

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

NOTED AS PRESENT:

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

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

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

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

William Quinlan

James Muntz

Samuel Johnson

Kevin Bowes

Jerry Fortier

Lee Carbonneau

Bob Varney

Terry DeWan

Cherilyn Widell

Mark Hodgdon

Chris Soderman

Jessica Kimball

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

I N D E X

PAGE NO.

PRESENTATION FROM THE SEC (by Pres. Officer Iacopino)	9
PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANTS (by Mr. Quinlan)	27
QUESTION-AND-ANSWER SESSION	42
PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY:	
Rep. Brad Bailey	139
Rep. Leon Rideout	141
Alan McLain	143
Carl Martland	150
Nancy Martland	152
Katie Rose	155
Jim Dannis	156
Mike Stirling	162
Paul Grenier	164
Harry Brown	166
Jason Lauze	173
John Wilkinson	175
Peter Powell	176
Art Hammon	179

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

I N D E X (continued)

PAGE NO.

PUBLIC STATEMENTS BY:

Allen Bouthillier	181
Dolly McPhaul	184
Mark McCulloch	186
Luke Wotton	188
Will Abbott	189
Paul Sepe	192
Joseph Keenan	193
Michael Vannatta	196
Jeanne Menard	197
Rita Farrell	200
Sen. Jeff Woodburn	201

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: All right.
3 Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Michael
4 Iacopino. And, I am Counsel to the New Hampshire Site
5 Evaluation Committee. And, we are here tonight in
6 Docket Number 2015-06, the Joint Application of
7 Northern Pass Transmission and Public Service Company
8 of New Hampshire for a Certificate of Site and Facility
9 for the project commonly referred to as "Northern
10 Pass". I am the outside counsel to the New Hampshire
11 Site Evaluation Committee, and I was appointed to run
12 this meeting by our Chairman, Martin Honigberg. Thank
13 you all for coming out.

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

24 If any time during the pendency of this

1 Application anybody needs information or has questions,
2 I would suggest that the first place that you go to is
3 the Site Evaluation Committee's website. It's up there
4 on the screen, *www.nhsec.nh.gov*. At our website, we
5 have posted the Application, the filings, the
6 pleadings, and we get them up on the website as quickly
7 as we can.

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

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

21 We will then take questions from the
22 public. And, those questions should be written out,
23 please, on the green sheets. If you don't have a green
24 sheet, you should probably get one. And, some folks

1 will be walking around with them, they're also
2 available out front.

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

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

19 And, again, in your questions, please
20 ask questions. You know, there is also blue sheets
21 available, if you wish to make a written comment. Or,
22 if you wish to make an oral statement, fill out one of
23 the yellow cards to make an oral statement. But the
24 questioning part of the process is so that people can

1 get their questions answered and the public can get the
2 information that they need.

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

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

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

24 So, that's the process that we're going

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

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

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

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

20 The Site Evaluation Committee is created
21 by RSA 162-H. RSA 162-H has a number of purposes that
22 the Legislature has published. The first is to balance
23 the impacts and the benefits of site selection on very
24 important considerations: The welfare of the

1 population, private property, the location and growth
2 of industry, the economic growth of the state, the
3 environment, historic sites, aesthetics, air and water
4 quality, natural resources, and public health and
5 safety.

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

18 And, finally, to ensure that the
19 construction and operation of energy facilities are
20 treated as a significant aspect of land use planning,
21 in which all environmental, economic, and technical
22 issues are resolved in an integrated fashion. In
23 essence, the Site Evaluation Committee is a statewide
24 planning board for energy projects. It's designed to

1 take all the various permitting that a energy project
2 would otherwise require if there was not a Site
3 Evaluation Committee, and to integrate it into a single
4 process. And, that process will include environmental,
5 economic, and technical issues.

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

18 *[Audio interruption.]*

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

23 Today, the Site Evaluation Committee is
24 made up of the folks that are up on the screen right

1 now. Our Chairman is the Chairman of the Public
2 Utilities Commission, Martin Honigberg; our Vice
3 Chairman is the Commissioner of the Department of
4 Environmental Services, Thomas Burack; Robert Scott and
5 Kathryn Bailey, who are both PUC Commissioners, sit on
6 the Site Evaluation Committee; as does our Commissioner
7 of the Department of Transportation, Victoria Sheehan;
8 as does our DRED Commissioner, Department of Resources
9 & Economic Development, Jeffrey Rose; also, the Site
10 Evaluation Committee includes either the Commissioner
11 of Cultural Resources or the Director of Historic
12 Resources, and usually it's the Director of Historic
13 Resources, and that's either -- in that case, it would
14 be either Van McCloud or Elizabeth Muzzey. And, We
15 have two public members, although there is a vacancy in
16 one spot. One of our public members died a couple
17 weeks ago, Roger Hawk. Our other public member is
18 Patricia Weathersby. And, we have an alternate public
19 member, Rachel Whitaker. That's the Committee.

20 Each member of the Committee that's a
21 state official has the authority to substitute somebody
22 in his or her place to sit on a subcommittee that
23 considers either a transmission line or an energy
24 facility before the Committee. And, in this particular

1 case, there has been a Subcommittee appointed, and
2 there have been some designations made.

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

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

21 In every case before the Site Evaluation
22 Committee where there is an application to site or
23 construct an energy facility or a transmission line,
24 Counsel for the Public is appointed. He or she is

1 appointed by the Attorney General, and has the
2 obligation to represent the public in seeking to
3 protect the quality of the environment and in seeking
4 to assure an adequate supply of energy.

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

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

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

19 MR. ROTH: Good evening, everybody. I'm
20 Peter Roth. I am a Senior Assistant Attorney General,
21 just like the slide said. I was appointed by the
22 Attorney General, Joseph Foster, in this case. I've
23 been appointed in this position as Counsel for the
24 Public in a number of other cases since approximately

1 2006, including the Laidlaw plant, which was built
2 here, and the Granite Reliable Wind Farm, also in Coos
3 County, in Dummer.

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

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

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

24 I have, in this case, already engaged

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

9 *[Laughter.]*

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

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

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

23 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
24 Peter.

1 As many of you in this room probably
2 know, there's a lot that goes on before the application
3 ever gets to the Site Evaluation Committee,
4 particularly in a case like this, in a docket like
5 this, that is relatively large. And, what I've done on
6 this slide is just sort of laid out a number of things
7 that are undertaken by applicants and the Committee,
8 and required, before an application can actually be
9 filed with the Site Evaluation Committee.

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

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

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

22 They should meet with your regional
23 planning commissions, your municipalities, sometimes
24 conservation commissions, sometimes planning boards,

1 sometimes zoning boards, sometimes boards of selectmen.

