform environmental and resource studies and address the issues that are pertinent to their application.

They have to attend -- well, if they're smart, they will attend pre-permitting meetings and meet with various state agencies and regulators to find out what the rules are.

They should meet with your regional planning commissions, your municipalities, sometimes conservation commissions, sometimes planning boards,
sometimes zoning boards, sometimes boards of selectmen.

Obviously, if you're going to build something like the wood burner up in Berlin, you would want to have a conversation with transmission companies. If you're going to transmit electricity, you're going to want to have power purchase agreements.

You've got to arrange financing. You've got to deal with the tax aspects of any particular facility.

And, finally, before an application can be filed with the Site Evaluation Committee, an applicant has to have pre-filing information sessions in each county. And, those are not run by the SEC, but by the applicant themselves. And, I understand that there was already one in this county, a pre-filing, held in this room, sometime back in September, I think. And, there was one held in each county where the transmission line would go. That's all before an application can even be filed.

The applications are -- this Application is voluminous. It's approximately 27,000 pages long. All applications before the Site Evaluation Committee must contain sufficient information to satisfy the application requirements for every state agency that
would have permitting or other regulatory authority under state or federal law. And, they have to have those application forms included in the application.

An application also has to include a number of things: It must reasonably describe in detail the type and size of each major part of the proposed project. It must identify the preferred choice and any other choice for the site of each major part of the proposed project. And, obviously, with a transmission line, which is a linear project, as we refer to them, there are a lot of different sites involved. It must describe in reasonable detail the impact of each major part of the proposed facility on the environment for every site. It must describe in detail the applicant's proposals for dealing with environmental problems. It must describe in detail the applicant's financial, technical, and managerial capabilities to undertake siting, construction, and operation of the project. It must document that notice has been given to each -- to the governing body of each community where the facility is proposed to be located. And, it must describe in reasonable detail the elements and financial assurances for a facility decommissioning plan. That is, "when the facility is no longer useful,
how is it going to be dismantled and removed?" And, finally, they must provide additional information as required by the Site Evaluation Committee.

And, as of December 15th -- December 16, 2015, the Site Evaluation Committee has new rules that have additional requirements for applications. And, this particular Applicant will be subjected to those new rules. However, under the statute, we are required to give them sufficient time to supplement their Application, if that is required. We understand that the Applicant is seeking until March 15th to supplement its Application. That's a decision that will be made by the Chairman of the Committee.

There are certain timeframes that the Site Evaluation Committee must act under by statute. The first, I spoke briefly about pre-application information sessions. Those have to be held by the applicant at least 30 days before they file their application. Once an application is filed, the application has to be distributed to each agency that has permitting or other regulatory authority. And, it has to be reviewed by the Committee itself. And, the Committee has to determine if the application is what we call "complete". "Complete" doesn't mean it's going
to be granted. It just means that it contains sufficient information for the Committee to do its job, and also sufficient information to satisfy each of the state agencies that might have jurisdiction in the case.

And, that determination had to be made within 60 days of the filing of the Application. And, in this case, on December 18th, 2015, the Site Evaluation Committee voted to deem this Application to be complete. Now, that's an important day, because all of the rest of the timeframes start on December 18th, 2015.

We already have a Subcommittee designated. I've shown you who the members of the Subcommittee are. Right now, we are, I think today is January 20th, we are in the fourth of five public information sessions, that we have to complete those within 45 days of acceptance of the Application. And, then, after this process, where the idea is to get information out to you, as the public, there will be a time for the public to speak to the Committee members themselves. And, we call those "joint public hearings". And, they will be held in each county. There will be a schedule that will be issued and
published. And, we have to complete those five proceedings before Saint Patrick's Day.

And, then, the next date that is required is any agency that has permitting or other regulatory authority has to provide the Site Evaluation Committee with any draft conditions or any draft reports that it thinks or that it is considering in imposing on their particular permits. So that there's ample opportunity for all the parties to the proceeding to consider those preliminary reports and draft conditions. And, then -- and, that's 150 days after the Application was accepted. In this case, that will be May 16th. And, then, final decisions from all the state agencies are required, in this particular case, by August 15, 2016.

Between August 15, 2016 and December 19th, 2016, the Subcommittee of the Site Evaluation Committee is required to hold adjudicative hearings. Those are hearings that are very much like a courtroom trial. There will be witnesses. Those witnesses will be cross-examined. There will be exhibits presented by all of the parties.

And, the Site Evaluation Committee will consider, at the end of the adjudicative process,
everything that they have heard in the adjudicative
process, everything that they have heard at the joint
public hearings, everything that they have read in all
of the transcripts, including the transcripts from
meetings like tonight, before they reach any final
decision in this case. That final decision has to be
determined within 365 days of the acceptance of the
Application. And, that date is December 19th, 2016.

So, those are the timeframes that the
Site Evaluation Committee will be operating under.

There are many ways for the public to
participate in the Site Evaluation Committee process.
One you've already heard a little bit about. You can
call Counsel for the Public and let him know what
concerns you may have or not have about a project.
There was an opportunity for members of the public to
speak at the pre-filing information sessions. There is
opportunity tonight to ask questions or to make a
statement, and as there will be tomorrow night in
Lincoln as well. There will be the public hearings
that will be held before Saint Patrick's Day, one in
each county. And, there will be an opportunity for
public statements at those meetings as well.

We accept written public comment
anytime. You want to write a letter and tell us how you feel about any particular project, including this one, we will accept public written comments right through until the record is closed in the case. In other words, until once the Committee starts deliberating. In fact, even tonight, if you don't -- if somebody doesn't like to speak publicly, but you would like to leave us a written comment, there is a blue form. Please fill it out and leave that comment for us. That will go into the record and will be considered by the Subcommittee.

And, finally, sort of the way to participate most fully, I guess, is by what we call "filing a motion to intervene". And, if that motion is granted, you will be provided the same rights as any other party to the proceeding. However, in order to file a motion to intervene, you must demonstrate that you have rights, duties, privileges, immunities, or other substantial interests that may be affected by the proceedings, and that your participation as a party in the proceeding will be in the interest of justice and will not impair the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceedings. In this case, any motions to intervene must be filed by February 5, 2016.
Finally, you're probably wondering what's -- "how is the Site Evaluation Committee going to make this determination?" After all of that process that I've just discussed has occurred, they will deliberate and make a determination. That will be after holding public information sessions, like tonight, after holding joint public hearings, after holding adjudicative proceedings, after considering all the written comments and the various transcripts. They will deliberate in public, as they are required to do. And, in their deliberations, they're required by statute to give due consideration to important information regarding the siting or route of a proposed facility. They have to give due consideration to the significant impacts and benefits. And, they must consider whether the issuance of a certificate will serve the purposes of RSA 162-H, which are those purposes that I showed you in the very first slide.

In addition, in order to issue a Certificate of Site and Facility, the Site Evaluation Committee must find by a preponderance of the evidence these features right here: One, that the applicant has adequate financial, technical, and managerial capability to assure that the siting, construction, and...
operation of any facility will comply with the terms and conditions of any certificate that may be granted. Number two, that the facility will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region with due consideration having been given to the views of the municipal and regional planning commissions and municipal governing bodies. And, that's where municipal input into the Site Evaluation process comes in. Third, the Site Evaluation Committee, before it can issue a Certificate of Site and Facility, must find by a preponderance of the evidence that the proposed facility will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics, historic sites, air and water quality, the natural environment, or public health and safety. And, finally, the Site Evaluation Committee, in order to issue a Certificate of Site and Facility, must find that the issuance of the certificate will serve the public interest.

Those are the criteria, by law, that the Site Evaluation Committee is to use in making its determinations.

Again, there's our website and important contact information. If, at any point in time, you'd like to see how this translates, please go on our
website, pull up a final order in any of the dockets that are on there, and you can see some examples of how the Site Evaluation Committee applies those standards and goes through the process that I've discussed here today.

   Now, at this point, we're going to allow the Applicants to make a presentation about the Project to you. And, then, we will go into the question-and-answer period, followed by the statements, public statements.

   Again, if you have a question, please write it on a green sheet. Please remember that these should be questions, not statements. If you'd like to make a written statement, but not wish to speak at the microphone, feel free to write it out on one of the blue sheets, and that will go into our record as well. And, finally, if you wish to speak here tonight, fill out one of the yellow cards, that looks like this [indicating], and we're going to call those, with one exception, for somebody who has a meeting to get to, in the order in which they have come in. Thank you.

   MR. QUINLAN: Good evening, everyone.

   [Audience interruption.]

   MR. QUINLAN: I'm Bill Quinlan. I'm the
President of Eversource New Hampshire.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Bill, can you wait a minute? I would ask, I should have done this before, I am going to ask that everybody please be courteous during the course of this meeting. New Hampshire has a reputation for courteous participation at public meetings like this. Everybody who wishes to make a statement will likely get the chance, unless we go way too late. Yelling out from the audience will neither be recorded nor will it be considered by the Site Evaluation Committee.

So, I ask you all please to be courteous. I know you will. Thank you.

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. As I was saying, I'm Bill Quinlan. I'm President of Eversource New Hampshire. I do want to thank you all for being here tonight. You know, we've, as Attorney Iacopino mentioned, had several public information sessions a few months ago, and we're in the midst of our next round. The input we're getting from many of the folks here and others has been very helpful to us as we designed our Project, and in basically shaping the Project as we move into the siting process. So, these remain important. We're continuing to listen as we
move through this important process.

What we're going to do here is we're going to use a video to kind of remind you what Northern Pass is all about. I'm going to spend a few minutes talking about Coos County, and what this Project means to this county in particular. And, then, probably most importantly, we're going to take your questions and answer them to the best of our ability.

So, first, a quick video on Northern Pass.

[Video presentation provided on the Northern Pass Project.]

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. Now, just drilling down into Coos County for a few minutes. First, from a route perspective, this is really depicting what's going on the county here. The video showed, you know, in essence, you have a project in Canada that delivers power to the border in Pittsburg, okay? So, Northern Pass picks up in Pittsburg, and then ultimately runs to Deerfield.

So, as you'll probably recall, if you've been following the Project, a couple of years ago we moved the Project from the western part of the state, over to the eastern part of the state. One of the
reasons we wanted to do that was we can go from Dixville down to Dummer in one continuous piece of property. That's the 24 miles of working forest. Okay? So, that's this area down to here [indicating].

So, we've essentially got 16 miles of new right-of-way in this entire Project. The dashed portion of this is underground. So, through Clarksville, and much of Stewartstown, underground. So, the overhead portions of new right-of-way are in Pittsburg, and then in these areas [indicating].

These red ovals are depicting areas of particular interest from a visual impact perspective. So that, in those areas, we've determined that we're going to with a more streamlined structure design, and that's intended to minimize visual impacts.

So, we've identified many of those here in Coos County. In fact, over 100 different structures, we've made the decision that we're going to use monopole structures here in this county.

A few other points of reference. You know, the average or the most common structure height throughout this portion of the route is around 85 feet. Once you get to this point [indicating], you're at an existing right-of-way. So, this entire quadrant, down
through Whitefield, there's an existing transmission right-of-way, an existing transmission line. And, we're essentially going to run Northern Pass in parallel with what's referred to now as the "Coos Loop" or the "Northern Loop". So, this is all existing, and we're running the two lines in parallel.

I'm going to come back to the Coos Loop later. Because one of the things that we're going to do, as part of this Project, is upgrade the capacity of that loop. And, I'll explain why that's important to New Hampshire.

So, 40 miles, from Pittsburg down to Dummer, are new, much of it in a working forest, 24 of it, 8 of it underground, and then 8 miles of new overhead right-of-way. Okay?

When Department of Energy took a look at the visual impact, and I know that is a significant issue, "what are the scenic impacts of" -- "what are the visual impacts of this Project?" And, as Attorney Iacopino mentioned, there is a process going on where the Department of Energy is a lead federal permitting agency. So, when they did their Environmental Impact Statement, which is now available in draft form, this was their conclusion when they looked at Northern Pass
in its totality, which is that it would essentially have a moderate impact from a visual or a scenic perspective.

Now, that was a determination they made before we committed to an additional 52 miles of underground construction in the White Mountain National Forest. So, you know, our view is, when they ultimately do their final review, their assessment of this will be lower still.

Now, we do recognize that, you know, that's one perspective. We've heard consistently in New Hampshire that we need to do more to address scenic impact/visual impact. These are some of the other techniques that we're using to locally address visual impacts. I mentioned streamlined structures, so they blend more naturally into the landscape. There are things we can do with material construction, heights, location, colors. These are all techniques that are available to us locally, and we intend to use them all as we move through this design and engineering phase. And, we understand that we need to continue to work on this very important issue. Input from municipalities, landowners, local communities, terribly important in us doing that work well.
Here's an example that I just want to show you a visual simulation. So, as part of this process and as part of our Application, we've had a series of visual simulations performed from areas of particular import. In this case, Weeks State Park. And, we have a visual simulation expert, who looks at the existing conditions, which is what you see here, and then compares it to what it will look like if Northern Pass is built the way we're currently proposing. And, what it allows us to do, first, it allows us to answer the question that everyone asks, "What is this going to look like? I need to be able to visualize it." We have an expert in the field who's preparing this. This is, in essence, you know, his work.

So, we can answer those questions, "what is it going to look like?" It also helps us as we think through the final design and engineering. You know, are there things that we can do to reduce visual impacts? This is Weeks State Park. It's in Lancaster. And, you're probably familiar with, this is East Overlook, which has been identified for us as an important viewscape. This is from a distance of, in some cases, as close as a mile, and, in other cases,
over two miles, okay?

This is the existing corridor

[indicating], right here, where the Coos Loop passes today. So, there's an existing right-of-way and an existing transmission line. Again, this is from a distance of about a mile. Okay? So, this is as existing.

Okay. If we placed Northern Pass and simulated what it would look like, that's what our experts are telling us it will look like from this critical viewscape.

Now, this is just one of dozens of viewscapes that we've had prepared. Again, the goal being --

[Audience interruption.]

MR. QUINLAN: Again, the goal being, it will allow us to answer your questions as to "what does it look like?", and for us to refine our design. Okay?

So, there's several dozen of these available in our Application. Some of them are here in the open house. If you have a particular view that you're interested in visualizing, this is a helpful tool in doing so. Again, this is the work of an expert. This is not something the Company does. Okay?
But it's terribly important work.

[Audience interruption.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Go ahead, Bill, just -- please be courteous. You don't need to yell out from the audience.

MR. QUINLAN: So, view impact we understand. We understand that's an area of continued focus. We're going to continue to work on it, hopefully, right on through the construction phase. It's something that ultimately, you know, we do at a local level, structure-by-structure, community-by-community, view-by-view. That's how we refined our design.

What else does this Project mean to Coos County? As you look at this from a tax perspective, obviously, it's a significant infrastructure project. It's approximately $1.6 billion in total, generates approximately $30 million a year in tax revenue to the State of New Hampshire. You know, a good percentage of that resides here in Coos County, somewhere between $3 and $6 million a year. The reasons for the range is that, you know, we haven't finalized our design. We don't know the true cost today on a town-by-town basis. So, we've prepared a range. As we finalize our design
and engineering in the coming weeks, this range will narrow. I will tell you, we're likely to be closer to the middle to upper portion of this range, based upon where we are today.

This is how it breaks down along the towns and municipalities here in Coos County. You'll see, for some of these municipalities, it's a very significant addition to the tax rolls. Okay?

Beyond tax benefits, view impacts. You know, the other question I've gotten repeatedly since I've been involved in the Project is, "What does this Project mean to New Hampshire? What does it mean to Coos County? Where are the benefits? Isn't this Project all about getting power to southern New England?" You know, that's something that I hear repeatedly.

We prepared, and you've probably heard of it, the ForwardNH Plan, to not only capture where the New Hampshire benefits are associated with the Project, but also it's a framework within which we've added benefits. I'm just going to touch upon some of those that pertain to Coos County.

Obviously, lower energy costs are critically important to residential customers,
businesses statewide, and, for that matter, across New England. One of the big selling points for Northern Pass, it has a very dramatic impact on stabilizing energy costs and lowering them. Okay? That's also true with taxes. I've talked about taxes.

The video mentioned the "ForwardNH Fund". That's the commitment we've made, it's sizable, in my view, which is a $200 million commitment to a fund that we intend to invest locally, exclusively in communities along the route. We're going to put a particular focus on the North Country and here in Coos County. So, you know, that's something we've identified when we rolled out this concept. We're firmly committed to doing that. We've got four focus areas. And, community input has been already important to determine what are the initiatives we're going to try to fund through this. These investments are at a community level, and really are intended to make a difference in the communities hosting the line. so, that's an example of a benefit we've added. That's going to have particular relevance here in Coos County.

Another one I'll touch upon, jobs. When we introduced the ForwardNH approach and plan, we also made a "New Hampshire first" commitment. And, we are
imposing that on all of our major contractors. So, while we are lining up national firms to do some of the work, the engineering, the general contracting, etcetera, the commitment we've made to New Hampshire, and particularly relevant here in the North Country, is, to the extent possible, we're going to source all of the work associated with this Project locally in the State of New Hampshire. Whether it's electrical workers who are installing the line or other construction and trades, or supporting the building of the facility, whether it's, you know, clearing roads, delivering gravel. You name it, we're going to source it locally. And, we're going to impose that commitment on all of our contractors in this regard.

As we started to vet this here in the North Country, I think this is an area where we're going to rely very heavily on local labor and local resources. There's a lot of talent, a lot of capability in this region. So, we expect to be able to deliver some very significant benefits to contractors and others here in the North Country. Okay?

Another thing that's particular in the North Country, announced a little while ago, it's now up and running, is a North Country Job Creation Fund.
These are funds that we've committed. We've established a board here in the North Country that is independent from our company. And, they're going to manage that fund, and fund initiatives here in the North Country to stimulate the economy and create jobs. They have already had some very good success in 2015. Look forward to more in 2016.

I'm not going to dwell on the environmental benefits. But, before I go there, you know, the video did mention "$3.8 billion". When you do the math on these economic benefits across New Hampshire, it's approximately $4 billion worth of economic benefits, direct economic benefits that will reside here in New Hampshire. So, that's the answer to the question "what's in it for New Hampshire?" Four billion dollars of economic benefits.

These are the environmental benefits which aren't quantified up above. Obviously, a significant reduction in greenhouse gases and carbon emissions. Here, in the North Country, we've made a commitment to use 5,000 acres of properties that we own and put them to mixed uses here in the North Country, in part economic development, perhaps some preservation, some recreational. But we're going to
look to folks here in Coos County to decide how best to use those properties. And, right now, we're envisioning a mixed use, where these lands aren't simply being preserved, but they're being used for purposes that are important to the county.

This last one is the one I alluded to earlier, which is the Coos Loop upgrade. You know, for decades, we've had an issue with a transmission system that is basically at capacity. It was built long ago, it hasn't been upgraded significantly in a couple of decades. And, more and more renewable generators, whether it's wind power, biomass facilities, hydropower, has been tied into that so-called "Coos Loop", to the point where that transmission infrastructure is at capacity.

On any given day, under certain system conditions, some of that generation cannot run, because the loop is inadequate. It can't carry all that capacity to market. Which is unfortunate. You know, we've got a lot of great renewable energy potential here in the North Country, and it's being constrained by the transmission system.