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

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

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

20 The applications are -- this Application
21 is voluminous. It's approximately 27,000 pages long.
22 All applications before the Site Evaluation Committee
23 must contain sufficient information to satisfy the
24 application requirements for every state agency that

1 would have permitting or other regulatory authority
2 under state or federal law. And, they have to have
3 those application forms included in the application.

4 An application also has to include a
5 number of things: It must reasonably describe in
6 detail the type and size of each major part of the
7 proposed project. It must identify the preferred
8 choice and any other choice for the site of each major
9 part of the proposed project. And, obviously, with a
10 transmission line, which is a linear project, as we
11 refer to them, there are a lot of different sites
12 involved. It must describe in reasonable detail the
13 impact of each major part of the proposed facility on
14 the environment for every site. It must describe in
15 detail the applicant's proposals for dealing with
16 environmental problems. It must describe in detail the
17 applicant's financial, technical, and managerial
18 capabilities to undertake siting, construction, and
19 operation of the project. It must document that notice
20 has been given to each -- to the governing body of each
21 community where the facility is proposed to be located.
22 And, it must describe in reasonable detail the elements
23 and financial assurances for a facility decommissioning
24 plan. That is, "when the facility is no longer useful,

1 how is it going to be dismantled and removed?" And,
2 finally, they must provide additional information as
3 required by the Site Evaluation Committee.

4 And, as of December 15th -- December 16,
5 2015, the Site Evaluation Committee has new rules that
6 have additional requirements for applications. And,
7 this particular Applicant will be subjected to those
8 new rules. However, under the statute, we are required
9 to give them sufficient time to supplement their
10 Application, if that is required. We understand that
11 the Applicant is seeking until March 15th to supplement
12 its Application. That's a decision that will be made
13 by the Chairman of the Committee.

14 There are certain timeframes that the
15 Site Evaluation Committee must act under by statute.
16 The first, I spoke briefly about pre-application
17 information sessions. Those have to be held by the
18 applicant at least 30 days before they file their
19 application. Once an application is filed, the
20 application has to be distributed to each agency that
21 has permitting or other regulatory authority. And, it
22 has to be reviewed by the Committee itself. And, the
23 Committee has to determine if the application is what
24 we call "complete". "Complete" doesn't mean it's going

1 to be granted. It just means that it contains
2 sufficient information for the Committee to do its job,
3 and also sufficient information to satisfy each of the
4 state agencies that might have jurisdiction in the
5 case.

6 And, that determination had to be made
7 within 60 days of the filing of the Application. And,
8 in this case, on December 18th, 2015, the Site
9 Evaluation Committee voted to deem this Application to
10 be complete. Now, that's an important day, because all
11 of the rest of the timeframes start on December 18th,
12 2015.

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

1 published. And, we have to complete those five
2 proceedings before Saint Patrick's Day.

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

16 Between August 15, 2016 and December
17 19th, 2016, the Subcommittee of the Site Evaluation
18 Committee is required to hold adjudicative hearings.
19 Those are hearings that are very much like a courtroom
20 trial. There will be witnesses. Those witnesses will
21 be cross-examined. There will be exhibits presented by
22 all of the parties.

23 And, the Site Evaluation Committee will
24 consider, at the end of the adjudicative process,

1 everything that they have heard in the adjudicative
2 process, everything that they have heard at the joint
3 public hearings, everything that they have read in all
4 of the transcripts, including the transcripts from
5 meetings like tonight, before they reach any final
6 decision in this case. That final decision has to be
7 determined within 365 days of the acceptance of the
8 Application. And, that date is December 19th, 2016.

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

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

24 We accept written public comment

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

12 And, finally, sort of the way to
13 participate most fully, I guess, is by what we call
14 "filing a motion to intervene". And, if that motion is
15 granted, you will be provided the same rights as any
16 other party to the proceeding. However, in order to
17 file a motion to intervene, you must demonstrate that
18 you have rights, duties, privileges, immunities, or
19 other substantial interests that may be affected by the
20 proceedings, and that your participation as a party in
21 the proceeding will be in the interest of justice and
22 will not impair the orderly and prompt conduct of the
23 proceedings. In this case, any motions to intervene
24 must be filed by February 5, 2016.

1 Finally, you're probably wondering
2 what's -- "how is the Site Evaluation Committee going
3 to make this determination?" After all of that process
4 that I've just discussed has occurred, they will
5 deliberate and make a determination. That will be
6 after holding public information sessions, like
7 tonight, after holding joint public hearings, after
8 holding adjudicative proceedings, after considering all
9 the written comments and the various transcripts. They
10 will deliberate in public, as they are required to do.
11 And, in their deliberations, they're required by
12 statute to give due consideration to important
13 information regarding the siting or route of a proposed
14 facility. They have to give due consideration to the
15 significant impacts and benefits. And, they must
16 consider whether the issuance of a certificate will
17 serve the purposes of RSA 162-H, which are those
18 purposes that I showed you in the very first slide.

19 In addition, in order to issue a
20 Certificate of Site and Facility, the Site Evaluation
21 Committee must find by a preponderance of the evidence
22 these features right here: One, that the applicant has
23 adequate financial, technical, and managerial
24 capability to assure that the siting, construction, and

1 operation of any facility will comply with the terms
2 and conditions of any certificate that may be granted.
3 Number two, that the facility will not unduly interfere
4 with the orderly development of the region with due
5 consideration having been given to the views of the
6 municipal and regional planning commissions and
7 municipal governing bodies. And, that's where
8 municipal input into the Site Evaluation process comes
9 in. Third, the Site Evaluation Committee, before it
10 can issue a Certificate of Site and Facility, must find
11 by a preponderance of the evidence that the proposed
12 facility will not have an unreasonable adverse effect
13 on aesthetics, historic sites, air and water quality,
14 the natural environment, or public health and safety.
15 And, finally, the Site Evaluation Committee, in order
16 to issue a Certificate of Site and Facility, must find
17 that the issuance of the certificate will serve the
18 public interest.

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

22 Again, there's our website and important
23 contact information. If, at any point in time, you'd
24 like to see how this translates, please go on our

1 website, pull up a final order in any of the dockets
2 that are on there, and you can see some examples of how
3 the Site Evaluation Committee applies those standards
4 and goes through the process that I've discussed here
5 today.

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

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

22 MR. QUINLAN: Good evening, everyone.

23 *[Audience interruption.]*

24 MR. QUINLAN: I'm Bill Quinlan. I'm the

1 President of Eversource New Hampshire.

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

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

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

1 move through this important process.