You know, because we're running parallel to the Coos Loop in that area that I identified
earlier, we are going to use this as an opportunity to upgrade the loop, and basically unlock a lot of that potential. I know that's important to many here in Coos County. I think it, obviously, helps us as a state reach our clean energy goals. It also is important to, you know, our existing biomass plants. You know, I heard reference earlier to the Burgess Biomass Plant. That's a plant that has been built, it's operational. You want it to run just as much as it can. It's an important economic driver here in the North Country. We intend to unlock it, so that transmission does not constrain that power from getting to market. Okay? And, the same is true with hydro plants and wind power opportunities here in the North Country.

So, that's another specific area we haven't quantified what the economic benefit of that is to the North Country. So, these numbers here, when I say "$4 billion", they're probably on the conservative side. We're doing a lot locally that's going to drive, not only Coos County benefits, but benefits to New Hampshire and the rest of New England. Okay?

So, with that brief overview, hopefully, you have a little better perspective on this Project or
on Coos County, what it means. And, we look forward to
your questions. So, thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, there's a lot of them, so I'm not sure we'll be looking
forward to them by the time we get to the end.

And along that line, the first set of
questions is directed to the Site Evaluation Committee,
and the first one's actually -- I will answer it.

"Will the moderator please ensure that
questions are answered directly and succinctly?"

The answer is yes. Mr. Quinlan, I'm
going to ask that you and your staff please answer the
questions directly and succinctly.

And will I -- "Will the moderator please
ensure that the expert answering the question is
interrupted if they're not answering the question
asked?"

The answer is no. Usually if somebody's
answering the question, I'm going to allow them to
finish their answer. And the record will speak to
whether or not they answered the question or not. That
record is reviewed by the Site Evaluation Committee.

The next question for the Site
Evaluation Committee is, "How can the Site Evaluation
Committee countenance towers and still meet the obligation of preserving environmental values according to R.S.A. 162-H?"

I can't answer that question because I can't -- I don't know what the evidence is in the case, and I don't sit on the Site Evaluation Committee. Each member of the Site Evaluation Committee is entrusted with that obligation and that responsibility, and they will carry out that responsibility.

"Coos County has once again been labeled 'the poorest county in the state.' Will the Site Evaluation Committee consider this in their process? We need jobs that will keep the people from leaving."

Yes, the Site Evaluation Committee will consider the environmental -- I'm sorry -- the economic consequences, the orderly development of the region, and all of those issues that I went through at the end of my presentation. And I invite everybody to take a look at previous decisions from the Site Evaluation Committee on our web site, and you'll see examples of how they go about doing that. And if you want to see examples each way, by the way, you can find examples of where they've granted certificates and where they've denied certificates.
This next question, I guess, is to me. "Once you have accepted payment to represent Northern Pass in any capacity, don't you then give up your rights to speak as a private citizen at meetings? It seems that once you accept payment of any sort, you are an employee and can no longer speak as a private citizen. Please clarify."

Everybody, even employees of Eversource, have First Amendment rights and have the right to speak at these proceedings just as any other member of the public does. So, no, they don't give up their rights. Somebody doesn't give up their rights to speak their mind due to their employment.

Okay. This next question is about intervening. "If you don't bring up an issue in your letter requesting intervenor status, can it be brought up later as possible new information comes forward?"

There is a process in our rules and in the statute whereby you can file a request to intervene late. I would recommend that you look at the rules and at the statutes in order to do that. I can't give legal advice to folks here, but there is a process, if you're late, to request intervention status. However, our intervention deadline has not yet passed; it's
February 5th. So if anybody were to file between now and then, it'd still be on time and you don't have to worry about that.

Next question is, "How many proposed utility projects have not received approval from the Site Evaluation Committee over the past 10 years? What criteria were key factors in denying projects?"

The Antrim Wind Project filed in 2014 was denied a certificate. The key factor -- there were several factors in that, but the key one, or at least the one that got reported the most, was the concern about aesthetics of those particular wind towers. There have been no other applications for certificates that have been denied; however, jurisdiction has been denied in a couple of cases, which essentially meant the end of the project. There was a proposed wind facility, called "Timbertop," which went off the table because the Site Evaluation Committee would not take jurisdiction. There's also the Wild Meadows Wind Project that was proposed, that the Site Evaluation Committee did not accept their application because they didn't think it was complete, and that project never came back to the Site Evaluation Committee either.

"Does the Site Evaluation Committee feel..."
that HVDC towers and wires above the trees are aesthetically okay for New Hampshire residents?"

That's a determination that the Site Evaluation Committee will make based upon the individual circumstances in each docket, including this one.

"How can the SEC move forward when there's litigation pending regarding rights-of-way?"

Rights-of-way in that litigation involve the individual -- rights of individual citizens, and those rights are determined in courts of law. The Site Evaluation Committee -- there's no impediment to the Site Evaluation Committee moving forward unless we receive an order from a court telling us that we cannot do so.

"Why should" -- okay. The next question is really about taxes, so we're going to put that in the Economic pile.

Next question is about the SEC process as well. "After the SEC reaches their decision of the siting of this project, can their decision be challenged by the Applicant?"

Yes, and it can be challenged by Counsel for the Public. It can be challenged by any intervenor.
or any other person who has what lawyers call "standing" in the proceeding; in other words, they have an interest in the proceeding.

This next question involves the SEC, and it involves a project that I think was from the late 1980s. I'm not quite sure of the dates, but...

"Looking at the Site Evaluation Committee web site on past projects when transmission lines were changed from 80-foot to towers of 115 feet from Monroe to Ayer, Mass. -- specifically, Warren, New Hampshire -- the Site Evaluation Committee found no problem with these tall towers. Does this mean the Site Evaluation Committee views these towers as aesthetically pleasing?" And then the questioner quotes I think from that particular decision. "We find that the aesthetic impacts of the proposed Phase II facility will be minimal and would not have an unreasonable adverse effect."

The answer to the question is that the Site Evaluation Committee will determine whether or not there is an unreasonable adverse impact on aesthetics after they consider all of the evidence in this docket. Because they approved a certain tower height in another docket on another project does not mean that they are
bound to do the same thing in this particular case.

Okay. This next question is from an abutter. "There is a parcel of land that abuts the existing substation located in Deerfield. A large portion of this property is also in Nottingham. As I am a" -- "As an abutting community, and since Nottingham is likely to have similar concerns as Deerfield regarding the proposed expansion of the substation as it relates to issues such as emergency response, homeland security, noise, lighting, et cetera, how would I locate the rules and procedures for properly notifying landowners and municipalities to ensure that Nottingham has been properly noticed?"

It's the same as I went over in the presentation. Municipalities can move to intervene in these proceedings. They should do so by February 5th. If Nottingham, its select board or planning board, or whoever the municipal governing body is, determines that they want to intervene, they would file a motion just like anybody else. And there are rules. Those rules are on our web site. I can't quote them for you. I believe it's 301.11 is the rule for intervention. You should also look at R.S.A. 541-A, Section 32, which involves intervention in administrative proceedings.
This next questioner has a number of questions, two of which appear to relate to the SEC process, and the rest of them I'm just going to put under the questions with regard to burial of the Project.

The first one is, "How will the SEC eliminate the economic injustice created by the adjudicatory nature of its proceedings? As it stands now, the immense disparity in financial and legal resources between the Applicant and intervenors completely perverts the process. Can the Public Counsel order expert testimony on behalf of the public? Can the Public Counsel order as much expert testimony of the same quality as that submitted by the Applicant?"

The questions are really about what can Public Counsel do. I'll remind you that the statutory process is created by the legislature. It's not created -- the Site Evaluation Committee did not create this process; the legislature did. So the legislature apparently determined that it was a just process. Counsel for the Public has all the same rights as a party in any formal proceeding. He can hire witnesses, and he will make a determination as to the quality of the witnesses that he chooses to hire. And I'm sure he
will hire good ones. He always has. And Counsel for
the Public routinely hires expert witnesses in
applications for certificates of site and facility.

The next one is, "Two former members of
the Site Evaluation Committee, Tom Getz and Dana
Bisbee, are now representing Northern Pass. They both
served on the SEC with present member Kathryn Bailey,
and Mr. Getz served also with present member Martin
Honigberg. How is the public to maintain faith in the
objectivity of the Site Evaluation Committee given this
situation?"

I'm not sure whether these -- whether
Mr. Getz or Mr. Bisbee ever served with Chairman
Honigberg, and I'm not sure whether they sat on a
committee with Commissioner Bailey. But the question,
how is the public to maintain faith in the objectivity,
is they have the sworn duty to carry out this as part
of their job. It's been given to them by the
legislature. It's the same way that you can rely in
good faith on our public servants, whether it be folks
who issue air permits, wetlands permits, whether it's
your state representatives in Concord. The Site
Evaluation Committee has worked very hard, and they
know when they're allowed to speak and when they're not
allowed to speak and who they're allowed to speak with.

Next question is for me. "Why at these informational meetings do you have only the Project proponent with you at the podium and allowed to make a video presentation? Clearly, the Project proponent is going to only present one point of view, and many other claims have already been discredited. This does not provide" --

(Court Reporter interrupts.)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry.

"This does not provide complete public information. There are other well-informed groups that should have been invited to provide alternative views and information and videos. Is the SEC not interested in these alternate views and information? Does the SEC not consider it important to provide a well-rounded set of information to the public in these public information sessions?"

The reason why the Applicant is permitted at these proceedings to make a presentation to you is because the legislature has deemed that that's the appropriate way for these public information sessions to be held. They're specifically required to under the statute. It's not a determination whether
anybody is correct or incorrect. It's not a -- it has nothing to do with the correctness or incorrectness of any other organization or any person with a different view. It's a public information session where information is supposed to be provided to the public, and the Applicant is required to do that. Any organization, if they have a view on this, can participate in many of the same ways that I went through in the presentation, including and up to moving to intervene, where they will participate in the adjudicatory phase of the proceedings.

Okay. I think that's all the questions I had for the Site Evaluation Committee.

MS. MONROE: Where do you want to start?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Let's start with the route 'cause there's --

MS. MONROE: Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- a lot. And by the way, just so everybody knows, we have over 30 people who have signed up to speak tonight. So I am going to ask, again, Mr. Quinlan, that the answers be direct and as succinct as possible.

So these questions are generally about the route. The first one is, "What is expected" --
"What is the expected life span of the towers?"

MR. QUINLAN: The transmission infrastructure is a long-lived asset. From an accounting perspective, it's a 40-year life. Typically, transmission infrastructures last much longer than that. Could be 60 or 70 years.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next questions involve the decommissioning.

"What numbers has Northern Pass stated in its Application for the time required to remove the towers and restore the land to good views and sound conservation, for the cost of removal and restoration, for any jobs that might be filled by local labor? How will the cost be allocated among the various parties? Who are the various parties that will provide payment?"

Those are all -- that's three, five questions basically about your decommissioning.

MR. QUINLAN: So, just at a high level, just so we're clear, this is a commitment we've made long ago, and we continue to honor it, which is that neither the construction of this project nor its ultimate decommissioning will be paid for by New Hampshire customers, okay. So there are a series of agreements between us and our partner, Hydro-Quebec,
that provide the funding for the Project, including the
decommissioning. But in both cases, New Hampshire
customers won't bear any of that cost.

Mr. Bowes is our Vice-president of
Engineering. Do you want to add something or --

MR. BOWES: I think there was some
questions about how resources would be allocated at the
end of 60 or 70 years. That would be determined at the
end of life, not at this point in time.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The other
question was, do you have an idea how long it would
take to remove the towers?

MR. BOWES: Sure. It would be probably
a few days for each site to actually physically remove
the structure, and then there'd be remediation done for
the foundation areas. So, over the course of probably
three to four weeks at each location.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And then
the other question, Mr. Quinlan, was about if jobs
would be filled by local labor for decommissioning.

MR. QUINLAN: We've not determined how
we would source the decommissioning. Now, our
anticipation is that, you know, that's a decision we'll
make 50 or 60 years from now. Our commitments around
using local labor are for construction purposes. Although, you know, I suspect, particularly here in the North Country, there's plenty of demolition contractors who can help play a role in that ultimate decommissioning process. It would make sense to look there first. But that's something we wouldn't decide for a number of decades.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next question involves a specific point along the route. "What will Transition Station No. 5 in Bethlehem look like, including the types of structures, their size and foundation? And please provide information about the size of the lay-down and staging areas, construction time and the extent of blasting."

MR. QUINLAN: I'm going to defer that question to Sam Johnson. Sam is with Burns & McDonnell. They are doing the engineering design work around the project. There's a lot of questions there, and for us to be succinct is going to be challenging, but we'll try.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Please do your best.

MR. QUINLAN: Go ahead.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. We'll start with
the transition station in Bethlehem. Typically these are --

(Court Reporter interrupts.)

MR. JOHNSON: Oh. Typically, these transition stations are about 200 by 300 feet in a square-type profile. There will be an A-frame structure which a take-off conductor will go to the overhead portion and a transition down to the underground section will occur within this fence line. It'll be a fairly typical substation type of look with a fence and a gravel surface around the equipment. There will be screening around each of these properties, not only in Bethlehem. But all of the transition stations will provide some screening from a visual perspective.

Lay-down areas was the next question?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes.

Lay-down areas and then construction time and blasting.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Lay-down areas will actually be dependent on where they are. They will most likely range from 2 acres to upwards of 5 to 10 acres. It really depends on the site conditions of where they're located and the type of property they are. For instance, if it's an old warehouse that we're
using for indoor storage, it could be upwards of a
100,000 square feet type of facility. And they will be
interspersed throughout the project area. Obviously,
when you start with the material, the closer you can
get it to the actual construction site, the better it
is from a transportation perspective.

And what was the last?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Blasting.

MR. JOHNSON: Blasting is permitted by
law within the state, as long as you comply with the
appropriate blasting protocols. And we do plan on
blasting in certain locations where we do find hard
rock. This is the Granite State for a reason. But
that will be governed by the appropriate authoritative
responsibility and done by the appropriate permitted
contractors.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.
The next two questions involve the route as well and
the height of the poles along the route. They both
kind of say the same thing. So, basically, these
questioners are asking -- they're making statements,
but they're asking whether or not -- well, I'll just
read one of them, and the other one's pretty much the
same.
"The proposal to erect 120-plus-foot towers down the entire length of the state is simply preposterous to New Hampshire residents. These giant towers are required due to the high voltage proposed for this line. Would Eversource consider a lower voltage wire which would have lower negative impacts on New Hampshire and still deliver benefits to the New England grid?"

The other question is very similar, except they asked: Do you think it is right for creating this ugly scar through the town of Stark?

MR. JOHNSON: I'll speak to the heights of structures. Heights of structures are typically determined by two things: One, as was mentioned in the question, is the voltage of the lines. The voltage of the lines were chosen based on an exhaustive study of economics of the Project, and basically what made sense from a delivery perspective. And that's how we ended up with originally 1200 and then in the end 1090 megawatts.

The height of the structures, while they're governed by the National Electric Safety Code, they are also governed by topography and right-of-way width. So when we discuss our average height for our
DC structures being in the -- around 85 feet, 80 to
85 feet, that is really based on the national code.
Certain heights of other structures are determined by
topography and/or river crossings and road crossings
where the spans have to be somewhat taller or
lengthier.

And sorry. Missed one of the questions.
Oh, the right-of-way.

So, in certain areas there are
constraints within the right-of-way, meaning that there
are other structures or other transmission lines
located within a right-of-way. And so we may have to
go vertical in a configuration in certain circumstances
which would require the structures to be somewhat
higher.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next
question is about the Coos Loop. "How would building
the so-called 'Coos Loop' in Coos be assisted or not
assisted by building the Northern Pass line?"

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. So, as part of the
rebuild within the Coos Loop, we will be rebuilding the
existing 115 line, and that is the structures that we
just discussed in Stark, for example. Because those
structures were built many, many years ago, we're going
to replace them with a more robust system, meaning the electrical capacity of the lines will be increased. That's how this -- and we'll connect it into the substation eventually in Dummer. This will allow increased capacity to get out because we're replacing the existing line with a larger conductor.

MR. QUINLAN: By "larger conductor," it's a larger-diameter wire with a greater capacity to carry electric energy.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "What are the federal regulations protecting the White Mountain Forest" -- "pertaining to preservation of the forest? Why can Northern Pass be permitted to go through the White Mountain Forest?"

So, as the video indicated, we've made the determination to, in essence, bypass the White Mountain National Forest with underground construction. Now, there is an existing transmission right-of-way through the White Mountain National Forest and an existing 115kV transmission line through the White Mountain National Forest. That was our previous design was to run these lines in parallel. As we announced late this summer, based upon feedback we received from New Hampshire, we've decided to have all that be
underground, bypassing the forest, Franconia Notch, the Appalachian Trail. These were all areas identified to us as being important. That resulted in the Project being reduced in size by almost 20 percent and added several hundred million dollars of cost. And we've made that decision based upon feedback from sessions such as this and others.

Anything to add?

MR. BOWES: It is still subject to all permitting, though.

MR. QUINLAN: Sure, but it will be underground in the public way; so, essentially along the state highway system.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next questions are somewhat similar, so I'll lay them all out there for you.

The first one is, "Please explain why Eversource is constructing lines and putting poles along Route 145 in the Clarksville- Stewartstown area."

And then the second part of that question is, "If Northern Pass is approved, are there plans to use these specific lines to transmit energy from Hydro-Quebec?"

And then the next question asks, "The
The proposed route goes through the Forest Society, Kauffman Forest and Nash Stream State Forest, along with others. What is the purpose of these conservation lands if your company can propose building ugly metal towers through these conservation properties?"

So, those all involve specific places along the route.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. So --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Clarks-ville, Stewartstown, Nash Stream, the Forest Society, Kauffman Forest.

MR. JOHNSON: All right. So, addressing the Route 145 in Clarksville, the Project actually transitions to the underground portion, being the 7-1/2-mile underground portion just to the west of Route 145, and it will actually go across Route 145 underground and then continue south at that point. So the actual crossing of Route 145 is underground.

The second question regarding SPNHF and the two state forests that they note, the existing rights-of-way go through both of these properties, and therefore we have the easement rights to put additional structures in these properties and to do improvements within this right-of-way, and therefore, we have the
rights to build our project.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question is about the route as well. "Your proposed route parallels an existing HVDC route from Monroe to Ayer, Massachusetts. Why don't you use this existing route?"

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, our route actually does not parallel that. We did look at that corridor as one of our possibilities. However, that corridor is basically built out to its maximum, and we could not use that due to space constraints.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question is --

MR. QUINLAN: But it is worth noting, however, that there are existing transmission infrastructure to essentially do what Northern Pass is intending to do, which is to allow for the importation of large amounts of clean and renewable hydropower. There's the line that was just referred to, and then there's actually a second line that runs through Vermont. This would be the third such line.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The next question about the route. "If the New Hampshire Department of Transportation does not see it necessary
to complete this Project, why should we?" And, "Can the public see your proposal to the Department of Transportation?"

Just from the Site Evaluation Committee's standpoint, the entire Application except for some limited parts subject to a confidentiality request right now is available, including the applications to the DOT, I believe.

So I don't know if you have anything to add to that answer.

MR. QUINLAN: I don't.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. "Who will supply the cables, transfer stations, converter stations, and will the supplier supervise construction?"

MR. QUINLAN: We have not announced either our major contractors or equipment suppliers. However, we are, as we move into this next phase of planning, basically in negotiations with all of the above, the major contractors, equipment suppliers. And we do anticipate in the coming weeks being in a position to announce how this project is going to move forward and to whom are we looking for key pieces of equipment. We are not in a position to do so now.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Is it your common practice to have your -- to have the supplier supervise your construction?