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

9 So, first, a quick video on Northern
10 Pass.

11 *[Video presentation provided on the*
12 *Northern Pass Project.]*

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

21 So, as you'll probably recall, if you've
22 been following the Project, a couple of years ago we
23 moved the Project from the western part of the state,
24 over to the eastern part of the state. One of the

1 reasons we wanted to do that was we can go from
2 Dixville down to Dummer in one continuous piece of
3 property. That's the 24 miles of working forest.
4 Okay? So, that's this area down to here *[indicating]*.
5 So, we've essentially got 16 miles of new right-of-way
6 in this entire Project. The dashed portion of this is
7 underground. So, through Clarksville, and much of
8 Stewartstown, underground. So, the overhead portions
9 of new right-of-way are in Pittsburg, and then in these
10 areas *[indicating]*.

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

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

20 A few other points of reference. You
21 know, the average or the most common structure height
22 throughout this portion of the route is around 85 feet.
23 Once you get to this point *[indicating]*, you're at an
24 existing right-of-way. So, this entire quadrant, down

1 through Whitefield, there's an existing transmission
2 right-of-way, an existing transmission line. And,
3 we're essentially going to run Northern Pass in
4 parallel with what's referred to now as the "Coos Loop"
5 or the "Northern Loop". So, this is all existing, and
6 we're running the two lines in parallel.

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

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

16 When Department of Energy took a look at
17 the visual impact, and I know that is a significant
18 issue, "what are the scenic impacts of" -- "what are
19 the visual impacts of this Project?" And, as Attorney
20 Iacopino mentioned, there is a process going on where
21 the Department of Energy is a lead federal permitting
22 agency. So, when they did their Environmental Impact
23 Statement, which is now available in draft form, this
24 was their conclusion when they looked at Northern Pass

1 in its totality, which is that it would essentially
2 have a moderate impact from a visual or a scenic
3 perspective.

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

10 Now, we do recognize that, you know,
11 that's one perspective. We've heard consistently in
12 New Hampshire that we need to do more to address scenic
13 impact/visual impact. These are some of the other
14 techniques that we're using to locally address visual
15 impacts. I mentioned streamlined structures, so they
16 blend more naturally into the landscape. There are
17 things we can do with material construction, heights,
18 location, colors. These are all techniques that are
19 available to us locally, and we intend to use them all
20 as we move through this design and engineering phase.
21 And, we understand that we need to continue to work on
22 this very important issue. Input from municipalities,
23 landowners, local communities, terribly important in us
24 doing that work well.

1 Here's an example that I just want to
2 show you a visual simulation. So, as part of this
3 process and as part of our Application, we've had a
4 series of visual simulations performed from areas of
5 particular import. In this case, Weeks State Park.
6 And, we have a visual simulation expert, who looks at
7 the existing conditions, which is what you see here,
8 and then compares it to what it will look like if
9 Northern Pass is built the way we're currently
10 proposing. And, what it allows us to do, first, it
11 allows us to answer the question that everyone asks,
12 "What is this going to look like? I need to be able to
13 visualize it." We have an expert in the field who's
14 preparing this. This is, in essence, you know, his
15 work.

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

1 over two miles, okay?

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

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

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

15 *[Audience interruption.]*

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

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

1 But it's terribly important work.

2 *[Audience interruption.]*

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

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

14 What else does this Project mean to Coos
15 County? As you look at this from a tax perspective,
16 obviously, it's a significant infrastructure project.
17 It's approximately \$1.6 billion in total, generates
18 approximately \$30 million a year in tax revenue to the
19 State of New Hampshire. You know, a good percentage of
20 that resides here in Coos County, somewhere between 3
21 and \$6 million a year. The reasons for the range is
22 that, you know, we haven't finalized our design. We
23 don't know the true cost today on a town-by-town basis.
24 So, we've prepared a range. As we finalize our design

1 and engineering in the coming weeks, this range will
2 narrow. I will tell you, we're likely to be closer to
3 the middle to upper portion of this range, based upon
4 where we are today.

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

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

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

23 Obviously, lower energy costs are
24 critically important to residential customers,

1 businesses statewide, and, for that matter, across New
2 England. One of the big selling points for Northern
3 Pass, it has a very dramatic impact on stabilizing
4 energy costs and lowering them. Okay? That's also
5 true with taxes. I've talked about taxes.

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

22 Another one I'll touch upon, jobs. When
23 we introduced the ForwardNH approach and plan, we also
24 made a "New Hampshire first" commitment. And, we are

1 imposing that on all of our major contractors. So,
2 while we are lining up national firms to do some of the
3 work, the engineering, the general contracting,
4 *etcetera*, the commitment we've made to New Hampshire,
5 and particularly relevant here in the North Country,
6 is, to the extent possible, we're going to source all
7 of the work associated with this Project locally in the
8 State of New Hampshire. Whether it's electrical
9 workers who are installing the line or other
10 construction and trades, or supporting the building of
11 the facility, whether it's, you know, clearing roads,
12 delivering gravel. You name it, we're going to source
13 it locally. And, we're going to impose that commitment
14 on all of our contractors in this regard.

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

22 Another thing that's particular in the
23 North Country, announced a little while ago, it's now
24 up and running, is a North Country Job Creation Fund.

1 These are funds that we've committed. We've
2 established a board here in the North Country that is
3 independent from our company. And, they're going to
4 manage that fund, and fund initiatives here in the
5 North Country to stimulate the economy and create jobs.
6 They have already had some very good success in 2015.
7 Look forward to more in 2016.

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

17 These are the environmental benefits
18 which aren't quantified up above. Obviously, a
19 significant reduction in greenhouse gases and carbon
20 emissions. Here, in the North Country, we've made a
21 commitment to use 5,000 acres of properties that we own
22 and put them to mixed uses here in the North Country,
23 in part economic development, perhaps some
24 preservation, some recreational. But we're going to

1 look to folks here in Coos County to decide how best to
2 use those properties. And, right now, we're
3 envisioning a mixed use, where these lands aren't
4 simply being preserved, but they're being used for
5 purposes that are important to the county.

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

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

23 You know, because we're running parallel
24 to the Coos Loop in that area that I identified

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

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

23 So, with that brief overview, hopefully,
24 you have a little better perspective on this Project or

1 on Coos County, what it means. And, we look forward to
2 your questions. So, thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

23 The next question for the Site
24 Evaluation Committee is, "How can the Site Evaluation

1 Committee countenance towers and still meet the
2 obligation of preserving environmental values according
3 to R.S.A. 162-H?"

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

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

14 Yes, the Site Evaluation Committee will
15 consider the environmental -- I'm sorry -- the economic
16 consequences, the orderly development of the region,
17 and all of those issues that I went through at the end
18 of my presentation. And I invite everybody to take a
19 look at previous decisions from the Site Evaluation
20 Committee on our web site, and you'll see examples of
21 how they go about doing that. And if you want to see
22 examples each way, by the way, you can find examples of
23 where they've granted certificates and where they've
24 denied certificates.

1 This next question, I guess, is to me.
2 "Once you have accepted payment to represent Northern
3 Pass in any capacity, don't you then give up your
4 rights to speak as a private citizen at meetings? It
5 seems that once you accept payment of any sort, you are
6 an employee and can no longer speak as a private
7 citizen. Please clarify."

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

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

18 There is a process in our rules and in
19 the statute whereby you can file a request to intervene
20 late. I would recommend that you look at the rules and
21 at the statutes in order to do that. I can't give
22 legal advice to folks here, but there is a process, if
23 you're late, to request intervention status. However,
24 our intervention deadline has not yet passed; it's

1 February 5th. So if anybody were to file between now
2 and then, it'd still be on time and you don't have to
3 worry about that.

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

8 The Antrim Wind Project filed in 2014
9 was denied a certificate. The key factor -- there were
10 several factors in that, but the key one, or at least
11 the one that got reported the most, was the concern
12 about aesthetics of those particular wind towers.

13 There have been no other applications for certificates
14 that have been denied; however, jurisdiction has been
15 denied in a couple of cases, which essentially meant
16 the end of the project. There was a proposed wind
17 facility, called "Timbertop," which went off the table
18 because the Site Evaluation Committee would not take
19 jurisdiction. There's also the Wild Meadows Wind
20 Project that was proposed, that the Site Evaluation
21 Committee did not accept their application because they
22 didn't think it was complete, and that project never
23 came back to the Site Evaluation Committee either.

24 "Does the Site Evaluation Committee feel

1 that HVDC towers and wires above the trees are
2 aesthetically okay for New Hampshire residents?"

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

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

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

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

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

23 Yes, and it can be challenged by Counsel
24 for the Public. It can be challenged by any intervenor

1 or any other person who has what lawyers call
2 "standing" in the proceeding; in other words, they have
3 an interest in the proceeding.

4 This next question involves the SEC, and
5 it involves a project that I think was from the late
6 1980s. I'm not quite sure of the dates, but...

7 "Looking at the Site Evaluation Committee web site on
8 past projects when transmission lines were changed from
9 80-foot to towers of 115 feet from Monroe to Ayer,
10 Mass. -- specifically, Warren, New Hampshire -- the
11 Site Evaluation Committee found no problem with these
12 tall towers. Does this mean the Site Evaluation
13 Committee views these towers as aesthetically
14 pleasing?" And then the questioner quotes I think from
15 that particular decision. "We find that the aesthetic
16 impacts of the proposed Phase II facility will be
17 minimal and would not have an unreasonable adverse
18 effect."

19 The answer to the question is that the
20 Site Evaluation Committee will determine whether or not
21 there is an unreasonable adverse impact on aesthetics
22 after they consider all of the evidence in this docket.
23 Because they approved a certain tower height in another
24 docket on another project does not mean that they are

1 bound to do the same thing in this particular case.

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

14 It's the same as I went over in the
15 presentation. Municipalities can move to intervene in
16 these proceedings. They should do so by February 5th.
17 If Nottingham, its select board or planning board, or
18 whoever the municipal governing body is, determines
19 that they want to intervene, they would file a motion
20 just like anybody else. And there are rules. Those
21 rules are on our web site. I can't quote them for you.
22 I believe it's 301.11 is the rule for intervention.
23 You should also look at R.S.A. 541-A, Section 32, which
24 involves intervention in administrative proceedings.

1 This next questioner has a number of
2 questions, two of which appear to relate to the SEC
3 process, and the rest of them I'm just going to put
4 under the questions with regard to burial of the
5 Project.

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

15 The questions are really about what can
16 Public Counsel do. I'll remind you that the statutory
17 process is created by the legislature. It's not
18 created -- the Site Evaluation Committee did not create
19 this process; the legislature did. So the legislature
20 apparently determined that it was a just process.
21 Counsel for the Public has all the same rights as a
22 party in any formal proceeding. He can hire witnesses,
23 and he will make a determination as to the quality of
24 the witnesses that he chooses to hire. And I'm sure he

1 will hire good ones. He always has. And Counsel for
2 the Public routinely hires expert witnesses in
3 applications for certificates of site and facility.

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

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

1 allowed to speak and who they're allowed to speak with.

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

9 (Court Reporter interrupts.)

10 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry.

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

19 The reason why the Applicant is
20 permitted at these proceedings to make a presentation
21 to you is because the legislature has deemed that
22 that's the appropriate way for these public information
23 sessions to be held. They're specifically required to
24 under the statute. It's not a determination whether

1 anybody is correct or incorrect. It's not a -- it has
2 nothing to do with the correctness or incorrectness of
3 any other organization or any person with a different
4 view. It's a public information session where
5 information is supposed to be provided to the public,
6 and the Applicant is required to do that. Any
7 organization, if they have a view on this, can
8 participate in many of the same ways that I went
9 through in the presentation, including and up to moving
10 to intervene, where they will participate in the
11 adjudicatory phase of the proceedings.

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

14 MS. MONROE: Where do you want to start?

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

17 MS. MONROE: Okay.

18 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- a lot.
19 And by the way, just so everybody knows, we have over
20 30 people who have signed up to speak tonight. So I am
21 going to ask, again, Mr. Quinlan, that the answers be
22 direct and as succinct as possible.

23 So these questions are generally about
24 the route. The first one is, "What is expected" --

1 "What is the expected life span of the towers?"

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

7 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next
8 questions involve the decommissioning.

9 "What numbers has Northern Pass stated
10 in its Application for the time required to remove the
11 towers and restore the land to good views and sound
12 conservation, for the cost of removal and restoration,
13 for any jobs that might be filled by local labor? How
14 will the cost be allocated among the various parties?
15 Who are the various parties that will provide payment?"
16 Those are all -- that's three, five questions basically
17 about your decommissioning.

18 MR. QUINLAN: So, just at a high level,
19 just so we're clear, this is a commitment we've made
20 long ago, and we continue to honor it, which is that
21 neither the construction of this project nor its
22 ultimate decommissioning will be paid for by New
23 Hampshire customers, okay. So there are a series of
24 agreements between us and our partner, Hydro-Quebec,

1 that provide the funding for the Project, including the
2 decommissioning. But in both cases, New Hampshire
3 customers won't bear any of that cost.

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

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

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

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

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

21 MR. QUINLAN: We've not determined how
22 we would source the decommissioning. Now, our
23 anticipation is that, you know, that's a decision we'll
24 make 50 or 60 years from now. Our commitments around

1 using local labor are for construction purposes.