MR. QUINLAN: The equipment supplier, not typically. For large transmission projects, likely we will hire a nationally-known general contractor, who's really on the construction side. The equipment suppliers tend to be specialists in their given area, whether it's cable or converter technology. They don't typically oversee construction.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next question about the route is, "Why was Franklin chosen to be the site of the conversation" -- "converter station? Was it to be a jump-off point to run power lines west to Vermont?"

MR. JOHNSON: No. Actually, we did study a wide variety of sites all up and down that corridor between Franklin and Deerfield. There were two particular constraints: One, we had to have a site that was big enough and a willing landowner that was willing to sell us property. And thirdly, I guess -- so, three items -- a community that was willing to host us. And Franklin certainly has been a very gracious host to this point.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next question has a number of questions, and so I saved it for last with the respect to the route because some of the questions go into burial. So we'll go right into burial of the line as part of this.

"What is the number, average height, height range and type of tower planned for your Coos Loop upgrade? Given the concerns expressed for visual impact, why hasn't this information, along with visual impact studies and simulations, been provided to the public?"

MR. JOHNSON: As far as the information being provided, it is part of our application. It is in all of the drawings that have been provided and the maps for where each of the structure locations will be. I'm going off the top of my head here, so I'm going to be close, but I believe that our structure heights in the Coos Loop will range from 60 feet to 130 feet, depending where you are. And again, that's constrained by either topography or by the amount of items that are already within the right-of-way.

MR. QUINLAN: So, just we're clear, this question is pertaining to the Loop itself or Northern Pass?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yeah, this questioner has other questions about other parts of the Northern Pass and the route. But that is -- I read that question as being with respect to the Coos Loop, the upgrade.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Upgrade.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

MR. QUINLAN: I just wanted to be clear.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question. "Since the Northern Pass proposed an above-ground route from Bethlehem to Northumberland" -- I'm sorry. I missed a word.

"Since the Northern Pass proposed above-ground route from Bethlehem to Northumberland was acquired, and in at least one location taken by eminent domain in order to meet the reasonable requirements of service to the public for one or more 115kV transmission lines, how does Northern Pass plan to justify siting a 345kV line not needed for the public good on this right-of-way?"

I don't know -- do you know what right-of-way --

MR. QUINLAN: I think that's really a legal question. As our lawyers have looked at our
existing property rights, they're confident that we have the legal rights to use those existing properties, which, again, this is an area where there's an existing right-of-way and existing transmission infrastructure for the purpose that we're proposing.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question is similar and you might have a similar answer. "How does Northern Pass plan to get around the fact that fiber optic cable is not permitted in the majority of the right-of-way easements, yet is necessary for running HVDC lines?"

MR. QUINLAN: Sam or Ken?

MR. BOWES: My understanding is that communications and control equipment is integral to the design of the HVDC line, and it's not intended for public use, but only for protection of the circuit itself.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This one is sort of out of order, but we might as well take it now so I don't lose it.

"Please explain clearly the relationship between Northern Pass, Eversource and Hydro-Quebec."

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. Northern Pass, LLC is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Eversource, and there
is a -- there are a series of contracts between
Northern Pass Transmission Company and our partner,
Hydro-Quebec. In essence, Hydro-Quebec is responsible
for building the portion of this line that's in Canada,
and they will also be the supply of power and
especially delivery to the border. Northern Pass will
then take it down from Pittsburg to Deerfield.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: There is
one historical question here I'm just going to skip
until we get to those. We're now into burial, okay,
burial of the lines.

"The Transportation Act, administered by
Federal Highways, includes a section properly
identified as 'Section 4(f)' that directs Federal
Highways and its designees to examine project
alternatives and select the feasible and prudent
project alternative that avoids impact to cultural
resources found under the Section 106 process. Doesn't
burial under I-93 and other roads" -- I'm sorry.
"Wouldn't burial under I-93 and other roads be much
less likely to impact cultural resources found
significant under the Section 106 process, as well as
all other resources, such as properties eligible for
listing on the Register of Historical Places which are
not eligible for consideration under the Section 106 process?"

MR. QUINLAN: As to the I-93 alternative, you know, as we've looked at that, we determined it not to be "feasible." We recently filed the basis for that with the Department of Energy. So our position on that is clear. We don't think it's a viable alternative.

As to the Section 106 process, maybe Lee Carbonneau or Mark, would you spend a moment?

MS. WIDELL: Sure.


MS. WIDELL: Good evening. Cherilyn Widell. I'm with Widell Preservation Services.

Yes, underground federal undertaking related to 4(f) would definitely be subject to Section 106, regardless of where it was.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Actually, could you answer the question of whether burial under I-93 is less likely to impact cultural resources?

MS. WIDELL: Not necessarily, because there may be cultural resources that were identified and protected through that process. So, it depends.
It really does depend.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And this next one I'm going to take is because it's on this. Actually, why don't you come back up. We'll do the historic resource questions.

"In what towns are you considering cultural landscapes as part of your historical review?"

MS. WIDELL: Northern Pass has prepared a Historic Property Assessment Report, which is posted on our web site. And in that report, absolutely cultural resources, cultural landscapes, rural historic districts, even traditional cultural properties were all part of the survey process.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Stay here because Ms. Monroe just handed me another one right up your alley here.

"SEC review includes identifying and analyzing the Project's impact on historic and cultural resources. These places may be individual structures or large landscapes, and setting and views can be included. What historic and cultural data will be used by the Project..." I can't read the word. "What is its scope and availability to the public, and how will the Site Evaluation Committee process intersect or not with..."
the federal Section 106 process? Seeking clarity, as answers at previous sessions have seemed to evolve."

Do you understand the question? Want me to repeat it?

MS. WIDELL: Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The questioner first states, "SEC review includes identifying and analyzing the Project's impact on historic and cultural resources, including individual structures and large landscapes, and settings and view can be included. What historic and cultural data will be used by the Project..." I can't read that word, but I assume used by the Project in its application? What is its scope and availability to the public, and how will the SEC process and the 106 process intersect?

MS. WIDELL: As I had mentioned, I would encourage -- if you're interested in the scope and detailed information about historic and cultural resources, the Historic Property Assessment Report was completed by Preservation Company and myself. It is very detailed, complete. And the scope of it includes, as I stated, cultural landscapes. Traditional cultural properties were considered and then were identified. Rural historic districts, single properties, view
sheds. That is posted on the web site and available for you to take a look at. There is a data base that includes 1248 properties constructed prior to 1968 and detailed information on 194 of those properties that were found likely to be eligible for the national register. And that is the criteria that is used in an adverse effect which is related to application of that Section 106.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Section 106 and Site Evaluation -- I think I can answer that. The Site Evaluation Committee is required to consider whether or not the Project will have an unreasonable adverse effect on aesthetics and historic sites. We go through our process to make that determination. We are lucky that there is also a Section 106 process that goes on federally because we get the benefit of that process in almost every docket that we have. Sometimes the Section 106 process goes for a longer period of time than the Site Evaluation Committee process. If a certificate is granted, it is often the case that, if the Section 106 process is still going on, that a condition of any certificate is continued cooperation in the Section 106 process and following up with any mitigation that may be required by that process. So
that's how they intersect. It's two different agencies. The 106 is effectuated by the lead federal agency, and the determination by the Site Evaluation Committee is made by the Site Evaluation Committee. However, a lot of the information that is considered is from both processes, at least at the Site Evaluation Committee. I can't speak for the federal lead agency. So we oftentimes see 106 documents and evidence in our Site Evaluation Committee proceedings. Ultimately, the Site Evaluation Committee will make its determination as to whether or not there is an unreasonable adverse impact on historic sites and aesthetics.

Next question. Again, I just want to -- there's a lot of questions on here. This one doesn't really have to do with historic sites.

MS. WIDELL: Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I don't even know if -- "Mr. Getz, a former member of the Site Evaluation Committee, and now employed by Northern Pass, wrote in his resume for the Devine Millimet Law Firm, 'Most recently I played a key role in efforts to revise the statutes and rules governing the siting of energy facilities in New Hampshire.'" And the question is, does this refer to the recent rules revision
referred to by myself in my presentation on the SEC? I don't know the answer to that question.

Do you know the answer?

MR. QUINLAN: I don't.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Moving on.

More questions about the burial. And again, this is an example of really more of a statement than a question. But since the questioner asked, I'll ask it of you.

"If the Eversource experts we have here tonight were blessed with a 2016 newborn grandchild, and their son or daughter now lived adjacent to the proposed route, would the expert Eversource grandparents propose the route to be above ground or below ground?"

Experts?

MR. BOWES: I would prefer overhead transmission line for Northern Pass.

[Audience interruption]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: If I could just say something to the crowd. This is the type of question that is really not meant to get information, okay. It's meant to try to embarrass people. I'm going to ask it, but, you know, it really doesn't move the ball.
[Audience member interrupts.]  

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Go ahead, folks, if you'd like to answer. You don't have to if you don't want to. But if you'd like to --

MR. HODGDON: I have power lines in front of my house. Most people do. Doesn't bother me.

[Audience member interrupts.]  

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Have a seat. This is not time for statements, sir. Please sit down.

"Could you explain any potential benefits that could be provided to the economically challenged Coos County from requiring burying the line only in the most critical areas?"

MR. QUINLAN: Can you repeat that question?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Could you please explain any potential benefits that could be provided to the economically challenged Coos County from requiring the burying of the line only in the most critical areas?"

MR. QUINLAN: So I think I alluded to the balance that we've been trying to strike earlier. You know, we've made a commitment to 60 miles of
underground construction. That was based upon feedback from across New Hampshire as to -- you know, and that was consistent -- where the areas were where we should really focus our limited ability to go underground. If you get to the point where you're trying to justify a fully underground project, it adds about a billion dollars to this project. In our view, it becomes an uneconomic project. At that point, the benefits that we talked about earlier, the roughly $4 billion worth of benefits to state of New Hampshire, don't materialize. So we've been trying to strike a balance between a project that works economically and addresses the most critical view impacts, and it's largely been based upon feedback from across the state of New Hampshire.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next two questions are very similar. The first one is, "Is it possible to bury the line all the way?"

And the second one is, "Why don't you spend the extra money and bury bigger cable, and then in 10 or 20 years you will not have to upgrade to handle more watts."

So, is it possible to bury the whole line and --
MR. QUINLAN: It's technically possible to bury the entire line, all right. It is technically possible to do that.

[Audience interruption]

MR. QUINLAN: Is it a balance that allows the Project to move forward for those benefits to New Hampshire to materialize? In our view, it doesn't because the cost becomes prohibitive. You know, as to, you know, could we have continued with a 1200-megawatt project with the amount of underground construction that we've committed to? The answer is no. When we made the decision to have 60 miles of underground construction, there is no cable in service in this world at 1200 megawatts for that distance of underground construction. So we necessarily had to reduce the size of the Project to 1,090 megawatts to allow the amount of underground construction that we've committed to. And even at that level, it's going to be the longest HVDC underground construction in North America when it's in service. So, in our view, we've struck the appropriate balance between a project that works financially, protects the critical view impacts, and technically uses equipment that we know is going to be reliable when put into service.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Would spending the money now to bury the cables create a better view aesthetically forever?"

MR. QUINLAN: Just so we're clear, the additional billion dollars, in our view, makes the Project not economic. So the benefits that we talk about don't materialize. The question of what are the impacts of full burial depends on where you bury it. Some of the initial feedback we've gotten, you know, "just bury it in your existing right-of-way," when we looked at the environmental impacts of burying this line through the corridor that we currently occupy, they're massive if you think about blasting your way through that existing transmission corridor and attempting to bury this line. While the view impacts ultimately may be less, the environmental impact is significantly greater than what we're proposing. So, again, we're trying to strike an appropriate balance.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Please explain in specific terms what you mean by "uneconomic" when you say you cannot bury the whole line? Do you mean, A) if you bury the whole thing, the Project would not break even; B) Eversource has a profit threshold below which it will not go, and if so, what is it; and
C) is it something else?

MR. QUINLAN: The additional cost of underground construction is approximately a billion dollars if this would be underground from beginning to end. We, along with our partners, are not prepared to move forward with the Project that costs an additional billion dollars. In our view, it doesn't make sense financially.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next one: My family has worked for all three grand hotels between Whitefield and Dixville. Why would you pick an area with three grand hotels and not bury the line in that area?

MR. QUINLAN: So the areas that we've selected for burial are based upon feedback we received from across New Hampshire. So when we started to consider additional underground construction, we spent a lot of time across this state getting feedback as to what are the areas that we should really be focused on. Almost universally we heard about the White Mountain National Forest, Franconia Notch, the Appalachian Trail. That's why we selected that area for underground construction.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. I
may not be able to read all these questions, but there's a number of questions here. One of them you've already answered is, Why not bury the ground -- bury the entire line?

The next one is, "Where else in the United States, Canada or Western Europe has a similar project of overhead DC lines combined with underground lines of both types..." I don't -- "through both rural and residential neighborhoods been constructed and implemented?" In other words, is there a project that closely parallels from which experience with post-construction problems can be studied?

MR. QUINLAN: Either Ken or Sam.

MR. JOHNSON: As alluded to earlier, the 60 miles of underground will end up being the longest installed cable in North America. There are a few AC cables that have been installed. I know of one in Connecticut. There's a couple in California. There are also undersea cables of a similar type of technology as we're using today. Obviously, they don't have the same characteristics of land use as we do on this project here. Typically, because of the expense of these projects, undersea cable is the only use of this type of DC technology.
MR. BOWES: So I'm familiar with an AC project that is similar in size and scope to this and was approximately $2 billion. It occurred in the state of Connecticut. It had 36 miles of underground 345kV AC; about 60 miles or less of overhead 345kV AC; 33 total circuit miles, so, 138kV submarine cable; and 22 miles of 115kV underground cable. So the size and scope was similar in cost. It had a transition station as this DC project does. It had some, I'd say, advanced technology. And in this case, the Connecticut project, the stat com was at one of the terminals, similar to the technology of a converter station. This was a project that was completed by, at the time they were Northeast Utilities, now Eversource Energy, and it was completed on schedule and under budget.

MR. QUINLAN: And just on the reliability issue, it has been in service for over a decade at this point.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Why have you not considered going underground through the Pondicherry Wildlife Refuge if you don't plan to bring" -- "if you don't plan to bury it everywhere?"

Pondicherry Wildlife Refuge, why aren't you burying it through that particular --
MR. QUINLAN: So, again, the area that we've committed to underground construction was based upon what I'll call "statewide feedback." That's why we selected the area in and around the White Mountain National Forest.

Sam, as far as the Pontachuck -- can you repeat the area?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The Pondicherry Wildlife Refuge. Pondicherry, P-O-N-D-I-C-H-E-R-R-Y.

MR. QUINLAN: Lee?

MS. CARBONNEAU: Hello, I'm Lee Carbonneau with Normandeau Associates. There is an existing transmission line through Pondicherry already. The Pondicherry area is relative to the portion of the White Mountains where the underground is going, and it's much flatter. It is less likely to be visible from the trails that are commonly used, and it's well on the northwest edge of Pondicherry. It doesn't go through the ponds or over those wetlands that are so famous for breeding birds and activities from visitors. So it's much less of a visual impact than what you would find in the overhead route through the White Mountain National Forest.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And the final question on this sheet goes back to the Coos Loop. "Why haven't you upgraded the Coos Loop in the past if it has been inadequate for two decades? Isn't that your responsibility with or without Northern Pass?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, in essence, what's caused the capacity situation on the Coos Loop are the number of generators that have interconnected on the Loop. Typically, it becomes the generator's responsibility to fund upgrades to existing transmission infrastructure. In this case, the generators who have interconnected with the Loop have found it to be cost-prohibitive to fund those upgrades. So we're now in a situation where the capacity is constrained. You know, the studies that have been done historically have put a very big price tag on the cost of that upgrade, and no generator has been willing to pay for it. So this is an opportunity for us, as part of this Project, to address that issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This question states, "The Massachusetts governor has actively expressed interest in purchasing hydropower from Canada; New Hampshire has not. As a publicly
regulated utility, would Eversource work with the citizens of New Hampshire on an option to bring hydropower from Canada into the New England grid south from the Connecticut River along I-93 and along I-91, or an alternate underground route from the Canadian border to that point?"

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So the Project that we proposed obviously terminates in Deerfield, New Hampshire, which is essentially the interconnection point between this line with the New England grid. We've selected that endpoint because it's a very robust portion of the regional electric grid. There's very few system upgrades required in and around that Deerfield substation to allow this amount of power to flow onto the grid and then across New Hampshire. So we consciously picked that delivery point because of its design characteristics. We think it's kind of the optimal location for the termination of this Project.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Also -- I'm sorry. Did you want to --

MR. QUINLAN: Was there anything either of the two of you would add?

(No verbal response)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This next
question deals with the Coos Loop as well.

"Volume 1 of your ForwardNH Plan Public Interest Bullet No. 2 states, 'No cost to New Hampshire customers. All costs of siting and constructing Northern Pass will be paid by the Project, at no cost to New Hampshire customers.' At Bullet No. 6, Coos Loop Transmission Upgrade, it states as a project benefit, 'A transmission upgrade of the Coos Loop which will relieve existing constraints and unlock up to 100 megawatts of renewable generation.' Is it correct that Eversource guarantees here, based on this plan that's been filed with the SEC, that Eversource or its affiliates will not in the future come before the PUC or go to New Hampshire ratepayers for any of these proposed upgrade costs to the Coos Loop transmission upgrade as listed in Bullet 6 if the Northern Pass Project is permitted?"

MR. QUINLAN: Based upon the current scope of work that we're anticipating for the Coos Loop, it's our intention not to go to the Public Utilities Commission for cost recovery. That will be funded through the Project in the agreements that we alluded to earlier.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And I
assume you're talking about Bullet No. 6 that the
questioner is --

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. Currently planned
upgrades will not be passed on to New Hampshire
customers.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next
question. I'm sorry. Next question is, "What
arrangements, if any, does Northern Pass or its
affiliates have with Bayroot-Wagner on using their
lands for the Northern Pass right-of-way in the North
country in return for upgrading the Coos Loop or
other?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, Sam, you want to
handle that question?

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. The two are not
linked at all. We have an agreement with Bayroot to
establish a new right-of-way approximately 24 miles
through their property, and that lease arrangement is
part of our property rights. The upgrade of the Coos
Loop is independent of the Bayroot property.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next
question involves the ForwardNH Plan as well.

(Court Reporter interrupts.)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry.
"Volume 1, Bullet No. 3, Power Purchase Agreement. 'As described above, the PPA will permit'" -- and this is a quote from your Bullet No. 3. "'As described above, the PPA will permit delivery to New Hampshire of approximately 100 megawatts of firm, on-peak, renewable hydroelectric power, together with the potential environmental attributes and will provide greater price stability at estimated customer cost savings totalling $100 million over 20 years.' Since the Application uses the term 'firm,' which is Northern Pass's word choice to describe this arrangement, can you provide documentation to justify that such an agreement exists, or is this another attempt to mislead the public as to how certain the deal and terms actually are?"

MR. QUINLAN: So the agreement that exists has been executed as between us and the supplier of the power, Hydro-Quebec, in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding. The term that's referred to has to do with "firmness" of the power, meaning, you know, what exactly is Hydro-Quebec's commitment. And it is a "firm commitment," meaning it is financially available to Public Service of New Hampshire, now Eversource New Hampshire, during the hours required, okay. So it's
a -- you know, in wholesale marketing parlance, it's financially firm.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "In hearings last week, you stated that full burial using the I-93 corridor was impossible, in part because no party to the Franconia Notch Interstate Settlement would permit such use. Have you had a conversation with all of the principals to that settlement? Have you made a similar official request with New Hampshire Department of Transportation to use the I-93 corridor for burial option; if so, with whom and what were the responses?"

MR. QUINLAN: Can you introduce yourself?

MR. HODGDON: Yes. My name is Mark Hodgdon. I'm a private attorney in Concord, consulting with Northern Pass on highway permitting issues for their underground sections primarily. For 24 years I was in the attorney general's office, and I represented DOT prior to going out on my own.

Can you repeat the question, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, I can. "Last week you stated that full burial using the I-93 corridor was impossible, in part because no party to
the Franconia Notch Interstate Settlement would permit such a use. Have you ever requested a conversation with all the principals to that settlement? Have you made a similar official request with New Hampshire Department of Transportation to use I-93 corridor for burial option; if so, when, with whom, and what were the responses?"

MR. HODGDON: Well, at the outset, I disagree with the premise of the question. I think it actually mischaracterizes what I said. But regardless of that, the fact of -- the Franconia Notch Parkway was built under a federal court consent decree back in the 1980s, and there are numerous signatories to it, including the Appalachian Mountain Club and the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, among others. And that agreement specifically prohibits any further construction or any additional lanes within the Franconia Notch area. Now, that is one barrier to going through the Franconia Notch Parkway. The other aspect of it is Franconia Notch is incredibly environmentally sensitive, which is what led to that agreement. And Franconia Notch is also very culturally sensitive in New Hampshire. It is, after all, the place where we get our identity. And that's why the
Franconia Notch Parkway is unique, or at least at the
time, and I believe it still is, was very unique in the
nation. That's why it's not a full interstate design.
When you go through it, you'll notice that it goes down
to one lane in each direction, barely divided by a few
feet --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. Mr.
Hodgdon, though, have you ever requested a conversation
with all of the principals --

[Audience interruption]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Please be
courteous.

-- with all of the principals to that
settlement agreement?

MR. HODGDON: The answer to that is no,
we have not requested a conversation. One of the
signators has already filed suit against us for other
underground sections. And we do know DOT's position on
that, and we have had discussions with DOT regarding
both 93 and Franconia Notch.

Just by way of background, DOT put in a
guardrail in between those two lanes that I mentioned
back in the early 1990s. I was, in part, involved in
that process. And that took an incredible amount of
effort, and years of effort by many people in the North Country to get it done. And that wasn't easy. DOT has no desire to open up that project for a non-safety agreement.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And the second question is about the rest of the I-93 corridor. Have you made a similar request to the Department of Transportation regarding the I-93 corridor? I assume that means beyond Franconia Notch.

MR. HODGDON: Right, I assume.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And if so, with whom, and what was the response?

MR. HODGDON: We have had conversations with NHDOT for going on three years, at least -- I couldn't tell you exactly -- over what they would look for in an application and what they would require and what they prefer. And they made it clear they preferred us using other -- or applying for other roads rather than I-93 at the beginning, and so that's what we started looking at is alternatives to I-93, which is how we came up with the present proposal.

And just keep in mind, the DOT's policy on using I-93 or any freeway or any interstate for new underground facilities is summed up in one sentence,
and that is in their Utility Accommodation Manual, which says that longitudinal, meaning along the highway, installations are not permitted within the limited access right-of-way lines parallel to either the through road or its ramps. That's their policy. It's one sentence. The Commissioner can grant exceptions to that if there is an extreme hardship, and part of the extreme hardship criteria is you have to show you have no other viable alternatives. And our Application shows we do have viable alternatives. From our perspective, we can't meet the criteria. And from DOT's perspective, we can't meet their criteria.

And also keep in mind, that even if the Commissioner granted an exception, that exception can't be granted for the median or the roadway itself. It would be granted outside the roadway in the disturbed areas, and that means we'd be building -- and we can't access it from the road, so we'd be building an access road parallel to I-93 along the fence line. And I think the environmental impacts there would be extreme.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question is regarding the same thing. "Would you use the I-93 corridor for full burial if the appropriate parties did not object?"
MR. QUINLAN: Yeah, let me answer this.

You know, as I mentioned earlier, we have filed recently with the Department of Energy a full explanation as to why the I-93 corridor is not feasible. You know, I think all of these questions could be answered by reading that explanation.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Well, maybe this one can. You tell us, Mr. Quinlan.

"Last week at public hearings, Northern Pass stated that the cost of burying the Project would be an additional $1 billion plus. Will you make public, in sufficient detail, the documentation that you used to reach that conclusion?"

MR. QUINLAN: So it's a fairly simple exercise, but we think it's accurate. You know, we look at the incremental costs per mile of underground construction. It's in the $5- to $10 million per mile. That's now based upon cost estimates that we've gotten by the folks who are actually going to build this line, as well as some of the experience that Mr. Bowes referred to. So we've got experience. The folks who are actually building this and are going to commit to building it for a particular price have given us bids. We know what the cost per mile is for underground
construction. It's taking that range and applying it to the current overhead portion. That's how you arrive at the approximately $1 billion number.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "If Northern Pass were able to use the I-93 corridor for a full burial project, would Eversource achieve the same payback from Hydro-Quebec compared with the proposed corridor? If so, or if not, what would the payoff difference be?"

MR. QUINLAN: Hypothetically, the Project would result in a larger return. Why? Because it's an additional $1 billion worth of investment. It's the investment that triggers the return to Eversource. So, a more costly project results in larger returns, all other things being equal.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And "Since Hydro-Quebec is a partner in Northern Pass LLC, a party to this" --

MR. QUINLAN: Could you repeat that?

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Since Hydro-Quebec is a partner" -- and if you don't agree with what this says, you just have to tell them.

"Since Hydro-Quebec is a partner in Northern Pass, LLC, a party to this Application before
the Site Evaluation Committee and this evening's public
hearing, this question is to Hydro-Quebec. What
consideration and conversations has Hydro-Quebec had
with the TDI New England Clean Power Link, if any, to
use their just-approved buried transmission line in
Vermont, and can you provide specifics?"

MR. QUINLAN: So I think the underlying
premise of the question is not accurate. Hydro-Quebec
is not a partner in Northern Pass Transmission, LLC.
That is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Eversource. And
as to, you know, what conversations Hydro-Quebec may
have had with other projects, I'm not privy to those.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And the
last question on this sheet is, "Can you specifically
state why the North Country's scenic value is not of
sufficient value to the residents of this region of the
state, and the tourists that will visit it and make up
the mainstay of this region's economy, to not propose
burying the Project in the North Country?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, you know, as I said at
the outset, we are continuing to focus on the scenic
and view impacts across this entire route. We selected
the areas that we did for underground construction
based upon feedback we've gotten from many different
stakeholders across the state. Universally they pointed us in that direction.

We are also doing things here in Coos County. I mentioned we moved the entire line to the east into that Wagner Forest, which allowed us to put 24 miles of this segment, in essence, in an area being routinely timbered. That was intended to mitigate view impacts. I mentioned some of the other things we're doing around design, structure and location. We do have 8 miles of underground construction here in the North Country. So we are focused on mitigating view impacts not only in Coos County, but across the entirety of the route. Again, ultimately we have to strike a balance that results in a project that can move forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I think we've hit most of the burial questions. The next set of questions, and there's a lot of them, deal with the general areas of economic, and this includes various things from taxes to --

MR. QUINLAN: Sure.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Biomass power plants are really important to the local economy here. Will this power up in Canada hurt our local
energy resources and have negative impact on the
logging industry in Coos County?"

MR. QUINLAN: Short answer is no. You
know, if you look at the regional energy supply mix
over the next 5 or 10 years, you've got thousands of
megawatts of existing generation, whether it's
coal-fired, oil-fired, nuclear plants that have either
retired already or have announced their intention to
retire, all of that needs to be replaced. Northern
Pass is going to -- it's a large supply, but it's only
going to replace a fraction of what is actually
retiring. We are going to need to look to other
sources to replace the balance of it if we're going to
keep prices low. Obviously, a portion of that will be
natural gas-fired power plants. But there's plenty of
opportunity for small-scale renewables and, in
particular, biomass to help fill the energy supply
needs of the future. I think here in the North Country
we've tried to propose a project that furthers
small-scale renewables, including biomass. I mentioned
the Coos Loop upgrade. That's specifically designed to
unlock that potential. Those plants that currently
exist and are constrained, including Burgess Biomass
here in Berlin, you know, shouldn't be constrained in
the future as a result of transmission limitations. So we think these are complementary. There's certainly a role for large-scale hydro and plenty of opportunity for small-scale renewables going forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question is, "In Coos County, a new right-of-way through the working forest will be created. Will New Hampshire loggers and companies be engaged for this, or will the contracts go to out-of-state workers and companies?"

MR. QUINLAN: So this is a great example of local opportunities that I expect will be fully sourced locally. Certainly there's expertise here in the North Country around logging. So when we're clearing new rights-of-way, whether it's for, you know, this portion of the route or for a lay-down area or a transition station, I fully expect we're going to source those locally. Based upon kind of preliminary feedback we've gotten from large contractors, they're very pleased with the level of support they can source locally. In all instances, you know, it's best if we put local folks to work on this project. That's our intention, particularly in this critical area.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next
question is, "Please explain the impact" -- and if you've done this, just say so.

MR. QUINLAN: Yeah.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Please explain the impact of multiple power plants that will be closing in New England in the next few years."

MR. QUINLAN: I think I did touch upon that. But, you know, just to frame that out, so if you look at all of New England, roughly 32,000 megawatts of generation existing, approximately a quarter of it, 8,000 megawatts, has either retired or announced its intention to retire. Northern Pass is a little over a thousand megawatts. So if you think about 8,000 megawatts going away, we'll replace around an eighth of that. You know, and that's my point: There's plenty of opportunity for other sources of energy to help fill that void, including some of the ones we're referring to here, where there's real opportunity in the North Country, whether it's biomass or otherwise.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Do you consider the Coos Loop an asset belonging to Eversource New Hampshire or to the ratepayers, and is the proposed upgrade of the Coos Loop an investment in Eversource infrastructure?"
MR. QUINLAN: So I think, you know, as to the second question, it's clearly an investment in existing Eversource infrastructure. As Mr. Johnson indicated, we're going to take our existing line, and we're going to reconductor it and going to make it a more robust transmission segment with larger conductors. So it's clearly an investment in our infrastructure.

As to, you know, legal ownership of that infrastructure, these are investments that, with Coos Loop, they were made by Public Service of New Hampshire on behalf of customers, all in furtherance of our delivery of reliable transmission service to the area. So they are technically and legally assets of Eversource and they certainly deliver benefits to our customers in the region and they'll certainly be upgraded as part of the Project.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This is a two-part question. You probably already answered the first part, but... "What does Northern Pass say it" -- "Why does Northern Pass say it is uneconomic to bury the lines?" And No. 2 is, "Will Northern Pass expenses be included in electricity costs?"

MR. QUINLAN: So when we look at a
billion dollars of additional costs for no additional capacity, we don't believe it's an economic project. Ultimately, someone has to pay for this infrastructure. It will not be New Hampshire customers, but others will pay for it. And there comes a point where the benefits to those others are exceeded by the costs. We think an additional billion dollars with no additional capacity makes it an uneconomic project. Again, we've already added several hundred million dollars of costs and reduced the original project size by about 20 percent based upon feedback from New Hampshire, and an additional billion dollars pushes us over the tipping point.

And what was the second point? I'm sorry.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh, hold on. "Will Northern Pass expenses will be included in electricity costs?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, Northern Pass's expenses, which are expenses of continued operation once in service, will be collected through the agreements I was referring to with Hydro-Quebec. They will not be borne by New Hampshire customers.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The
next three questions at least have to deal with property tax issues. The first one is: "You are distributing sheets titled "Illustration of Northern Pass Transmission Local Property Tax Payments" for various towns. Are the figures in the columns that are headed as "Illustrative Value of Northern Pass Transmission" and "Illustrative Tax Payment Range", are those quotes on your sheets", that's your informational sheets I guess they're talking about, "based on current tax values or on your projected figures resulting from suing towns for lower assessments?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, I'm going to introduce Lisa Shapiro. So, she can provide the background and answer your questions.

MS. SHAPIRO: My name is Lisa Shapiro. And, to answer that question specifically, it was based on kind of midpoint of the estimated costs of the Project projected for the community, and then using a two and a half percent depreciation rate each year, because that's one of the methods for taxation and for what is fair market value.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. "Why should towns that have underground get any additional money?"
MR. QUINLAN: So, if what you're referring to is the ForwardNH Fund, I think I said that at the outset, you know, we are putting a particular emphasis on the North Country with respect to the ForwardNH Fund. Again, that's a $200 million fund that we are establishing really to drive community benefit. You know, we are going to focus a substantial percentage of that right here in Coos County, and in the other areas along the route where the construction is largely overhead.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Actually, there's more than three questions about that. So, I'll keep going on the taxes.

"For the many, many us whose property abuts the right-of-way and who stands to lose thousands of dollars of equity in our houses, should the towns" -- "should the towers be constructed in view of our homes, what recourse do we have? I know that I, for one, can't afford to lose upwards of $20,000 in the value of my house, and I'm sure many others are in the same position."

MR. QUINLAN: So, we've conducted an extensive amount of outreach to abutting landowners up and down the route. I think we've had over 3,000 touch
points thus far. So, we're continuing to have discussion with adjacent landowners.

I would refer that questioner to Sam Johnson. He's probably the right intake point for that question. He's overseeing, among other things, the outreach. So, if there's specific questions that need to be answered, I think that's probably the single most efficient way.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: So, if that questioner has --

MR. QUINLAN: And, that's a general --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, where can they reach Mr. Johnson? Is he here? Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. QUINLAN: He's right here.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. QUINLAN: Maybe during a break, come up and introduce yourself.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: So that, do you mind if he discusses a specific property?

MR. JOHNSON: Otherwise, -- I can, to some. Otherwise, the 1-800 number or the e-mail hotline gets funneled directly to me. And, so, I will
get it through there as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Do Northern Pass and Eversource agree with the towns about tax liability before the project is built?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, we've published these illustrative ranges, as I said earlier. As the final Project design and engineering takes place, those ranges will tighten. We'll have more detail as to, you know, what exact infrastructure is going to be located in each town, how much does it cost. So, the range will narrow. And, one of the things that we have communicated to municipalities is that we are willing to make commitments around that tax range, assuming the municipality is willing to consider kind of the industry-accepted practice for valuing utility property, which is the one Mrs. Shapiro described, referred to as kind of the "net book value approach", where you, you know, you put the plan -- the asset in service based upon the value of it, and you depreciate it over a long period of time, which is 40 years. It's kind of the industry-accepted practice, and that's a methodology we are certainly comfortable with and willing to commit to with municipalities.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, there
was a second question on here, I probably should have asked it initially. But, assuming that the answer to
the first question that you don't make the agreements beforehand with the Town, "will you change your process
so that there is an agreement that will avoid lawsuits that Eversource currently has against New Hampshire
towns?" I assume they mean "tax abatement suits".

MR. QUINLAN: Right. And just, in those
instances where we are seeking an abatement of property
taxes, it's because a municipality has chosen an
approach that's not consistent with this net book value
methodology. And, it results in a tax burden that's
significantly greater than this methodology. You know,
this is, in essence, a pass-through for Eversource.
Our tax burden is ultimately passed onto our customers
and ratepayers. We have an obligation to ensure that
the taxes imposed on our infrastructure are reasonable
and appropriate. We don't seek abatement if the
customary methodology and accepted methodology is
applied. It's only when we face a tax burden which is
significantly higher than that.

You know, as I said, we are willing to
talk to municipalities about an agreed upon
methodology, either before construction, during
construction, or after the Project is put in service, when we have actual construction costs. We are open to those discussions, and we're actually having them with several municipalities.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. And, I think this is the last question about "tax abatements". Again, referencing your abatement process: "Why should we believe Eversource on anything about tax revenue to towns when you are in court to reduce your current tax liabilities?"

MR. QUINLAN: Again, I think the response I just gave to the prior question hopefully answers that. We are not seeking abatement when the industry-accepted methodology is used. We're only seeking an abatement in instances where a different methodology is used and the taxes borne ultimately by our customers are unreasonably high.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Question for Mr. Quinlan: Your estimate of economic benefits to New Hampshire is focused one-sided on the supposed benefits of Northern Pass. What are the net economic impacts, taking into account the negative impacts, including loss of tourism, loss of investment, loss of property values and wealth, and associated loss of jobs..."
and GDP. Will Northern Pass actually create a positive net impact?"

MR. QUINLAN: We believe so. We believe the $4 billion of economic benefits is a conservative estimate, could be far greater than that, based upon other projects of similar size in other states.

You know, as far as tourism and property values, you know, these are issues that we're also focusing on. And, I think our Application does seek to address them. And, we are continuing to look for opportunities to minimize those, those impacts.

But, overall, we're very comfortable with the estimate that I showed you earlier, which is approaching $4 billion of economic benefit.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "For Mr. Quinlan: How many permanent jobs do you plan to add to New Hampshire, beyond the construction phase? Please be as specific as possible."

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, you know, one of the things that we have announced is an apprenticeship program. We've launched that in collaboration with the IBEW. The purpose of that program is to essentially train the electrical workers of the future. You know, my hope and expectation is
that, through projects like Northern Pass and Northern Pass, we're going to use that as the opportunity to create job opportunities for folks interested in that highly-skilled trade.

Ultimately, I do hope to hire a number of those folks as permanent employees of Eversource New Hampshire. What the exact number is? I'm not in a position to estimate that today. But we've got our first apprentice class up and running. I think we've got 15 apprentices. We hope to be launching a second class early this year. As we move forward with construction at -- with Northern Pass, I think those classes and those opportunities are going to grow significantly.

Perhaps, Lisa, you want to talk about the jobs impact and what the overall estimate looks like?

MS. SHAPIRO: Sure. Once the permitting, once the Project will be operational, there's a number of different avenues that would drive permanent jobs. Mr. Quinlan just talked about the direct, in terms of the apprentice program. But, first and foremost is the reduction in energy costs. Energy costs are a big drag for manufacturers in this state.
We've lost a lot of manufacturing jobs. It's a big issue that you hear about a lot. And, you can see that that's affected the jobs in that area.

So, the $80 million estimated reduction in electricity cost leads to job growth, both in the business sector, as they're able to invest and expand and keep their production, as well as in consumer spending and reallocated to other places in the state.

There also is about a three and a half million dollar annual operating cost, and that will be spent locally as well. And, Mr. Quinlan also talked about the $200 million ForwardNH Fund. So, one way to look at that is an additional $10 million a year spent locally, and that will also generate additional jobs. So, the permanent jobs estimates is kind of building up from those different areas, and we're looking at hundreds of jobs a year.

MR. QUINLAN: And, just to wrap that up, the numbers I was sharing in the apprenticeship, those are permanent positions within Eversource. We employee currently about 1,500 employees here in the State of New Hampshire. And, you know, we expect the apprentice program to be a feeder to permanent positions in our company. What Ms. Shapiro are referring to are the
permanent jobs outside of Eversource, and now you're into hundreds of jobs across New Hampshire, a good percentage here in the North Country.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The next question has to do with the agreement to purchase -- I'm sorry, your agreement with Hydro-Quebec: "Is the Memorandum of Agreement the only formal PPA agreement currently signed between Hydro-Quebec and Eversource, and, if so, how confident can New Hampshire residents be in Eversource's promises of lower taxes, lower rates, and community funding and jobs?"