2 Although, you know, I suspect, particularly here in the
3 North Country, there's plenty of demolition contractors
4 who can help play a role in that ultimate
5 decommissioning process. It would make sense to look
6 there first. But that's something we wouldn't decide
7 for a number of decades.

8 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next
9 question involves a specific point along the route.

10 "What will Transition Station No. 5 in
11 Bethlehem look like, including the types of structures,
12 their size and foundation? And please provide
13 information about the size of the lay-down and staging
14 areas, construction time and the extent of blasting."

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

21 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Please do
22 your best.

23 MR. QUINLAN: Go ahead.

24 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. We'll start with

1 the transition station in Bethlehem. Typically these
2 are --

3 (Court Reporter interrupts.)

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

16 Lay-down areas was the next question?

17 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes.

18 Lay-down areas and then construction time and blasting.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Lay-down areas will
20 actually be dependent on where they are. They will
21 most likely range from 2 acres to upwards of 5 to 10
22 acres. It really depends on the site conditions of
23 where they're located and the type of property they
24 are. For instance, if it's an old warehouse that we're

1 using for indoor storage, it could be upwards of a
2 100,000 square feet type of facility. And they will be
3 interspersed throughout the project area. Obviously,
4 when you start with the material, the closer you can
5 get it to the actual construction site, the better it
6 is from a transportation perspective.

7 And what was the last?

8 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Blasting.

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

17 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.
18 The next two questions involve the route as well and
19 the height of the poles along the route. They both
20 kind of say the same thing. So, basically, these
21 questioners are asking -- they're making statements,
22 but they're asking whether or not -- well, I'll just
23 read one of them, and the other one's pretty much the
24 same.

1 "The proposal to erect 120-plus-foot
2 towers down the entire length of the state is simply
3 preposterous to New Hampshire residents. These giant
4 towers are required due to the high voltage proposed
5 for this line. Would Eversource consider a lower
6 voltage wire which would have lower negative impacts on
7 New Hampshire and still deliver benefits to the New
8 England grid?"

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

12 MR. JOHNSON: I'll speak to the heights
13 of structures. Heights of structures are typically
14 determined by two things: One, as was mentioned in the
15 question, is the voltage of the lines. The voltage of
16 the lines were chosen based on an exhaustive study of
17 economics of the Project, and basically what made sense
18 from a delivery perspective. And that's how we ended
19 up with originally 1200 and then in the end
20 1090 megawatts.

21 The height of the structures, while
22 they're governed by the National Electric Safety Code,
23 they are also governed by topography and right-of-way
24 width. So when we discuss our average height for our

1 DC structures being in the -- around 85 feet, 80 to
2 85 feet, that is really based on the national code.
3 Certain heights of other structures are determined by
4 topography and/or river crossings and road crossings
5 where the spans have to be somewhat taller or
6 lengthier.

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

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

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

20 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. So, as part of the
21 rebuild within the Coos Loop, we will be rebuilding the
22 existing 115 line, and that is the structures that we
23 just discussed in Stark, for example. Because those
24 structures were built many, many years ago, we're going

1 to replace them with a more robust system, meaning the
2 electrical capacity of the lines will be increased.
3 That's how this -- and we'll connect it into the
4 substation eventually in Dummer. This will allow
5 increased capacity to get out because we're replacing
6 the existing line with a larger conductor.

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

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

15 So, as the video indicated, we've made
16 the determination to, in essence, bypass the White
17 Mountain National Forest with underground construction.
18 Now, there is an existing transmission right-of-way
19 through the White Mountain National Forest and an
20 existing 115kV transmission line through the White
21 Mountain National Forest. That was our previous design
22 was to run these lines in parallel. As we announced
23 late this summer, based upon feedback we received from
24 New Hampshire, we've decided to have all that be

1 underground, bypassing the forest, Franconia Notch, the
2 Appalachian Trail. These were all areas identified to
3 us as being important. That resulted in the Project
4 being reduced in size by almost 20 percent and added
5 several hundred million dollars of cost. And we've
6 made that decision based upon feedback from sessions
7 such as this and others.

8 Anything to add?

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

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

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

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

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

24 And then the next question asks, "The

1 proposed route goes through the Forest Society,
2 Kauffman Forest and Nash Stream State Forest, along
3 with others. What is the purpose of these conservation
4 lands if your company can propose building ugly metal
5 towers through these conservation properties?"

6 So, those all involve specific places
7 along the route.

8 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. So --

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

12 MR. JOHNSON: All right. So, addressing
13 the Route 145 in Clarksville, the Project actually
14 transitions to the underground portion, being the
15 7-1/2-mile underground portion just to the west of
16 Route 145, and it will actually go across Route 145
17 underground and then continue south at that point. So
18 the actual crossing of Route 145 is underground.

19 The second question regarding SPNHF and
20 the two state forests that they note, the existing
21 rights-of-way go through both of these properties, and
22 therefore we have the easement rights to put additional
23 structures in these properties and to do improvements
24 within this right-of-way, and therefore, we have the

1 rights to build our project.

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

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

12 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next
13 question is --

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

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The
23 next question about the route. "If the New Hampshire
24 Department of Transportation does not see it necessary

1 to complete this Project, why should we?" And, "Can
2 the public see your proposal to the Department of
3 Transportation?"

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

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

11 MR. QUINLAN: I don't.

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

16 MR. QUINLAN: We have not announced
17 either our major contractors or equipment suppliers.
18 However, we are, as we move into this next phase of
19 planning, basically in negotiations with all of the
20 above, the major contractors, equipment suppliers. And
21 we do anticipate in the coming weeks being in a
22 position to announce how this project is going to move
23 forward and to whom are we looking for key pieces of
24 equipment. We are not in a position to do so now.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Is it your
2 common practice to have your -- to have the supplier
3 supervise your construction?

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

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

16 MR. JOHNSON: No. Actually, we did
17 study a wide variety of sites all up and down that
18 corridor between Franklin and Deerfield. There were
19 two particular constraints: One, we had to have a site
20 that was big enough and a willing landowner that was
21 willing to sell us property. And thirdly, I guess --
22 so, three items -- a community that was willing to host
23 us. And Franklin certainly has been a very gracious
24 host to this point.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next
2 question has a number of questions, and so I saved it
3 for last with the respect to the route because some of
4 the questions go into burial. So we'll go right into
5 burial of the line as part of this.

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

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

22 MR. QUINLAN: So, just we're clear, this
23 question is pertaining to the Loop itself or Northern
24 Pass?

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yeah, this
2 questioner has other questions about other parts of the
3 Northern Pass and the route. But that is -- I read
4 that question as being with respect to the Coos Loop,
5 the upgrade.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Upgrade.