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, the Memorandum of Understanding will be converted into a power purchase agreement, a PPA. There is another existing agreement that's signed with Hydro-Quebec. It's referred to as the "Transmission Support Agreement". That agreement is not only signed, it's been approved by FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. So, many of the benefits you're referring to there occur as a result of the Transmission Support Agreement, which, as I said, is fully executed, has been approved by the federal government, and is in effect today.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This next
question has to do with your economic analysis. And, it's a question that you're going to hear a lot. "Why is an important analysis of economic costs and benefits limited to one page, which is marked "confidential"?"

I think they're talking about Exhibit -- or, Appendix 43.

MR. QUINLAN: Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That was a discussion in a previous meeting.

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, there is a very detailed expert report which quantifies all of the economic benefits we're referring to. Looks at energy cost savings, looks at jobs being created, it looks at GDP effects. Much of that analysis is proprietary to the preparer, which is London Economics Group. So, things that are in there are like their projection of the future cost of natural gas in the region, their projection of power purchase prices in the region. All of these key assumptions are highly proprietary and sensitive to that expert.

Competitors of theirs would love to have access to, you know, "What does London Economics think the forward price of natural gas would be?" So, it is the expert and the sensitive nature of their
information that's resulted in it being, you know, sought protective treatment for. It's highly sensitive to them.

And, I think, you know, the SEC will have full access to that report, and all the underlying assumptions and analyses.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next question is: "If the project is needed, why did Northern Pass file it as a non-reliability project, instead of a reliability project? Is the reason that Northern Pass filed as a non-reliability line because the Company will generate a higher return on equity or profits under such a classification during the 40-year term of the line?"

I guess, start off with "why is it a non-reliability versus a reliability?", and then address the economics.

MR. BOWES: The simple answer is is it doesn't qualify under the ISO-New England guidelines as a reliability project.

MR. QUINLAN: ISO-New England being the regional grid operator. So, for our Project to qualify as a "reliability project", it, in essence, is required to keep the lights on. That is not the case with
Northern Pass. While it's an important new supply of energy into the region, it's going to help replace some of the generation that's retiring, today it's not required to keep the lights on.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, the other part of that question dealt with the economics of it. If it were a -- I guess the easiest way to summarize the question, is "what's more profitable to your Company, a reliability project or a non-reliability project?

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. In both instances, the return on equity will be -- has to be approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: So, would they be the same, whether it's a reliability or a non-reliability project?

MR. BOWES: I mean, the rate of return for the distribution company in New Hampshire, the transmission company in New Hampshire, and Northern Pass likely will all be different. One may not be -- Northern Pass may not necessarily be any higher than the transmission tariff rate.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, is that -- you have to go before a regulatory agency to
MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, the regulatory agency, again, transmission is, you know, energy transmitted in interstate commerce, it's jurisdictional to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. They will look at whatever rate is determined, both for reliability and non-reliability projects, and ensure that they're reasonable.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next two questions deal with the Bayroot property up in northern New Hampshire: "Can you explain in detail the relationship between Northern Pass and Bayroot, LLC, as it relates to future wind development on lands owned by Bayroot? And, will Northern Pass make public the lease agreement between Northern Pass and Bayroot, so that the public can understand whether the agreement is in the public interest?"

MR. JOHNSON: The agreement that we have with Bayroot does not have anything to do with future wind expansion. Again, that's an independent project, or set of projects, separate in whatever deal Bayroot does with whatever entity is independent from Northern Pass.

The second part?
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, "will Northern Pass make the lease agreement between Northern Pass and Bayroot public?"

MR. QUINLAN: Does anyone on the team know?

MR. JOHNSON: I'm sorry, I don't know the answer to that.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: If you don't know, that's the answer.

MS. Maldonado: We can check on that on the break, we can try to give an answer.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You're expecting a break?

[Laughter.] 

MR. JOHNSON: We will --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The answer is, they don't know. They're going to try to check and get the answer for us.

Next question starts off: "Expected savings of $80 million", what dollar amount" -- "what is the dollar amount", I assume he means the savings, "on my monthly $100 electric bill?"

MR. QUINLAN: If you look at all customers, you know, across New Hampshire, and I'll say
across New England, because the $80 million is only 10 percent of the total savings. You know, that's roughly New Hampshire's load share of all New England load, it's about 5 percent. Whether you're a residential customer or a business customer, on average, it's 5 percent. That's for all of New Hampshire, and you can look at, in essence, all of New England as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: So, that would be $5.00 on a $100 bill?

MR. QUINLAN: Roughly.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "1,090" --

MR. QUINLAN: I will say, just to add, you know, across New England, it's a $800 million a year energy cost savings. So, you know, 5 percent across New England is a big number.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "1,090 megawatts: How many go to New Hampshire residents, to Massachusetts residents, to Connecticut residents, Rhode Island residents, etcetera? And, who decides on how much goes to who?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, the Memorandum of Understanding I alluded to earlier reserves approximately 10 percent of that 1,090 megawatts for
New Hampshire. So, we have a commitment for 10 percent. That's roughly our load share for all of New England. The balance of it is not committed at this point. So, none of those other states, nor New Hampshire, have locked in any additional supply. So, to the extent New Hampshire is willing and interested in increasing the amount procured for New Hampshire, you know, I'm certain Hydro-Quebec would be willing to entertain that.

But, right now, the only committed portion is the 10 percent under the anticipated power purchase agreement with Eversource New Hampshire.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This next question addresses that 10 percent as well: "In previous sessions hosted by Northern Pass, representatives have asserted that they have no way of knowing in which direction power flows over transmission lines or what the source of the power is. Can you explain how the 10 percent of hydropower which Northern Pass asserts will be available to New Hampshire residents would be made available to New Hampshire residents, and if it can be allocated to New Hampshire, why would it not simply displace other (possibly lower priced) energy sources?"
MR. QUINLAN: So, you know, electrically, all of the power gets delivered to Deerfield, New Hampshire. So, all 1,090 megawatts is delivered into the regional grid in Deerfield, New Hampshire. At that point, it flows along the existing lines based upon system conditions.

Financially, Eversource New Hampshire customers will get the benefit for 10 percent of that. If we're interested in more, we can certainly pursue additional supply from Hydro-Quebec.

And, what's happening, you know, to drive down energy costs? Essentially, what you've got is the way the wholesale market works today is customers across New England demand a certain level of supply. Every hour the grid operator looks at that demand, and they stack up generation sources until the supply reaches the demand, equals the demand. When they get to that point, that last generation asset sets the price for all of the lower cost assets below it. Okay?

If you take Northern Pass, and you put that in to that bid stack, 1,090 megawatts of higher cost, generally carbon-emitting, generation falls out of the bid stack every hour. That's what drives the
economic benefit, is you are displacing higher cost, carbon-emitting supplies, whether it's coal, oil, natural gas. Those tend to be the plants that are on the margin. Nuclear power, hydropower, wind power, biomass, it's all in the bid stack down here [indicating]. What's on the margin are fossil fuel plants. So, that's what gets displaced, and that's what drives the regional benefit.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Ever-source's application states that the Northern Pass Transmission will recover the costs of constructing the Project from Hydro Renewable Energy, Inc., an indirect, wholly-owned U.S. subsidiary of Hydro-Quebec. Is it accurate to state that the entire or majority of the cost of construction of the proposed 192-mile line is being paid for by Hydro-Quebec?"

And, that's the question. "Is it accurate to state that the entire or a majority of the cost of construction of the proposed 192-mile line is being paid for by Hydro-Quebec?"

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, either directly, or indirectly, that's true. It will not be borne by New Hampshire customers. Okay?

So, you know, we mention, you know,
southern New England, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, they are currently soliciting a large amount of clean energy. Northern Pass will likely participate in that solicitation. So, that potentially could be a funding source. So, there's going to be a combination, potentially, of funding sources. Ultimately, our relationships, our agreements are with Hydro-Quebec, and it flows through that Transmission Support Agreement that I alluded to earlier.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. This is an economic question, but I'm not sure if you can answer it.

"How can a reduction in the overall production here in America contribute to economic growth and stability? Won't the outsourcing of production reduce overall gross domestic product? What type of legislation does the United States have in place to safeguard the monopolization of American energy markets? Would Hydro-Quebec be willing to partner with the U.S. and perform profit-sharing as the Alaskan oil industry has done?"

MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, you know, if you look at New England, and what are the -- where are the sources of baseload power to replace the retiring
nuclear plants, coal plants, and oil plants? You know, there are very few viable options for New England. You know, we can build more natural gas plants with domestic production. But we are already in excess of 50 percent dependent on natural gas for New England's energy supply. So, you know, we are losing what -- something that, you know, energy planners have long valued, which is supply diversity. We are highly dependent on natural gas for generating electricity now.

Today, it looks good. Gas prices are low, you see it at the pump. Natural gas prices are low, therefore, electric prices are. You know, it tends to be a volatile commodity for the price and supplywise, and we are becoming very dependent on it.

We're not going to build any new nuclear plants any time soon, I suspect, in New England. Coal and oil also not viable.

You know, there's virtually no other baseload options other than large-scale hydro imports. We can use small-scale renewables, wind and solar, but those are intermittent. They're not going to replace a baseload supply.

So, from a production perspective, we
really need to, you know, figure out the answer. How do we rebuild those supplies for the plants that are retiring? In my view, it's going to be a combination of natural gas, large-scale hydro imports, and then a growing dependence on renewables that are intermittent, solar and wind.

You know, as far as, I guess, the cross-border importation of hydro. You know, if you look at the Obama Administration Clean Power Plan, and look at our -- how does this country, how does this region meet its clean energy goals in the future? For the first time, in the recently released plan by EPA, they put a very heavy emphasis on hydro imports from Canada. It's the only way this country meets its clean energy goals. So, is there -- you know, there's certainly a federal recognition of the important part that this supply could play in the energy mix.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. We're going to move on to some environmental questions, public health and safety, wildlife. First one is: "People in Massachusetts and southern New Hampshire are hearing radio ads saying that Eversource is "bringing hydropower" and green energy to those areas. What transmission lines are those ads referring to? And, is
there any chance that those ads partially refer to the Northern Pass?"

MR. QUINLAN: I suspect they do. Those ads are referring to Northern Pass. You know, it's clearly our intention to bring a large amount of clean energy into the region to meet our clean energy and other objectives. You know, as I say, the only commitments thus far have been from New Hampshire, in the form of the Memorandum of Understanding that we were talking about earlier.

But I do expect Massachusetts to have an interest in this power supply. You know, Massachusetts is a state with very aggressive clean energy goals. Pilgrim Nuclear Station just announced its retirement. So, it's a non-emitting source, a large source that's going away. You know, unless they rely on imported hydro, you know, they're going to be going in the wrong direction, because it's going to be replaced by natural gas. Or, they're going to run coal and oil more regularly.

So, I do expect Massachusetts to have an interest in the supply. You know, I alluded to the Clean Energy RFP, there are key participants in that. Northern Pass is the ideal project for helping to meet
those needs as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Speaking of what direction you're going in, "If Northern Pass is supposed to deliver power to New England, why is it a bi-directional line as described in the FERC agreement?"

MR. BOWES: Technology allows for actually precise control, unlike an AC connection. So, the DC power can be delivered to New England, or it could also be delivered to Hydro-Quebec.

I'm aware of one occasion in the last decade where New England actually delivered power to Hydro-Quebec. I believe that occurred in December of 2014, where they ran into an emergency situation surrounding Montreal. And, for a period of a few hours, we actually exported power to help Hydro-Quebec and the City of Montreal get through a potential reliability issue.

So, again, this is not a "reliability project", but it will have some ancillary benefits to Hydro-Quebec as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr. Quinlan, "Transmission cables are now proposed for the length of Lake Champlain. Why can't you put
transmission cables down in the Connecticut River?"

MR. JOHNSON: The Connecticut River is a non-navigable waterway, which means that it's not deep enough to allow for boats or any kind of traffic. There are certain requirements of minimum depths that must be met for the safe operation and the installation of undersea or underwater cables in this sense. So, the Connecticut River is not a viable option as a route.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The next question is about a specific abutter, but I think it's a pretty important issue that probably you're going to get a lot of questions about as you go forward.

"If this HVDC line happens, I will be an abutter. My home is in Stewartstown and would be very close to a transition area where the line will come from underground to towers. The tower and transition area will be on or next to my easement, spring and aqueduct on Holden Hill. What guarantees do we have that Northern Pass will not destroy my water source to my house and my two neighbors' homes?"

And, I guess you might want to address that for all abutters on the line.
MR. JOHNSON: That's an excellent question. Typically, what we do, prior to construction, is meet with landowners that have wells and/or septic systems, and/or, in this case, artesian streams that are a water supply source. During the construction phase, we will be very careful not to disturb these supplies. Obviously, it's critical to have a house and have a water supply.

If there is some damage or incidents that occur, those will be addressed on a case-by-case basis as we go forward. And, our goal, obviously, is to have no impact at all.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Please provide the relevant findings on electric and magnetic fields that have been published in specific science journals that are peer reviewed."

MR. SODERMAN: My name is Christopher Soderman. I'm with Eversource Energy. And, Appendix 37 to the Application, which is available on the website, is a summary of all of the studies that have been done by a number of agencies, including the World Health Organization; the Scientific Committee for Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks, SCENIHR, in Europe; ARPANSA, in Australia. All of these agencies
conduct these kinds of reviews.

And, additionally, all other published studies have been addressed and are discussed in that report, so that all of those findings are available. Again, this is Appendix 37 to the Application. You can see it right on the website.

And, it should be noted that the World Health Organization and SCENIHR recently concluded that there's no causal, you know, relationship that they can establish based on all this research. And, this is particularly the case with HVDC lines, especially considering that the magnetic fields from HVDC lines mimic a naturally occurring phenomenon, being the same field that makes your compass point north.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. This next question is another question about the Pondicherry Refuge. And, the question is: "Has Northern Pass researched the" -- and you may have answered some of this already, but I will ask the whole question, because there are some parts that have not been answered. "Has Northern Pass researched the possibility of negative impacts on the 10 square mile Pondicherry U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Refuge? Northern Pass comes close to this Refuge at its
northwest corner. Has there been any contacts between Northern Pass with this Refuge?" I assume they mean "U.S. Fish & Wildlife". "Will the towers be seen from locations in the Refuge? And, will the Northern Pass corridor influence fragmentation of the wildlife corridors? And, has there been any study by Northern Pass regarding impact on wetlands in and around the Refuge and on the potential introduction of invasive species into the Refuge?"

MS. CARBONNEAU: Yes. Thank you. Lee Carbonneau, from Normandeau Associates. And, we have addressed the issues at Pondicherry in much the same way that we address them anywhere in the corridor. So, we've evaluated the impacts to wetlands. We have quantified those impacts to wetlands. We have looked at the potential effects on wildlife movement through the corridor. Because this is an existing corridor, the wildlife that use it are likely to keep using it. It will be managed in much the same way that the corridor is currently managed.

The addition of new structures that are spaced 700 -- 600 feet apart, on average, should not affect the movement of wildlife through this corridor, either flying wildlife or walking wildlife.
We have met with folks from the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, and the Pondicherry Division in particular, to discuss our project. They have asked us to try and make sure that any construction methods that are used are consistent with their management plans. And, they have just issued a management plan in 2015. So, we will be checking that and making sure that any of our avoidance and minimization methods that are proposed are consistent with what they would like to see during construction.

Let's see. As far as invasive species, that is always a concern in corridor management and during construction. So, we have developed a plan for trying to minimize the introduction or spread of invasive species throughout the Project area. And, it involves monitors that are checking to make sure that equipment is properly washed and taken care of, that any construction mats that are laid down for access, these are timber mats, across wetlands or other sensitive areas, are kept cleaned and aren't used from one spot to another without being inspected. If invasive species are encountered in a particular area where actual excavation is occurring, the Project will dispose of any of that soil containing those species in
a manner that doesn't permit them to be spread in any other locations.

So, a number of these kinds of protective measures are outlined in our Application, in the -- they're in the Wetland Mitigation Report, I believe. I think that covers it.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. All right. The next question is one similar to what we had before. And, Eversource employees who don't wish to answer are under no obligation to answer.

But this question is: "I would like to know, by a show of hands, who among the attendees tonight are working or employed either directly or indirectly by Eversource of Northern Pass? Second question: By show of hands, how many have absolutely no problem asking your neighbors, your friends and your family to live near the new proposed power line?"

[Show of hands.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: How many have no problem with your friends and neighbors living near the power line?

[Show of hands.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. This first question on this sheet has already been asked
about jobs after start-up. But the second question is: "There are" -- "You are saying there are $4 billion of proposed economic benefits for New Hampshire. How many billions of dollars will Hydro-Quebec get per year?"

MR. QUINLAN: I don't know the answer to that question.

[Audience interruption.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I think his answer is he "does not know".

Well, this question is phrased as a follow-up question: "You just said" -- people who can write quickly are advantaged in this proceeding. "You just said that the taxes will get paid by ratepayers, is that correct? I thought no part of Northern Pass would be paid by ratepayers?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, what I was referring to were taxes on current infrastructure owned by Eversource New Hampshire. That is in our rate base, and is therefore being paid for by ratepayers. Taxes associated with Northern Pass will not be borne by Eversource New Hampshire ratepayers. They will be part of the ordinary expense of the Project.

[Audience interruption.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.
Please be courteous. The next question is: "You said an additional billion dollars to bury the line isn't feasible. Yet you said a more costly project results in larger returns. So, if you get larger returns, won't you recoup that billion dollars?"

MR. QUINLAN: It's not a question of, you know, Eversource's returns. It's a question of "is the Project economic?", meaning someone will pay for it. Our view is that, if you added an additional billion dollars of cost, with no additional benefit or capacity, no one will pay for it.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Did you consider a different route through Bethlehem, one that would involve the Pinetree Power right-of-way? And, if you haven't, would you?"

MR. JOHNSON: I cannot speak directly to the -- what was it, the Pine --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Pinetree Power right-of-way.

MR. JOHNSON: The Pinetree Power right-of-way, I'm unfamiliar with that.

FROM THE FLOOR: It's a biomass plant.

MR. JOHNSON: Oh. Okay. I will say, in general, that we did do an exhaustive study early on
regarding right-of-ways throughout the entire state. And, so, all the way from the international border south to Deerfield, and evaluated different sets of corridors, such as the Pine plant. The one corridor that made sense is the one that we had originally proposed as an overhead solution, using as much as possible existing right-of-way. So, the right-of-way that we've chosen through Bethlehem was because it was the most direct route from the north to the south.

MR. QUINLAN: As well as there being an existing right-of-way with an existing transmission line that could be run parallel. You know, that's what led to that selection.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Can you state to what degree the following statements are true or false." And, I'll just go through them. There's three. "Did indication of opposition by National Forest play any role in burying it", meaning the line, "through the Forest?"

In other words, the question is, "did an indication of opposition", I assume by the Forest Service is what they're talking about, "play any role in burying Northern Pass through the Forest?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, there were a lot of
factors in that decision. You know, I would say the principal driver for it was feedback we received from stakeholders in New Hampshire. You know, we also factored in, you know, the Department of Energy's Draft Environmental Impact Statement. But there are several different factors.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Did opposition by the Forest Society on its land play any role in burying it in those sections?"

MR. QUINLAN: No.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Did the overall wealth of the communities to fight overhead play any role in burying it in those areas or communities?"

MR. QUINLAN: No.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, this goes to the ForwardNH Plan: "Why aren't you targeting all ForwardNH money to towns with above-ground transmission lines?"

MR. QUINLAN: So, that is largely the intention. It may not be exclusive. There may be some investments that -- and initiatives that are pursued in other towns hosting the line. But I do expect the vast majority of it to be directed towards communities where
the construction is overhead. And, again, we're committed to having a particular focus on Coos County and the North Country in deploying those proceeds.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's all the questions. We have exhausted all of them. We are going to take a three-minute break. Please be back in your seats at nine o'clock.

(Recess taken at 8:56 p.m. and the public information session resumed at 9:05 p.m.)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Please take your seats. Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we've now reached that stage of our meeting where we take public comment. We have about 30 -- almost 35 people who wish to speak. We're going to try to limit everybody's statements to three minutes or less please. What I'd like you all to do is take a look to your left and your right, and in front of you and behind you, and note that these are your neighbors and fellow citizens, many of whom also want to speak. So, please think of them when you come up to make your statements.

In addition, as I've indicated on several occasions tonight, the Site Evaluation Committee takes written comment throughout our
proceedings. There is no different weight generally
given to written comment versus an oral statement made
at these proceedings. So that, if you feel, by the
time that you get to your -- whatever number you might
be in my stack of people who wish to speak here, if you
feel you'd rather just speak your piece by writing it
out, there are blue sheets that are available. I'm not
trying to discourage anybody from speaking, but I'm
just trying to let you know that there are options that
are available.

That being said, if you do come up to
speak, if you are reading from a prepared statement, if
possible, please provide a copy of it to the court
reporter. And, that way they will ensure that what
they have recorded from you is accurate. We are not
going to -- we are not going to be able to record
people yelling out from the audience. Please be
respectful of the other speakers. If you don't like
what somebody has to say, just be quiet about it and
let them finish.

The first speaker, I'm going to read out
the first -- I'm going to go three at a time, with the
hopes that, if we stick to three minutes each, it will
only be about an hour and half or so before we're done.
So, the first three speakers will be Representative Brad Bailey, Representative Leon Rideout, and Alan McLain. And, if those three would come up to this microphone here in that order, we'll hear from them.

REP. BAILEY: Thank you. Again, my name is Brad Bailey. I represent the Towns of Littleton, Bethlehem, Monroe, Lyman, Lisbon, Franconia, and Sugar Hill.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: What district is that, Representative?

REP. BAILEY: Grafton 14. I wanted to just mention, and I will be brief, and we've talked a lot about figures and burial and so forth, but, back in 1978, my father and I took a fishing trip up to Canada. It was a while ago. We used to go fishing every summer. And, my dad wanted to go up to Quebec. And, he wanted to go to the north shore of the Saint Lawrence seaway. And, he said "I want to go fishing up along the Manicouagan River." So, it was a long trip.

And, when we got up to the Village of Baie-Comeau, which is right on the water, we had to drive another 100 miles up this river to get to the Manicouagan Dam. Now, the Manicouagan Dam, for people
that don't know its size and the scope of it, which was built by Hydro-Quebec, is absolutely enormous. We've never seen anything like it before, also known as the Daniel Johnson Dam. It was built between 1959 and 1970. That dam is 700 feet tall, 4,300 feet long. It's the largest dam of its type in the world. And, the reservoir is the fifth largest in the world.

Northern Pass is looking to generate a thousand megawatts of power. This one dam generates over 2,500 megawatts of power. It's incredible.

As a matter of fact, if you go on a Google map, and you scale back, and if you're looking at all of North America and parts of South America, you can still see the reservoir. That's how big it is. It's about 50 miles across.

Anyway, the point I'm making is that, when we were up on top of the dam, again, I'm going back to 1978, my father was with me, and he said to a couple of Canadians, he said "Gosh, this is a lot of power. This is extremely impressive. Do you need all this power?" He said "no". He said, "Well, what's Quebec going to do with all of it?" He says, "We're going to sell it to you in 20 or 30 years."

So, here we are. And, it looks like
we're going to have power coming through the State of New Hampshire. But I have to say that, in my short time in the Legislature, whether it's casino gambling or it's the budget, this one issue has generated more phone calls and more e-mails to me and to most of us here in northern New Hampshire than any other topic. And, people are still worried.

We know you're going to bury some of it, but it is going to impact real estate values. It's going to impact tourism. And, on behalf of the majority of my constituents, the vast majority of my constituents, they're not going to be happy unless you look at burying the whole line. Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. One thing I forgot to say before is that I do have a little red light here. So, when you hit three minutes, I'm going to hit the red light. That means you should wrap it up, okay? I'm not going to stop anybody right at three minutes, but we do appreciate your courtesy.

Representative Rideout.

REP. RIDEOUT: Good evening. I'm Representative Leon Rideout. I represent Coos 7, which encompasses ten towns within northern Coos County.
Every single one of those towns are impacted by Northern Pass. And, as I travel about the North Country and I talk to people that live here, every single one of them are concerned.

And, though we've had dozens of these meetings, more and more information coming out, their concerns have not been allayed. They still do not feel like they have been listened to. And, at this point, when I talk to them, they do not want Northern Pass to come through New Hampshire.

But they said, as a compromise, because we are Yankees and we know sometimes we don't get everything we want, they would settle if it was buried and they didn't have the scars of the towers across the North Country.

So, I'm here on behalf of my constituents and telling you that, if you don't look at burying this, this process is going to drag on. We know they buried, over in New York and Vermont, a line nearly as long as Northern Pass. It took about a year to get approved. How many years have we been coming to these meetings? And, how much of these meetings and the delays costing this Project?

So, I ask you to seriously consider
burying the line, getting the Project going, hopefully creating the jobs you're saying it's going to. And, let's get moving and move on. Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, Representative.

Next speaker is Alan McLain, from Berlin.

MR. McLAIN: My name is Alan McLain. I'm a property owner.

COURT REPORTER: Can you spell that?

MR. McLAIN: Excuse me?

COURT REPORTER: Can you spell that?

MR. McLAIN: A-l-a-n, M-c-L-a-i-n. I'm a property owner in Berlin and a business owner. On the property side, I'd like to see my electric rates drop and my property taxes have some relief.

On the business side, we have worked on other energy projects in Coos County. These projects clearly injected money into our local economy and helped support our local business and provide critical jobs for people here.

Our involvement in these large energy projects allowed us to grow in size and position --
excuse me, and positioned us to build other projects, like switch stations, control houses, and other projects for utility companies. As a result, my employees are buying homes, buying trucks, and other products and services that support our local economy.

This Project will create good-paying jobs. I welcome it. And, I support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir. If you could give your statement to the court reporter?

[Audience interruption.]

MR. McLAIN: Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The next, I'm going to call out the next four speakers, you'll know why in a minute: Landon Placey, from West Stewartstown; Bob Baker, from Columbia; Carl Martland, from Sugar Hill; and Nancy Martland, from Sugar Hill.

So, Mr. Placey would be first.

MR. PLACEY: Yes. Hello, everybody. My name is Landon Placey, and I've come to several of these meetings.

COURT REPORTER: Can you spell your name please?

MR. PLACEY: Spell my name?
MR. PLACEY: Landon, L-a-n-d-o-n, and Placey, P-l-a-c-e-y.

As I was saying, I've came to several of these meetings to say how I felt and to say that I've been in favor of this whole plan. I think it's very evident that it's been shown, since we've first heard about it, it's very clear now that there is a need for that power. And, I think it's very sensible that it be hydropower. I think, before we're through, we'll need several hydropower lines to fill the need of the power that we're going to lose from oil plants and at coal plants that are closing down, which we should be in favor of those being closed down. I don't know what's happened to everybody wanting things to be green. But I'm in favor of the green still.

And, that the economics of this thing, we are paying high electric rates in this area, and Coos County is a hardship area. I wouldn't say there's an awful lot of folks here tonight that can't afford to pay their electric rates, but there is a lot of people in this area that have a hard job paying the rates. And, if we don't get some more power in from somewhere else, that the rates are bound to be going higher. If
there's a shortage, they always go higher.

So, I show up here. I usually get --

I've been booed and heckled. But that is all right.
Everybody has got a right to feel how they want. But I
think it's my own right to have my own say here. And, so, I appreciate very much you allowing me to.

[Audience interruption.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

MR. PLACEY: Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Bob Baker.

MR. BAKER: My name is Bob Baker. I live in Columbia, New Hampshire. I'm here to convey greetings from two North Country Representatives who can't be here. Steve Ellis is a Selectman from Stewart -- from Pittsburg, and he asked me to convey to this meeting his regrets that he could not be here. He's had a death in the family. He also asked me to convey the conviction of his town, Pittsburg, and his neighbors, Clarksville and Stewartstown, as towns being opposed to the Project, unless it is buried in its entirety.

The second person who's asked me to speak for them, and I have his typed comments, and I
think they have already been sent to Mrs. Monroe, is
Larry Rappaport. Larry is our Representative from Coos
District 1, which includes the northern tip of Coos
County and the towns there. This is Larry's typed
statement, and I'm reading it exactly as he sent it to
me.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Please read
it slow enough so that the court reporters can get it,
okay?

MR. BAKER: I will. "I am completely
opposed to the so-called "Northern Pass Project" that
is" -- "as it is now planned by Eversource for the
following reasons: (1) It is not considered necessary
by the ruling body, the Independent System Operator of
New England. (2) It will destroy the tourist industry
in northern Coos County, and that is all that we have
left for revenue generation in the northern part of our
state. People generally do not go to ugly areas for
vacation. (3) The power generated by Hydro-Quebec by
further damming of the Romaine River is most definitely
not ecologically friendly: [A] Large boreal forests
are being submerged and resulting in the production of
methane, a greenhouse gas, twenty times more pollution
than carbon dioxide. (B) A large portion of the
Canadian carbon sink is being destroyed. (C) A large portion of Canadian tribal lands will be destroyed. 

(4) There will be no lower cost of power benefit to New Hampshire residents. The Project has existed for over seven years yet there is no power purchase agreement. [5] Any benefit will accrue to the southern New England states relieving them of their obligation to produce clean power. (6) Eversource has publicly claimed this Project will lower electric rates yet has failed to prove it or offer any evidence to establish it. (7) Eversource claims that the Project will produce economic improvement for the area. They cite tax revenue, yet they offer nothing about the offsets produced by other property owners getting lowered assessments. They cite increased employment yet they have not provided any evidence that jobs produced will go to New Hampshire residents. Historically, specialized companies located in other states were used. (8) The Company recently agreed to bury the line through the White Mountain National Forest, proving the viability of burial, yet it steadfastly refuses to bury the line elsewhere; burial is a compromise position that would be accepted by many opponents. (9) The Company has never provided a
formal analysis of the costs inherent in burying the
Project, resorting instead to random guesswork, such as
"the cost of burial is 10 times the cost of aerial",
which has since proven to be entirely fallacious. [10]

Most of us remember the ice storms of a few years ago.
The transmission towers to the east of the city,
Montreal, buckled under the ice leaving Montreal
without power for several weeks. Would the proposed
towers be invulnerable to this? I think not.

I firmly believe that the Project, as it is now planned, should not be permitted. I think that private companies should not be allowed to prosper at the expense, via undeclared subsidy, of the public. If a landowner's view is degraded, the value of his property declines, and that, for many, is his largest investment. While obviously generating profits for Eversource, it will result in a significant economic loss for the 31 towns along the route, all of which voted against the Project, some of them unanimously.

Please say "no" to what I consider a horrible atrocity. Signed: New Hampshire State Representative Laurence M. Rappaport, Coos District 1."

Thank you very much.

[Audience interruption.]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Carl Martland and Nancy Martland.

MR. MARTLAND: Good evening. My name is Carl Martland. I'm here as the Chair of the North Country Scenic Byways Council. We have approximately 45 members representing all the towns where there is a scenic byway. And, every major road in the North Country is, in fact, a scenic byway. I have submitted a 12-page document today, and I will not go into the details of that. But I would like to develop thoughts based on the slides that Mr. Quinlan was kind enough to show.

And, I'd first like to start with a little story. Suppose there was a flood, and 20 square miles was flooded, and the depth was 1.1 meters. And, then, the next day it rained, and there was a greater flood, and the depth rose to 1.69 meters. People will be upset if the analysis did not point out that the flooded area had gone from 20 miles to 53 miles. In the North Country, 20 miles is in the viewshed of the current line, 53 miles would be in the viewshed of the new line. So, the averages that are cited in the Draft EIS are not the right numbers.

Second, we saw the picture of the key...
observation point at Weeks State Park, which is, indeed, a good place to view the towers. Those pictures are meant to be viewed on a computer or sitting at a desk. We couldn't see the pictures because of the lighting here. But I happen to have the actual numbers with me. And, the first picture, the existing system, was rated as 13 on a scale of zero to 45. That's "weak". And, quote -- this is the experts in visual impact, this is not me. This is the experts that were hired by DOE and paid for by Northern Pass. "Weak" means "it's noticeable, but so small as to be considered unimportant."

When the towers went in, the impact was 23. Which is moderate. "Moderate" doesn't sound bad, but the experts define that to be "moderate", "clearly noticeable to a casual observer and is likely to be considered adverse." And, if you look at the key observation points, you'll find that everything within about a thousand feet of the line, where you can see the towers, is not moderate, "likely to be considered adverse", it's "strong" or "severe", which means it's "unreasonably adverse".

So, I'll leave my comments on the byways to the more detailed comments I've submitted. This
will be a devastating impact to the byways. And, the 
byways are there to serve the back roads and the scene 
spots of northern New Hampshire.

[Audience interruption.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Nancy Martland.

MS. MARTLAND: That's me. Good evening, 
Bill. Sorry to have to meet you this way. You've got 
your job, I've got mine. I'm taking this opportunity 
to speak directly to the representatives of the 
developers this evening.

For the record, my name is Nancy 
That's right, I don't live in Coos County. I do live 
in a town that is part of the North Country of New 
Hampshire. And, I am here tonight to stand with my 
friends and neighbors of Coos to look Northern Pass 
developers in the eye and tell you that, if it is right 
to bury this line in Sugar Hill, it is right to bury it 
through the equally precious and valuable towns of Coos 
County.

And, it is not right to divide us into 
the saved and the damned, the burial towns and the 
tower towns.
The opening segment of your promotional video that you showed this evening I think symbolizes a fundamental flaw that has been present in your Project from the beginning. It represents New Hampshire, and we all saw this, as an animated sequence of lines connecting dots on a map. I think some of the anger and frustration that you see and hear in this room is because that is what the North Country is to you and your partners: A series of dots to be connected on a map, beginning at the dams in Quebec, and ending in southern New Hampshire, so that power can be sold into the apparently bottomless electricity sinkhole of southern New England.

This Project is a lucrative business deal, hatched in corner offices in Hartford and Montreal. It has nothing to do with us. The expensively produced, slick Northern Pass storyline that you showed here tonight was created after the fact, after the deal, to sell the Project to the public. What really matters to you are the enormous profits that Eversource and Hydro-Quebec stand to gain. We in the North Country have the misfortune to be dots on your map.

Early on you made the mistake of
thinking you could just slide this by us and we dots
would not stand up to you. We all know how that turned
out. Do not compound that error by thinking that the
dots on the map will not continue to fight until you do
the right thing by all of us, not just some of us. We
know our own worth even if you apparently do not. You
cannot bully us, you cannot buy us, you cannot trick
us, you cannot wear us down, you cannot make us go away
until you do the right thing and bury every mile of
cable through our beloved State of New Hampshire.

Look around this room. Look at our
faces. Look at our resolve. Look at how individuals
and towns and organizations have come together in ways
that they never have before. Look at our willingness
to appear in public in a garish and unflattering color
for heaven's sake.

That granite that you used to claim you
couldn't dig through? It's in our veins. Go
underground or go home.

[Audience interruption.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next
date, four speakers are Katie Rose, Jim and Sandy Dennis --
Dannis, I'm sorry, Colles "Stohl" -- or, Stowell, and
Mike Stirling.
Now, Ms. Rose has told me she will keep
under the three minutes. And, so, we're going to allow
her to perform her musical piece for her comment.

MS. ROSE: Mr. Moderator has assured me
that my comment will be included, as it is just as
important as everyone else who has spoken here tonight.
And, the way that I represent it makes my comment no
different. The reporter has my lyrics.

[Musical performance by Katie Rose, with
the lyrics included below as provided.]

To the powers that be: do you not see?
Can you not hear? Or are you just acting out of fear?
The fate of our land is resting in your hands.
The people have spoken. Please prove to us that the
system's not broken.

To the powers that be, in such a powerful company:
How much more will you take from us? Do you realize how
much is at stake for us?

How can you stay blind to the devastation left
behind once you have taken of what we love?
Will it ever be enough?
Or once you have taken, will you just rape us again
& again? You never once asked our permission. You just
continue to force your own mission.
Well, this is all we have left. And there is no turning back once the damage is done. The loss for us is much greater than the gain might be for anyone.

For the ones without a voice: Nature, who has no choice in this. For all sacred land: I hear you and I understand.

So I sing this for you, that the powers that be may see the truth. That they may be brave enough to stand up for all of us.

And may they be wise to distinguish the truth from the lies.

May they represent you and me, for we are the ones who gave them the power to be.

[End of lyrics.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's a good time to stop, ma'am.

MS. ROSE: Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Jim and Sandy Dannis, from Dalton.

MR. DANNIS: My name is Jim Dannis, D-a-n-n-i-s. And, I live in Dalton. One of the principles of good government is, to borrow some words from Katie Rose, to give voice to people who don't have
a voice. Tonight's proceeding did not do that. And, I
address my comments to the SEC.

There are a lot of people in this room
who do not have faith in your process. I am among
those people. The statute under which you operate
asked you tonight to have the Applicant respond to
questions from the public, to answer questions. I made
a list, as I was listening, and I came up with ten
examples of answers that were so patently ridiculous
that anybody with commonsense would just say "This is a
stacked deck. This is not a fair process. Nobody is
asking for the truth." Let me give just a couple.

First, you had a lawyer stand up and
speak for, I timed it, four minutes, in order to answer
a question that took ten seconds to answer. That's
called a called a "filibuster". He just wasted time,
rann out the clock, and made all of us have to stand
around. The question was "Did you ask anybody
something? You can say "yes" or "no"." He didn't say
"yes" or "no", he spoke for four minutes. You, as a
moderator, just let him speak for four minutes.

Second, you had -- you had an
environmental -- I'm sorry, a historical resources
expert stand up and assert to this crowd that "Burying
the line under Route 93 may or may not have similar
effects on historical resources as the proposed route."
Patently ridiculous. Do you think all of us checked
our commonsense at the door? Do you think we're hicks
in orange with no teeth? We're not so dumb. We know
how the world works.

Next, you had Mr. Quinlan -- you allowed
Mr. Quinlan to stand up and say he "has no idea what
Hydro-Quebec's revenues may be from this transaction."
That's like me standing up and saying "I have no idea
how tall I am because I haven't measured myself in the
last second."

Of course he knows what the revenues
are. His company negotiates with Hydro-Quebec. You
can take publicly available information and calculate
the revenues.

The whole appearance of this process is
that you, the SEC, let the Applicant have free reign to
say what they want with no oversight. It's wrong. It
should not stand. Thank you.