7 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

8 MR. QUINLAN: I just wanted to be clear.

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

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

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

23 MR. QUINLAN: I think that's really a
24 legal question. As our lawyers have looked at our

1 existing property rights, they're confident that we
2 have the legal rights to use those existing properties,
3 which, again, this is an area where there's an existing
4 right-of-way and existing transmission infrastructure
5 for the purpose that we're proposing.

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

12 MR. QUINLAN: Sam or Ken?

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

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

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

23 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. Northern Pass, LLC
24 is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Eversource, and there

1 is a -- there are a series of contracts between
2 Northern Pass Transmission Company and our partner,
3 Hydro-Quebec. In essence, Hydro-Quebec is responsible
4 for building the portion of this line that's in Canada,
5 and they will also be the supply of power and
6 essentially delivery to the border. Northern Pass will
7 then take it down from Pittsburg to Deerfield.

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

12 "The Transportation Act, administered by
13 Federal Highways, includes a section properly
14 identified as 'Section 4(f)' that directs Federal
15 Highways and its designees to examine project
16 alternatives and select the feasible and prudent
17 project alternative that avoids impact to cultural
18 resources found under the Section 106 process. Doesn't
19 burial under I-93 and other roads" -- I'm sorry.

20 "Wouldn't burial under I-93 and other roads be much
21 less likely to impact cultural resources found
22 significant under the Section 106 process, as well as
23 all other resources, such as properties eligible for
24 listing on the Register of Historical Places which are

1 not eligible for consideration under the Section 106
2 process?"

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

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

11 MS. WIDELL: Sure.

12 MR. QUINLAN: Would you introduce
13 yourself. Succinct.

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

16 Yes, underground federal undertaking
17 related to 4(f) would definitely be subject to Section
18 106, regardless of where it was.

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

22 MS. WIDELL: Not necessarily, because
23 there may be cultural resources that were identified
24 and protected through that process. So, it depends.

1 It really does depend.

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

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

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

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

17 "SEC review includes identifying and
18 analyzing the Project's impact on historic and cultural
19 resources. These places may be individual structures
20 or large landscapes, and setting and views can be
21 included. What historic and cultural data will be used
22 by the Project..." I can't read the word. "What is its
23 scope and availability to the public, and how will the
24 Site Evaluation Committee process intersect or not with

1 the federal Section 106 process? Seeking clarity, as
2 answers at previous sessions have seemed to evolve."

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

5 MS. WIDELL: Yes.

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

16 MS. WIDELL: As I had mentioned, I would
17 encourage -- if you're interested in the scope and
18 detailed information about historic and cultural
19 resources, the Historic Property Assessment Report was
20 completed by Preservation Company and myself. It is
21 very detailed, complete. And the scope of it includes,
22 as I stated, cultural landscapes. Traditional cultural
23 properties were considered and then were identified.
24 Rural historic districts, single properties, view

1 sheds. That is posted on the web site and available
2 for you to take a look at. There is a data base that
3 includes 1248 properties constructed prior to 1968 and
4 detailed information on 194 of those properties that
5 were found likely to be eligible for the national
6 register. And that is the criteria that is used in an
7 adverse effect which is related to application of that
8 Section 106.

9 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Section 106
10 and Site Evaluation -- I think I can answer that. The
11 Site Evaluation Committee is required to consider
12 whether or not the Project will have an unreasonable
13 adverse effect on aesthetics and historic sites. We go
14 through our process to make that determination. We are
15 lucky that there is also a Section 106 process that
16 goes on federally because we get the benefit of that
17 process in almost every docket that we have. Sometimes
18 the Section 106 process goes for a longer period of
19 time than the Site Evaluation Committee process. If a
20 certificate is granted, it is often the case that, if
21 the Section 106 process is still going on, that a
22 condition of any certificate is continued cooperation
23 in the Section 106 process and following up with any
24 mitigation that may be required by that process. So

1 that's how they intersect. It's two different
2 agencies. The 106 is effectuated by the lead federal
3 agency, and the determination by the Site Evaluation
4 Committee is made by the Site Evaluation Committee.
5 However, a lot of the information that is considered is
6 from both processes, at least at the Site Evaluation
7 Committee. I can't speak for the federal lead agency.
8 So we oftentimes see 106 documents and evidence in our
9 Site Evaluation Committee proceedings. Ultimately, the
10 Site Evaluation Committee will make its determination
11 as to whether or not there is an unreasonable adverse
12 impact on historic sites and aesthetics.

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

16 MS. WIDELL: Thank you.

17 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I don't
18 even know if -- "Mr. Getz, a former member of the Site
19 Evaluation Committee, and now employed by Northern
20 Pass, wrote in his resume for the Devine Millimet Law
21 Firm, 'Most recently I played a key role in efforts to
22 revise the statutes and rules governing the siting of
23 energy facilities in New Hampshire.'" And the question
24 is, does this refer to the recent rules revision

1 referred to by myself in my presentation on the SEC? I
2 don't know the answer to that question.

3 Do you know the answer?

4 MR. QUINLAN: I don't.

5 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Moving on.
6 More questions about the burial. And again, this is an
7 example of really more of a statement than a question.
8 But since the questioner asked, I'll ask it of you.

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

15 Experts?

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

18 [*Audience interruption*]

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

1 *[Audience member interrupts.]*

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

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

7 *[Audience member interrupts.]*

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

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

15 MR. QUINLAN: Can you repeat that
16 question?

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

22 MR. QUINLAN: So I think I alluded to
23 the balance that we've been trying to strike earlier.
24 You know, we've made a commitment to 60 miles of

1 underground construction. That was based upon feedback
2 from across New Hampshire as to -- you know, and that
3 was consistent -- where the areas were where we should
4 really focus our limited ability to go underground. If
5 you get to the point where you're trying to justify a
6 fully underground project, it adds about a billion
7 dollars to this project. In our view, it becomes an
8 uneconomic project. At that point, the benefits that
9 we talked about earlier, the roughly \$4 billion worth
10 of benefits to state of New Hampshire, don't
11 materialize. So we've been trying to strike a balance
12 between a project that works economically and addresses
13 the most critical view impacts, and it's largely been
14 based upon feedback from across the state of New
15 Hampshire.