[Audience interruption.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Colles
Stowell.

MR. STOWELL: My name is Colles Stowell.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry.

MR. STOWELL: I can give you the spelling. I'll hand this over to you.

[Mr. Stowell handed a document to the court reporter.]

MR. STOWELL: My grandparents built a log cabin in Lancaster in 1938, and it faces the Franconia Range, including Pondicherry. So, I'm here to speak directly to the Applicant.

I am diametrically opposed to this Project for several years. Perhaps the most obvious of which is the reason that appears to be the most oft ignored by Hydro-Quebec, Eversource, lobbyists and politicians promoting the Project: Permanent or long-term ecological damage to pristine public and private lands for the primary economic benefit of a select few, namely the projects' initiators and supporters.

Let's be clear, the residents and property owners of the North Country opposed to this Project, and we are legion, gain nothing but headaches, plummeting property values and future nostalgia over what once was. Under the proposed plan, high-tension wires strung on towers reaching up to 130 feet through
Coos, Grafton, and Carroll Counties will permanently scar the landscape. These scars will be both visible and hidden, and will be much more expensive and painful to try and heal in the future.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: May I ask you to go slow, okay, because they're trying to take it down?

MR. STOWELL: Okay. Sure.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You're reading, I understand, but they still have to take it down.

MR. STOWELL: All right. The irony in this equation is Shakespearian in scope. Hydro-Quebec and Eversource broker a mutually beneficial deal that will make them hundreds of millions of dollars over several years but "spare" Eversource customers north of the notches the benefit to the lower cost energy being transported across their front lawns. During the presentation tonight we heard a lot about several claimed benefits, including "clean energy", which is a bit of a misnomer. Because if you flood several thousand acres of peat bogs and wetlands, you're covering a carbon sink. So, the carbon sequestration, which would minimize greenhouse gases, is prohibited by
flooding it with water to create this. So, it's not really "clean energy" in that term.

[Audience interruption.]

MR. STOWELL: I'm all for clean energy, but there's a problem with that, you know.

Second of all, you talked talk about "increasing jobs". Well, I'm all for increasing jobs. But, when you're talking about jobs that are going to be kind of part-time, because they're going to go on during the construction project, and you can't give any concrete answer to that, that's going to raise some questions.

You talk about "lowering taxes" and "community funding". Well, is that going to happen, if we're only stuck at a Memorandum of Understanding for seven years, and we don't have the actual agreement? I don't know.

I'm going to go out on a limb, and I'm going to say that probably most of the people in this audience don't care about the profit margins for Eversource. They don't care about the profit margins for Hydro-Quebec. What they care about is what makes the North Country the North Country, the beauty of the landscape.
So, I'm going to go out on a limb also, and I'd say that I'm probably not the only person here that would prefer that you take your $4 billion ForwardNH Plan and bury it. Bury it, and the tidal wave of opposition will likely dissipate. Bury it or bag it.

[Audience interruption.]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next speaker is Mike Stirling, from Groveton, followed by Paul Grenier, from Berlin, followed by Ron, I'm going to butcher the name, I'm sorry, Magoni, from Whitefield, and Harry Brown, from West Stewartstown.

MR. STIRLING: Hi. My name is Mike Stirling. And, I am the General Manager -- how are you doing? I am the General Manager for Chapman Development. And, we are the owners of the Groveton mill site, the former mill project up in Groveton.

And, what I'd like to say is how significant the impact of this Project could be in Groveton. We lost a mill eight years ago that employed over 750 people in a town of only 2,200. Those jobs have not returned. This is an aging community that every year sees young families pick up and move elsewhere, because they cannot find local employment to
support their families. And, this trend has depleted
the tax base, raised taxes significantly per capita and
decreased property values, because the supply seeks
demand.

This community needs the assistance that
this Project can provide. This Project can actually
reunite families up in the North Country. This Project
can bring revenue and work to businesses,
revitalization to the area, and hope to these familiars
and communities. Your support is vital, and we need
it.

This economic support from the ForwardNH
Fund is critical for the economic development in
Groveton. We currently have viable, and when I say
"we", Chapman Development, we have viable new business
projects that can start in Groveton immediately, if we
have the support from the Project.

The quicker the support can be extended,
the faster the recovery can begin. We look forward to
your support that you can provide. This community
needs your support. And, we are grateful for this
opportunity, and this area depends on your help. And,
we appreciate it. Thank you for your time.

[Audience interruption.]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Grenier.

MR. GRENIER: Attorney Iacopino, it's a pleasure to see you again.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Good to see you.

MR. GRENIER: My name is Paul Grenier, G-R-E-N-I-E-R, and I serve dual elected roles. I serve as Mayor of the City of Berlin and that of Coos County Commissioner from District 1. I am here this evening to testify officially on behalf of the City of Berlin.

The City has gone on record as fully supporting the Northern Pass Project. And you should have received our letter last week. Although you will hear this evening, "Either bury or stop the Project," the fact is, over 22 miles of this proposal lies within the boundaries of private timber land controlled by Wagner Forest, another 8 miles has been added to be buried, and most of the rest is to be situated in existing rights-of-way. It is our belief that the developers have worked hard to find solutions to issues raised by folks who initially opposed the Project.

The fact remains, however, that future
economic development here in Coos County will depend on availability to less expensive and dependable electricity. With thousands of megawatts of fossil fuel and nuclear power coming off production, Northern New England faces still greater obstacles if this problem is not resolved soon. I personally have been very active in business development recruitment in Berlin, and the high cost of electricity is difficult to mitigate. Left unchecked, still higher costs of electricity will be Coos County's Alamo.

The City of Berlin potentially stands to lose a lot of property tax revenue if the Northern Pass Project and the Coos Loop upgrade is not built. The City and Berlin Station signed a PILT Agreement in August of 2011 under authority of R.S.A. 72:74. In the agreement, Burgess Biopower is required to pay to the City 15 percent of gross revenue of all RECs produced over the 400,000 REC threshold that Eversource is required to purchase. Since the plant has the ability to produce upwards of 100,000 of additional unsold RECs it can put to the open market, the loss revenue to the City is estimated to be in the $9.7 million range. The plant has to operate at or near capacity for that to occur. Burgess Biopower has already faced some
production curtailments because the Coos Loop cannot handle the export load. The Northern Pass Project as presented addresses that problem and allows for still further renewable energy development.

The City of Berlin asks that you work toward a solution that allows for a site certificate be issued to Northern Pass. And I have enclosed the official Payment In Lieu of Tax Agreement between the City of Berlin and Berlin Station, LLC, and the letter that the City of Berlin has sent to Pam Monroe. And I would just like to say that the City of Berlin fully intends on intervening in this process, and we hope to be a partner to see that this gets a site certificate.

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

Ron Magoni from Whitefield. Mr. Magoni, I'm probably saying your name so bad that you don't recognize it. I know that feeling.

(No verbal response)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Harry Brown.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Harry Brown. I live at Diamond Pond in
Stewartstown, New Hampshire, with my wife Susan of 44 years. I'll be speaking for both of us tonight.

I am the immediate past president of the North Country OHRV Coalition, the organization behind Ride the Wilds, 1,000 miles of OHRV trails in Coos County --

(Court Reporter interrupts.)

MR. BROWN: -- and am current president of the New Hampshire Off-Highway Vehicle Association. I want to make it clear, I am not representing either organization here tonight, as neither has taken a position for or against the Project.

I have noticed lots of rhetoric in the press, more specifically the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire's Forest campaign, "Trees Not Towers: No Northern Pass," indicating that the above-ground transmission lines will have an impact on tourism and recreation, thusly affecting Coos County and the economy. An example of this not being the case is in Steamboat Springs, Colorado. In 1960, the population was 1843; in 1960 -- in 1990, it was 6,695; and in 2013 it was 12,100. Guess what? During that same period of time, a power line was erected right to the northwest corner of Mount Werner, the ski area constructed in the
late 1950s and directly over the south residential and commercial area of the town, even directly over McDonald's, with, quote, obviously no adverse effect with continued development of a resort town. By the way, it can be seen from all areas of the town and from the trails on the mountain itself. The towers are steel erector-set-type and are over 150 feet tall. The good news is that they're so high, no trees have to be cut.

In our opinion, a substantial portion of Coos County's economy relies on OHRVing, wheeled-vehicle motorized recreation, and snowmobiling and will not be affected by the Northern Pass transmission lines. As a matter of record, we're allowed presently, OHRV and snowmobile recreationists, to utilize the many miles of tails that cross under or run over -- under current power lines throughout the northeast, the rest of the United States and the Canadian Provinces. This is without any negative effects to the participants otherwise concerning their pursuits. Quite the opposite. It allows them access to trails that would not be otherwise available. The state of New Hampshire clearly recognizes that OHRV and snowmobiles are greater than a billion-dollar-a-year
industry and is especially important to Coos County, as
it has lit a new life for many current and new business
owners, an economic stimulus where many could not see
the light through the tunnel previously.

We want to recognize that without the
landowners giving us permission to utilize their
properties for our trails, there would be no Ride the
Wilds, nor snowmobiling in Coos County. Most of the
large landowners own the property as an investment and
are looking for an adequate return. In our opinion,
owners such as Bayroot, LLC has every right to allow
the Northern Pass transmission line to pass through
their property - a win-win for us all. A friendly
investor gets a good return, and we continue to have
snowmobile/OHRV trail access. No threat from a change
in ownership. After all, our state motto is "Live Free
or Die." In addition, for your information, Northern
Pass is one of those large landowners, and at this time
allows OHRVing and snowmobiling on their land that
affects 10 major tails, 3 of which are equal to I-93 or
I-91 for snowmobiling. Without them being a good
neighbor, this would be virtually shut down.

Snowmobiling and OHRV in Coos County --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr. Brown,
could you wrap it up, please? You've gone over your
three minutes.

MR. BROWN: I will.

Yes, we voted at the Stewartstown
meeting on March 3rd, 2011, to oppose the
1200-megawatt, high-voltage direct current -- I'm using
my wife's time now -- direct current transmission line
as presently proposed. This is important. This is at
the Stewartstown town meeting on March 3rd, 2011. This
was almost five years ago, and much has changed, with
all the line being buried in Stewartstown except for on
land that Northern Pass owns. Once again, "Live Free
or Die."

Susan and I are retired and living on
entitlements such as Social Security. We look forward
to the day when the Northern Pass transmission line
passes through Stewartstown on the latest route
proposed, thusly affording us all nearly 50 percent in
property tax relief. Many of my fellow citizens look
forward to that day when the Northern Pass transmission
line passes through Stewartstown on the latest proposed
route, thusly affording us all nearly 50 percent in tax
relief. Many of my fellow citizens in Stewartstown are
economically challenged. This would be --
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr. Brown,
you've got to stop --

MR. BROWN: I'll wrap it up. You've
given other people more than three minutes.

[Audience interruption]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I don't
need help from the crowd, okay.

Please wrap it up, Mr. Brown. Let's end
this.

MR. BROWN: I have one paragraph left.

This would be a true economic incentive.

Maybe some businesses might even fill up all their
empty store fronts in the area. Just think, Northern
Pass would pay huge property taxes annually without any
buildings, or requiring EMS and no bigger schools.

Finally, neither Susan nor I are OHRV
enthusiasts. But through the OHRV initiative, we just
wanted to help our neighbors be able to raise their
standards of living. We are also concerned that the
end result, all the conservation groups that oppose
Northern Pass will cast --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: That's a
long paragraph, Mr. Brown. Please end it.

[Audience interruption]
MR. BROWN: One sentence left.

[Audience member interrupting]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I don't need help from the crowd, please.

MR. BROWN: What you are all saying is boring to me. So give me the opportunity.

[Audience member interrupting]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Please --

MR. BROWN: One final thought: Riding through Franconia Notch, I envision what it looked like prior to 1938. No ski area, no aerial tram like Northern Pass towers. Maybe we should consider removing the tram and have only surface lifts. Many people here will get up tonight to speak about the negative impacts that this transmission line will have on New Hampshire. Most of it is not --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. That's more than one sentence.

MR. BROWN: -- fact-based. It is emotionally based. Thank you.

[Audience interruption]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next four speakers will be Charles Mansfer [sic] --

[Audience interruption]
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- from Whitefield; Jason Lauze, L-A-U-Z-E, from Farmington; John Wilkinson from Lancaster, and Peter Powell from Lancaster.

Charles Maser?

(No verbal response)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: He's apparently not here. Jason Lauze, L-A-U-Z-E. If I'm pronouncing that wrong, please correct me and spell it for our court reporter. I know the feeling.

MR. LAUZE: It's actually Lauze, L-A-U-Z-E.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: First name?

MR. LAUZE: Jason. My name's Jason Lauze. And while I'm not a resident of Coos County, I am a property owner and taxpayer in another county that is in the Northern Pass proposed path. I support the Project for two reasons: First of all, I'm the training director for the IBEW Apprenticeship Program, which was mentioned today.

(Court Reporter interrupts.)

MR. LAUZE: I know there's been a lot of talk about whether or not there's any of these jobs that are actually going to be permanent in nature. In
fact, I can speak to that, in that they absolutely will be. We take our New Hampshire residents and put them to work in permanent positions every day. Anyway, I can assure you that there will absolutely be numerous new jobs created that will both be manned by New Hampshire residents and permanent in nature, as I mentioned.

Secondly, while I may not live in the North Country area, I do live in an area that also depends on tourism to survive. Not only do I not feel that the existing transmission lines have an adverse effect on tourism, I do not feel that the Northern Pass Project will either. And in fact, I do tend to visit the North Country frequently as an avid snowmobiler and outdoorsman. And for many of the same reasons as the last gentleman mentioned, I don't see the transmission lines, either the existing transmission lines or those proposed, as being an issue, nor do I see them as deterring myself and others like myself from visiting the North Country. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

John Wilkinson from Lancaster, and following him will be Peter Powell from Lancaster.
MR. WILKINSON: My name is John Wilkinson. I live in Lancaster, and I'm a lifelong resident of New Hampshire. Over the past five-plus years I've followed the possible approval of this electrical transmission project. I've never witnessed greater public opposition or outrage to anything here in New Hampshire like there is to the Northern Pass. That said, there is finally a solution to end this conflict and move the project forward, if that's what Mr. Quinlan and the designers of the Northern Pass truly want. Northern Pass is nothing more than an extension cord for a private company. They want permission to stretch it over the state of New Hampshire, allowing it to zigzag from Canada to the New England grid. But since it is the state of New Hampshire, they're try to pass this extension cord project through. It is finally time to completely bury it along New Hampshire's railroad, highway and, yes, interstate rights-of-way, just like it's being done in projects in our neighboring states. New Hampshire and its citizens deserve to be respected, and the state of New Hampshire must remain unspoiled by all proposed private projects, including the Northern Pass. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir. Peter Powell.

MR. POWELL: I'm going to be as brief as I can. I wrote -- my name is Peter Powell. I live in Lancaster. I've been for 42 years in service to Coos County primarily as a real estate broker. And that's piling up a lot of experience in a large rural area.

I'm going to submit some pages online. I'm going to address specifically, when I have a chance to consume it, some of the reports you undoubtedly have about how this project will not harm values.

My main point this evening is simply that this project will impact negatively homeowners, property owners, property investors and others throughout the county, throughout the region, throughout the state in some ways that they may never be able to recover from. To put ugly objects -- it is simply a truth that, if you put an ugly object on a beautiful landscape, those who are forced to look upon it will experience the reduction in the value and the marketability of their home. And you cannot dress one of these things up to the point where it becomes acceptable to those who are forced to see it instead of that which they've come to enjoy. People, when they
come here, the market that we have for our properties here, will not accept in this location what you may accept in yours or what they may accept in their homes in Connecticut, Massachusetts or Southern New Hampshire. Here you start from a higher level, a pristine environment. And when that environment is attacked by something like this, the drop in value is precipitous and critical and severe. It isn't starting with someone who is already looking out at traffic and industrial development and pollution of one sort or another and other power lines and subtracting a lesser amount because you're already degraded. Here, that degree of degradation amounts to a large drop in value, and a consequence not only to the property owners, but also to businesses.

The idea of running around Lancaster, rolling down Martin Meadow Pond Road, up the North Road or out Route 2 and encountering a vision of these towers, where previously you encountered some of the most favorite vistas that we and others have ever had, is threatening and formidable. The idea that this doesn't happen because of lines is simply contrary to the record that we do have.

Anecdotally, Wheeler Clark, 25 years
ago, paid Public Service to bury the line in front of his home on my road, Martin Meadow Pond Road, because it stood between him and the view of Mount Washington. And he thought it was ugly, so he paid to bury it. In every division -- subdivision throughout New Hampshire where new homes are being built, property developers and property owners are putting their lines underground, just little residential lines, because they're ugly to see, and because they'll enjoy their properties more without them and they'll get a higher reward when they sell them. It's just being demonstrated throughout New Hampshire every day.

I stood in Randolph, in front of a home on beautiful land with a beautiful view of Adams and Madison last summer, with a couple from out of New Hampshire who looked at the view and saw the simple little residential line across the street about 400 yards -- 400 feet away and said, "Isn't it a shame that you have to look out at that power line." There are countless examples throughout the region where Northern Pass has already had a negative impact on property, disposition of property values. The outcome of this thing would be devastating.

The balance has not been arrived at yet.
It still has to be pursued. This is not in balance for our region. You've taken the approach, in my view, of starting across the region by building above the ground and finding out where you had to go under. I think you need to reverse that. And if Bayroot or somebody else wants you to pop up because nobody else can see them, save a few bucks and ruin their property, but don't impact those who have to look out upon this line anywhere along its length.

[Audience interruption]

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The next speakers will be Art Hammon from Whitefield, Allen Bouthier [sic] from Lancaster, Dolly McPhaul from Sugar Hill, and Mark McCullock from North Stratford.

MR. HAMMON: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name Art Hammon. I live in Whitefield. I'm a retired science educator. I was intrigued by the comment that, when asked what the potential profit or benefit to Eversource would be, you didn't seem to know. I find it interesting that a $4 billion project is being started without any idea what the return on investment would be. So let me see if I can help.

I've done a back-of-the-envelope
calculation regarding the commercial value of the electrons that will pass through -- and I used 1,000-megawatt line -- during the 40 years of its existence. The calculation begins with physical constants. It applies a rate of one cent per kilowatt hour as after-expenses profit that would be realized by Eversource. It seems that the return on investment of this line, even buried, would be substantial. Here's my calculation: A 1,000-megawatt line carries 3.6 times 10 to the 9th kilowatt hours per hour. Multiply that times 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, in 40 years, you'll have 3.1 times 10 to the 14th kilowatt hours. After considering expenses and amortizing the cost of construction during this period, an estimated return on investment of about a penny per kilowatt hour seems a reasonable constant. Using these estimates, the net value to Eversource of the electrons sent through a buried Northern Pass line of 1,000 megawatts for 40 years is $3.15 trillion. If, as stated by Eversource officials at the public hearing, that the buried line would cost as much as $3 billion, then that represents one one-thousandth of the collected revenues that would be realized over the 40-year life of the buried line. I hope these calculations prove helpful.
in your boardroom.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr. Allen Bouthillier. I know I'm not saying your name correctly, but you're going to have to spell your name for them as well.

MR. BOUTHILLIER: My name is Allen Bouthillier. First name is A-L-L-E-N, last name is B-O-U-T-H-I-L-L-I-E-R. I'm a resident of Lancaster, New Hampshire. My family and I own AB Excavating. I started out -- I was born and brought up in Coos County. I started out with a chainsaw and a desire to raise a family and make a living in Coos County. Eventually, I started my own company. I grew from one cable skidder, and I've diversified into an operation that logs, trucks, does land clearing and is heavily diversified and invested into construction. Major part of our business is land we own. We own over 3,000 acres in the North Country.

I'm here today to tell you that I support Northern Pass. Northern Pass is the type of project that helps companies like ours to grow and prosper. We hope to be able to land some of those local jobs that we've talked about. I've met with Bill Quinlan, Sam Johnson and many others from Eversource.
They've introduced many of us local contractors to some of the largest contractors in the United States. I feel very confident that they want local contractors working on this project and will meet their stated goal of New Hampshire workers first.

There's lot of bad information being put out from opponents about the jobs associated with this project not being good jobs or that there won't be local opportunities. Their statements are ignorant of the facts that those of us in the construction industry have already experienced with other energy projects. We experienced the increased opportunity to work, the need to hire more workers, experienced the need to hire lawyers, surveyors and the trickle-down effect of this work.

I've hired more workers. They have located here, bought homes here, bought vehicles here and raised their families here. As a landowner, I applaud Northern Pass for taking the time and the money to work with private landowners in developing their right-of-way. As a large landowner, let me assure you, each year it becomes harder to pay the taxes and justify tying up capital on large tracts of land in Coos County. Whether you were hiking, hunting, fishing...
or snowmobiling, I am sure that some people in this room take for granted the ability to freely cross private land for their own recreational enjoyment. And many of us who own these large tracts of land value our ability to provide these free access. This isn't the case in many states across the country, where people pay to have access to private land. However, when these same people, our state-elected officials and others, want to restrict our ability as private landowners to generate income from sources like this transmission line and force it to be buried in roads and on public land only, we have no other alternative but to start charging for the use of our private land. And in order to do that, we will raise capital by charging for fees for access to snow machines, hunting, fishing, leasing it, which is something that is now for free.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Going to ask you to wrap it up, sir.

MR. BOUTHILLIER: Yup. Coos County is 1831 square miles, 1,171,000 acres; 594 acres of it is Northern Pass; 13.5 acres of it's underground; 436 acres of it is on Wagner Forest and 145 acres is on land owned by Northern Pass. So, in the grand scheme
of things, it's a small impact on the total acreage of Coos County.

I'd like to also point out that the vast DC line in Vermont, the major DC line in Vermont, is a major north-south corridor for ATV snow machine use. And if this is utilized, it can be utilized here in New Hampshire, which would increase the tourism here with ATVs and snow machines, and not hinder it.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sir, time's up.

MR. BOUTHILLIER: I support Northern Pass because I want this opportunity for my family and my employees and my community, and I encourage SEC to approve this project as quickly as possible.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

Ms. McPhaul.

MS. McPHAUL: My name's Dolly McPhaul, and I'm from Sugar Hill. It's spelled M-C, capital P, H-A-U-L. I'm here to oppose the Northern Pass, and I'm also here to oppose the business practices of the Northern Pass.

Five years ago, Northern Pass came to New Hampshire. The residents didn't want it; however, we have been stuck with it. You have used low-down
business practices to force the Northern Pass the way you want it through New Hampshire. You have lied to us repeatedly. One of them, you recently said that there was a study done that showed tourism would not suffer because of the Northern Pass. Well, I beg to differ. One hundred thirty-five-foot towers -- or 85- to 135-foot towers every 5 to 700 feet through 120 miles of New Hampshire, most of which is beautiful scenery, is not going to affect tourism? You need to ask some tourists. I've done it. They said they wouldn't come back. Second homeowners who don't have affiliations to the area said they would be out of here, that they came here for the beautiful views and the lifestyle. They did not come out here to look out their windows and see steel towers.

You have mentioned your PPA, that New Hampshire would get 10 percent of the power, that we would get reduced rates, but when asked to produce your PPA, you had to admit you didn't have one.

And then there's the WOKQ fine of over $500,000 by the FCC for putting forth 178 pro-Northern Pass notices, failing to mention that they were paid ads, paid by Northern Pass.

I would like to go on, but I changed my
mind because of something you have dwelled on tonight, Mr. Quinlan, and that's your desire for a balance. As I see it, on one side we have the Northern Pass; on the other side we have thousands and thousands of people, and town after town after town. So I don't see the balance. And as I see it, you lose. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mark. McCullock. And could you spell your name for us, please.

MR. McCULLOCK: M-C-C-U-L-L-O-C-K, and I'm from North Stratford, New Hampshire. I've been involved in this battle for five years.

The average homeowner uses 1,000 kilowatt hours per month. My wife and I average 330 kilowatt hours per month. Even though we use such a little amount of power compared to the norm, we decided to install a solar system. We installed it June 27th. We have exported more power than we have used from day one, and we're still exporting more now than we're using.

Five years ago, remember when we were going to get our land taken away by eminent domain by these exceptionally good business folks, that they're so tried and true to us? You lost. New Hampshire's
Green Energy portfolio includes small hydropower, not large hydropower. You tried to change it, and you didn't.

You talk about scenic views. You show us pictures of scenic views. They're all in the summertime. Let's see these views you're showing in the wintertime. These poles will stand out like sore thumbs.

You talk about your EMF studies. Talk to Dr. McClaren(?) about EMF studies. I remember one that he spoke about in Europe. I don't mean to bore you, by the way, because you're looking at your watch.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Just doing my job, sir.

MR. MCCULLOCK: Yeah, I noticed.

The study he found in Europe found otherwise, as far as leukemia and kids are concerned.

As far as your $200 million to Forward New Hampshire, I know what you can do with that $200 million. Have a good evening.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

Okay. The next four speakers will be Robert Van Vlaanderen from Millsfield, Luke Wotton or
Wotton from Whitefield, K. Lee Dube from Berlin and Will Abbott from Holderness.

Mr. Van Vlaanderen from Millsfield?

(No verbal response)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr. Wotton.


I had a teacher in high school who was anti-Northern Pass, even before Northern Pass had happened. He taught us about the whole Hydro-Quebec and what you guys are doing with those fricken dams up there. That's not clean energy. I can guarantee it's not clean energy. Even at the U.N., the U.N. shut you guys down from building the Great Whale until you guys had people buying the power. The U.N. shut you guys down, Hydro-Quebec, for your dirty power up there that you're trying to sell as clean power. It's not clean power. I'm against all northern Quebec power. But screw it. I mean, bury it underneath the roads. And if DOT -- if DOT doesn't see it as necessary, then don't come to us. We don't need your fricken power. New Hampshire exports power. This power is not for us.
Stop saying it's for us. It's for the southern folks. It's not for us. God...

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir. K. Lee Dupre?

(No verbal response)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Will Abbott? And following Mr. Abbott we'll have Paul Sepe from Lancaster. Ms. McPhaul, did you put in two sheets? And Joseph Keenan.

MR. ABBOTT: Good evening. My name is Will Abbott. I'm from Holderness. And I'm here tonight speaking on behalf of the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests. The Forest Society owns and holds conservation easements in Coos County, and we own land in Coos County that are directly impacted by the current proposal for Northern Pass before the Site Evaluation Committee.

As we've noted in other forums, we have a legal and ethical responsibility to defend these conservation lands. We also have a long history of protecting scenic views in New Hampshire statewide. And our opposition to Northern Pass as opposed is based, in part, on the visual scars that the Project will cut across 132 miles of the state, including the
newly proposed corridor in northern Coos County. The current proposal includes burying an underground stretch in Clarksville through land that we own. It also involves burial over 7 miles along municipal roads in Clarksville and Stewartstown through privately owned lands on which the Forest Society holds conservation easements that prohibit above- or below-ground transmission lines. Truth be told, Northern Pass is not proposing this 8 miles of burial because you somehow got religion on landscape conservation; rather, you're proposing this 8 miles of burial because there's no other way to connect the dots for what was originally intended to be an entirely above-ground project. The Forest Society has no intention of allowing our Washburn Family Forest in Clarksville to facilitate 132 miles of new overhead lines that would create totally unavoidable scars on landscapes. Because the SEC is not authorized to resolve property rights disputes, only the New Hampshire Superior Court can do this, we have filed a petition in Coos County Superior Court to defend our property rights in Clarksville.

As Attorney Iacopino noted in his presentation earlier this evening, there are four
findings the Site Evaluation Committee must make before it can decide whether or not to issue a Certificate of Site and Facility. We have filed a motion to intervene, and we plan to litigate the Northern Pass Application as proposed. We believe it fails to meet even the minimum thresholds for three of the four required findings, and the SEC only needs to find that one of these four thresholds is not satisfied in order to say "No" to an application. On the fourth finding, we don't contest that Northern Pass has the financial and technical capability to build what they propose. In fact, as others have suggested this evening, we believe you have the financial and technical capability to do more than what you propose. We believe you have the capacity to bury the line completely. And we think you've taken a good step in the right direction by adopting the HVDC Lite technology and by acknowledging that burial is possible through the White Mountains. Mr. Quinlan earlier this evening acknowledged the broad public concern about scenic impacts and has said that there is still work to be done in this regard. We heartily agree. The only difference is we think that the way to refine the design is to completely bury it. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

Paul Sepe, S-E-P-E, looks like, from Lancaster, followed by Mr. Keenan, Joseph Keenan. And Mr. Keenan, followed by Jared Booth of Berlin.

MR. SEPE: I'm Paul Sepe from Lancaster. It's spelled S-E-P-E.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

MR. SEPE: Most of us in this room twice a year hear from our towns when we get our property tax bill. That property tax is dependent on the property record, the assessment we have. That assessment for me and a lot of people in this room includes our view. On that view we pay a property tax twice a year. That view is there for our property. The state has said so repeatedly. The view is part of our property. The Fifth Amendment to the U.S. constitution says, "Property shall not be taken without just compensation." Where is the just compensation for the taking of my property, my view? I live about a half a mile from the route. I would look out the window and see towers about a quarter of the height, apparent height of Mount Washington. In your bribes -- I mean, in your whatever you call the $200 million to the North
Country, I don't see any mitigation of what you call "minimal view impacts." You haven't mitigated. You haven't set aside any money for people like me who will lose tens of thousands of dollars on our property. Now, if you're so confident that the destruction of views is so minimal, why have you not -- or this is not a question time. I would suggest that you set aside some money in your list of bribes for property owners like me and like thousands of others in the North Country who are going to lose property. And I also address this to the state reps who may or may not still be here. I suggested this to some of them. The State of New Hampshire should protect us from this. We should be made whole when we lose our property. But there is no provision in state law or the Northern Pass Project to do that. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir. Mr. Keenan.

MR. KEENEN: Good evening. My name is Joseph T. Keenan, Ph.D. I live in Northumberland. K-E-E-N-A-N. I'm a child psychologist. I came here 20 years ago because one day I drove through Lancaster, and I liked the way it looked. I could have gone anywhere. I was at the University of Pennsylvania
finishing my doctorate, and I wanted to be a child psychologist in a rural area. I wanted to be someplace where there already wasn't somebody doing what I wanted to do. I decided to come here because of the way it looked.

I now own 280 acres of land in the Lost Nation section of Northumberland which I bought about 10 years ago, and I have a 50-kilowatt hydro electric power plant on my property. As I'm standing here right now, I'm generating 22 kilowatts into the grid with an arrangement that I have with Eversource. I'm part of a group net metering project. I have 10 people who buy power supposedly through me, and I have renewable energy credits that I sell every quarter of the year.

I have an outstanding, outstanding view to the west of the Vermont horizon right across the presently invisible right-of-way because those towers are below the tree line. I look out toward Vermont between Paige Hill Road and North Road. I see the sun go down every day. I've had my property reappraised for refinancing purposes twice in the past five years. On each reappraisal report it described the negative impact potential of the Northern Pass Project to my property value each time it was reappraised. It's in
writing. I have filed to be an intervenor. I have intervenor status on the basis of this project's financial impact on me. I support the Forest Society's legal fund with automated monthly contributions that will continue as long as necessary.

But that's not really why I'm standing here. I'm standing here because it's just background so you can recognize me as a stakeholder, one of the many of us who have been brought together from the right and the left and the middle, like no other project. No other issue I've ever seen in 20 years has brought together the political spectrum the way this one has. My reason for standing here is primarily because I don't believe this is the right way to do this for my town, for nature itself. It's not just about aesthetics. It's just wrong on so many levels. And it's interesting to me to speculate that, over the years that I've been involved in caring about political issues, that I've never put myself on the line to the point where I would be willing to be arrested. I admired Henry David Thoreau's stand. I admire what Martin Luther King did. I admire what Mahatma Gandhi did. You get things done sometimes by standing up and simply saying "No."
PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

Jared Booth from Berlin?

(No verbal response)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.

Michael Vannatta from Moultonborough, followed by Chris Reis from Fremont, followed by Jeanne Menard from Deerfield.

Mr. Vannatta.

MR. VANNATTA: My name is Michael Vannatta, and I live in Moultonborough, New Hampshire.

(Court Reporter interrupts.)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Your name.

MR. VANNATTA: Oh, sorry.


I support the Northern Pass for many reasons, but the main reason for me is jobs. And I'm here speaking for myself and for the five guys who had to leave because they couldn't wait any longer. They have to get up at 4:30. They've got to drive to Massachusetts to go to work. So that's my main reason.

You know, there's a lot of jobs being created here in New Hampshire, a lot of support of the New Hampshire economy. Create construction jobs for
New Hampshire residents. I, along with many, are
tired, you know, leaving the state to make a living for
our family. And that's really all I wanted to say.
So, thank you for your time.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, sir.

Chris Reis, R-E-I-S, from Fremont.

(No verbal response)

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Jeanne

Menard from Deerfield. Just remember to spell your
name for us, ma'am.

MS. MENARD: Jeanne, J-E-A-N-N-E,
Menard, M-E-N-A-R-D.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment

Northern Pass Transmission has
represented that Deerfield is the terminus of this
project. Since 2010, Deerfield residents have obvious
concerns about the current right-of-way impacts due to
Northern Pass, but we also have concerns about impacts
to outgoing lines and for future expansion projects to
route incoming electricity. I've been told by Northern
Pass representatives that Northern Pass has nothing to
do with the outgoing lines, that this will be handled...
by Eversource. Our Deerfield Conservation Commission recently received a handout entitled, "Northern Pass Transmission Project, Summary of Water Resource Impacts," and this was dated January 12, 2016. And on this list of towns -- and again, I'd like to repeat that the heading on this handout, and I will submit the handout, is "Northern Pass Transmission Project."

There are towns of Londonderry and Raymond with wetland impacts disclosed, along with Deerfield impact, wetland impacts. A Deerfield outgoing line from our substation connects to Londonderry. As there are five structures on that line that are slated for rebuild changes, I propose that this line should be considered for the same rigorous environmental impact studies as the proposed route. If Northern Pass performed in Londonderry and Raymond wetlands studies, in my opinion, this outgoing line should as well, given that the wetlands around the proposed upgraded structures are clearly evident and could be argued that they are part of the Northern Pass Project. Transparency regarding the true scope of this project with work in Deerfield around the existing substation already underway is of great concern to me.

I am disappointed that a member of the
New Hampshire Banking Commission is not sitting on the SEC. I consider this project a wire transfer, not about electricity, but rather money; electricity flowing to southern New England and money flowing internationally to Quebec. The for-profit aspect due to the partnership with Hydro-Quebec is a major concern for me. I feel that Eversource is capitalizing or cashing in, if you will, on this right-of-way with little regard for the statewide outcry against high towers. Burial of the lines creates a balance that help offset some of my concerns. Thank you, and safe travels home everyone.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you. Ms. Menard, could you give your notes to the court reporters? Thank you.

Ms. Farrell.

MS. FARRELL: Attorney Weatherbee --

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: No, I'm Mike Iacopino. Patricia Weathersby is the public member of the Site Evaluation Committee. I am counsel to the Committee.

MS. FARRELL: Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And could you spell your name, please.
MS. FARRELL: F-A-R-R-E-L-L.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

(Court Reporter interrupts.)

MS. FARRELL: R-I-T-A.

I'm here as a private citizen. I'm not here to talk about the Northern Pass. I am here to talk about the *modus operandi* of this meeting.

There seems to be a great disparity or inequity in the way the First Amendment rights of free speech are granted to the Applicant compared with those that are granted to the citizens affected by the Project. When the gentleman said that he would prefer a tower to burial, he said a tower, but never qualified his answer with why as a resident he would prefer a tower. This qualification is basic to good information. He's entitled to say what he wants to say, but he needs to qualify it, and it was not.

And, sir, I plan to look at the section of R.S.A. 162-H that says these meetings and hearings are to be conducted in this way, with no applause allowed or follow-up by a questioner dissatisfied with the inadequacy of an answer to a question, and people are silenced by the moderator with the gratuitous demand that people be polite, as if applause and cheers
are ipso facto rude.

And when Mr. Quinlan spoke -- you
mentioned this is like a court proceeding and that the
members of the Committee are judges. So when Mr.
Quinlan spoke of the confidentiality granted the London
Economics group, then I would like to ask if there was
a proffer made to determine that that confidentiality
was legitimate, or should that be open to the people?
When employees of Eversource in the back of the room
applauded, they were not told to be polite.

I think that this section -- I've been
to three of these now -- and this section of the
meetings would probably be best to be presented first
rather than at the very end when people have been worn
out by the long evening. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.
And last, but not least, Senator Woodburn.

SEN. WOODBURN: Thank you. Jeff
Woodburn. I am the senator from District 1,
representing all 58 communities, 27 percent of the
state's land mass, an area larger than two states and
17 foreign countries.

And I just have to tell the story -- and
I wasn't intending to, because I love Rita -- because
someone -- I was complaining about this process, and a friend who supports Northern Pass said, "Well, Senator, this is your process. You introduced legislation, along with our friends that were anti-Northern Pass, and many of the senators who oppose Northern Pass."

So, you know, I appreciate this process. No process is perfect. But the opportunity to listen, to take criticism, and I think this is a good process. So I just wanted to start with that.

But I want to focus my comments on a piece that I believe hasn't been dealt with -- and many areas have been dealt with -- and that is the imbalance that I see between part of my district in the south, the Grafton County area, and the part in the north, Coos County. And the current proposal falls short and must be changed to meet the needs of the North Country, particularly Coos County. I've long said that Northern Pass needs to provide tangible local benefits. And progress has been made back from 2010 when this process started, to see the changes in this more recently, the burial in the White Mountain region, and importantly, starting a large mitigation fund to expand economic opportunity and compensate communities impacted by this project.
But an imbalance still exists. And we cannot in the North Country divide ourselves into winners and losers. I remain concerned about the impact of this project in Coos County, especially in my hometown, the place my family has lived for three generations, where four out of five entry points to my hometown are impacted by these overhead lines. And quite frankly, more needs to be done to target and clearly define benefits for this region and to fix the imbalance.

And I would suggest this could be done with additional burial and could be done with more mitigation money to affected communities, or some combination of the two. Thank you very much for your work here, and thank you for your time.

PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you, Senator.

Okay. That's the last speaker that has signed up to speak. We are going to adjourn.

Please remember, if you believe that you have an interest, a substantive interest that would support your intervention, such motions have to be filed by February 5th. We're going to be having our final public information session tomorrow night at the
Mountain Club at Loon in Lincoln, New Hampshire, at 6 p.m. Thank you. We're adjourned.

(Whereupon the public information session was adjourned at 10:39 p.m.)