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

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

23 So, is it possible to bury the whole
24 line and --

1 MR. QUINLAN: It's technically possible
2 to bury the entire line, all right. It is technically
3 possible to do that.

4 *[Audience interruption]*

5 MR. QUINLAN: Is it a balance that
6 allows the Project to move forward for those benefits
7 to New Hampshire to materialize? In our view, it
8 doesn't because the cost becomes prohibitive. You
9 know, as to, you know, could we have continued with a
10 1200-megawatt project with the amount of underground
11 construction that we've committed to? The answer is
12 no. When we made the decision to have 60 miles of
13 underground construction, there is no cable in service
14 in this world at 1200 megawatts for that distance of
15 underground construction. So we necessarily had to
16 reduce the size of the Project to 1,090 megawatts to
17 allow the amount of underground construction that we've
18 committed to. And even at that level, it's going to be
19 the longest HVDC underground construction in North
20 America when it's in service. So, in our view, we've
21 struck the appropriate balance between a project that
22 works financially, protects the critical view impacts,
23 and technically uses equipment that we know is going to
24 be reliable when put into service.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Would
2 spending the money now to bury the cables create a
3 better view aesthetically forever?"

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

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

1 C)is it something else?

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

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

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

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. I

1 may not be able to read all these questions, but
2 there's a number of questions here. One of them you've
3 already answered is, Why not bury the ground -- bury
4 the entire line?

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

13 MR. QUINLAN: Either Ken or Sam.

14 MR. JOHNSON: As alluded to earlier, the
15 60 miles of underground will end up being the longest
16 installed cable in North America. There are a few AC
17 cables that have been installed. I know of one in
18 Connecticut. There's a couple in California. There
19 are also undersea cables of a similar type of
20 technology as we're using today. Obviously, they don't
21 have the same characteristics of land use as we do on
22 this project here. Typically, because of the expense
23 of these projects, undersea cable is the only use of
24 this type of DC technology.

1 MR. BOWES: So I'm familiar with an AC
2 project that is similar in size and scope to this and
3 was approximately \$2 billion. It occurred in the state
4 of Connecticut. It had 36 miles of underground 345kV
5 AC; about 60 miles or less of overhead 345kV AC; 33
6 total circuit miles, so, 138kV submarine cable; and
7 22 miles of 115kV underground cable. So the size and
8 scope was similar in cost. It had a transition station
9 as this DC project does. It had some, I'd say,
10 advanced technology. And in this case, the Connecticut
11 project, the stat com was at one of the terminals,
12 similar to the technology of a converter station. This
13 was a project that was completed by, at the time they
14 were Northeast Utilities, now Eversource Energy, and it
15 was completed on schedule and under budget.

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

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

23 Pondicherry Wildlife Refuge, why aren't
24 you burying it through that particular --

1 MR. QUINLAN: So, again, the area that
2 we've committed to underground construction was based
3 upon what I'll call "statewide feedback." That's why
4 we selected the area in and around the White Mountain
5 National Forest.

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

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

11 MR. QUINLAN: Lee?

12 MS. CARBONNEAU: Hello, I'm Lee
13 Carbonneau with Normandeau Associates. There is an
14 existing transmission line through Pondicherry already.
15 The Pondicherry area is relative to the portion of the
16 White Mountains where the underground is going, and
17 it's much flatter. It is less likely to be visible
18 from the trails that are commonly used, and it's well
19 on the northwest edge of Pondicherry. It doesn't go
20 through the ponds or over those wetlands that are so
21 famous for breeding birds and activities from visitors.
22 So it's much less of a visual impact than what you
23 would find in the overhead route through the White
24 Mountain National Forest.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And the
2 final question on this sheet goes back to the Coos
3 Loop. "Why haven't you upgraded the Coos Loop in the
4 past if it has been inadequate for two decades? Isn't
5 that your responsibility with or without Northern
6 Pass?"

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

21 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This
22 question states, "The Massachusetts governor has
23 actively expressed interest in purchasing hydropower
24 from Canada; New Hampshire has not. As a publicly

1 regulated utility, would Eversource work with the
2 citizens of New Hampshire on an option to bring
3 hydropower from Canada into the New England grid south
4 from the Connecticut River along I-93 and along I-91,
5 or an alternate underground route from the Canadian
6 border to that point?"

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

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

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

23 (No verbal response)

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This next

1 question deals with the Coos Loop as well.

2 "Volume 1 of your ForwardNH Plan Public
3 Interest Bullet No. 2 states, 'No cost to New Hampshire
4 customers. All costs of siting and constructing
5 Northern Pass will be paid by the Project, at no cost
6 to New Hampshire customers.' At Bullet No. 6, Coos
7 Loop Transmission Upgrade, it states as a project
8 benefit, 'A transmission upgrade of the Coos Loop which
9 will relieve existing constraints and unlock up to
10 100 megawatts of renewable generation.' Is it correct
11 that Eversource guarantees here, based on this plan
12 that's been filed with the SEC, that Eversource or its
13 affiliates will not in the future come before the PUC
14 or go to New Hampshire ratepayers for any of these
15 proposed upgrade costs to the Coos Loop transmission
16 upgrade as listed in Bullet 6 if the Northern Pass
17 Project is permitted?"

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

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And I

1 assume you're talking about Bullet No. 6 that the
2 questioner is --

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

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

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

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

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

23 (Court Reporter interrupts.)

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry.

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

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

1 a -- you know, in wholesale marketing parlance, it's
2 financially firm.

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

13 MR. QUINLAN: Can you introduce
14 yourself?

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

21 Can you repeat the question, please?

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Yes, I can.
23 "Last week you stated that full burial using the I-93
24 corridor was impossible, in part because no party to

1 the Franconia Notch Interstate Settlement would permit
2 such a use. Have you ever requested a conversation
3 with all the principals to that settlement? Have you
4 made a similar official request with New Hampshire
5 Department of Transportation to use I-93 corridor for
6 burial option; if so, when, with whom, and what were
7 the responses?"

8 MR. HODGDON: Well, at the outset, I
9 disagree with the premise of the question. I think it
10 actually mischaracterizes what I said. But regardless
11 of that, the fact of -- the Franconia Notch Parkway was
12 built under a federal court consent decree back in the
13 1980s, and there are numerous signatories to it,
14 including the Appalachian Mountain Club and the Society
15 for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, among
16 others. And that agreement specifically prohibits any
17 further construction or any additional lanes within the
18 Franconia Notch area. Now, that is one barrier to
19 going through the Franconia Notch Parkway. The other
20 aspect of it is Franconia Notch is incredibly
21 environmentally sensitive, which is what led to that
22 agreement. And Franconia Notch is also very culturally
23 sensitive in New Hampshire. It is, after all, the
24 place where we get our identity. And that's why the

1 Franconia Notch Parkway is unique, or at least at the
2 time, and I believe it still is, was very unique in the
3 nation. That's why it's not a full interstate design.
4 When you go through it, you'll notice that it goes down
5 to one lane in each direction, barely divided by a few
6 feet --

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

10 *[Audience interruption]*

11 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Please be
12 courteous.

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

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

21 Just by way of background, DOT put in a
22 guardrail in between those two lanes that I mentioned
23 back in the early 1990s. I was, in part, involved in
24 that process. And that took an incredible amount of

1 effort, and years of effort by many people in the North
2 Country to get it done. And that wasn't easy. DOT has
3 no desire to open up that project for a non-safety
4 agreement.

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

10 MR. HODGDON: Right, I assume.

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

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

22 And just keep in mind, the DOT's policy
23 on using I-93 or any freeway or any interstate for new
24 underground facilities is summed up in one sentence,

1 and that is in their Utility Accommodation Manual,
2 which says that longitudinal, meaning along the
3 highway, installations are not permitted within the
4 limited access right-of-way lines parallel to either
5 the through road or its ramps. That's their policy.
6 It's one sentence. The Commissioner can grant
7 exceptions to that if there is an extreme hardship, and
8 part of the extreme hardship criteria is you have to
9 show you have no other viable alternatives. And our
10 Application shows we do have viable alternatives. From
11 our perspective, we can't meet the criteria. And from
12 DOT's perspective, we can't meet their criteria.

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

21 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Next
22 question is regarding the same thing. "Would you use
23 the I-93 corridor for full burial if the appropriate
24 parties did not object?"

1 MR. QUINLAN: Yeah, let me answer this.
2 You know, as I mentioned earlier, we have filed
3 recently with the Department of Energy a full
4 explanation as to why the I-93 corridor is not
5 feasible. You know, I think all of these questions
6 could be answered by reading that explanation.

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

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

14 MR. QUINLAN: So it's a fairly simple
15 exercise, but we think it's accurate. You know, we
16 look at the incremental costs per mile of underground
17 construction. It's in the \$5- to \$10 million per mile.
18 That's now based upon cost estimates that we've gotten
19 by the folks who are actually going to build this line,
20 as well as some of the experience that Mr. Bowes
21 referred to. So we've got experience. The folks who
22 are actually building this and are going to commit to
23 building it for a particular price have given us bids.
24 We know what the cost per mile is for underground

1 construction. It's taking that range and applying it
2 to the current overhead portion. That's how you arrive
3 at the approximately \$1 billion number.

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

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

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

19 MR. QUINLAN: Could you repeat that?

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

23 "Since Hydro-Quebec is a partner in
24 Northern Pass, LLC, a party to this Application before

1 the Site Evaluation Committee and this evening's public
2 hearing, this question is to Hydro-Quebec. What
3 consideration and conversations has Hydro-Quebec had
4 with the TDI New England Clean Power Link, if any, to
5 use their just-approved buried transmission line in
6 Vermont, and can you provide specifics?"

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

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

20 MR. QUINLAN: So, you know, as I said at
21 the outset, we are continuing to focus on the scenic
22 and view impacts across this entire route. We selected
23 the areas that we did for underground construction
24 based upon feedback we've gotten from many different

1 stakeholders across the state. Universally they
2 pointed us in that direction.

3 We are also doing things here in Coos
4 County. I mentioned we moved the entire line to the
5 east into that Wagner Forest, which allowed us to put
6 24 miles of this segment, in essence, in an area being
7 routinely timbered. That was intended to mitigate view
8 impacts. I mentioned some of the other things we're
9 doing around design, structure and location. We do
10 have 8 miles of underground construction here in the
11 North Country. So we are focused on mitigating view
12 impacts not only in Coos County, but across the
13 entirety of the route. Again, ultimately we have to
14 strike a balance that results in a project that can
15 move forward.

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

21 MR. QUINLAN: Sure.

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Biomass
23 power plants are really important to the local economy
24 here. Will this power up in Canada hurt our local

1 energy resources and have negative impact on the
2 logging industry in Coos County?"

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

1 the future as a result of transmission limitations. So
2 we think these are complementary. There's certainly a
3 role for large-scale hydro and plenty of opportunity
4 for small-scale renewables going forward.

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

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

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next

1 question is, "Please explain the impact" -- and if
2 you've done this, just say so.

3 MR. QUINLAN: Yeah.

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

7 MR. QUINLAN: I think I did touch upon
8 that. But, you know, just to frame that out, so if you
9 look at all of New England, roughly 32,000 megawatts of
10 generation existing, approximately a quarter of it,
11 8,000 megawatts, has either retired or announced its
12 intention to retire. Northern Pass is a little over a
13 thousand megawatts. So if you think about 8,000
14 megawatts going away, we'll replace around an eighth of
15 that. You know, and that's my point: There's plenty
16 of opportunity for other sources of energy to help fill
17 that void, including some of the ones we're referring
18 to here, where there's real opportunity in the North
19 Country, whether it's biomass or otherwise.

20 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Do you
21 consider the Coos Loop an asset belonging to Eversource
22 New Hampshire or to the ratepayers, and is the proposed
23 upgrade of the Coos Loop an investment in Eversource
24 infrastructure?"

1 MR. QUINLAN: So I think, you know, as
2 to the second question, it's clearly an investment in
3 existing Eversource infrastructure. As Mr. Johnson
4 indicated, we're going to take our existing line, and
5 we're going to reconductor it and going to make it a
6 more robust transmission segment with larger
7 conductors. So it's clearly an investment in our
8 infrastructure.

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

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

24 MR. QUINLAN: So when we look at a

1 billion dollars of additional costs for no additional
2 capacity, we don't believe it's an economic project.
3 Ultimately, someone has to pay for this infrastructure.
4 It will not be New Hampshire customers, but others will
5 pay for it. And there comes a point where the benefits
6 to those others are exceeded by the costs. We think an
7 additional billion dollars with no additional capacity
8 makes it an uneconomic project. Again, we've already
9 added several hundred million dollars of costs and
10 reduced the original project size by about 20 percent
11 based upon feedback from New Hampshire, and an
12 additional billion dollars pushes us over the tipping
13 point.

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

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

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

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. The

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

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

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

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.
23 "Why should towns that have underground get any
24 additional money?"

1 MR. QUINLAN: So, if what you're
2 referring to is the ForwardNH Fund, I think I said that
3 at the outset, you know, we are putting a particular
4 emphasis on the North Country with respect to the
5 ForwardNH Fund. Again, that's a \$200 million fund that
6 we are establishing really to drive community benefit.
7 You know, we are going to focus a substantial
8 percentage of that right here in Coos County, and in
9 the other areas along the route where the construction
10 is largely overhead.

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

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

22 MR. QUINLAN: So, we've conducted an
23 extensive amount of outreach to abutting landowners up
24 and down the route. I think we've had over 3,000 touch

1 points thus far. So, we're continuing to have
2 discussion with adjacent landowners.

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

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

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

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

15 MR. QUINLAN: He's right here.

16 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Oh, I'm
17 sorry.

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

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

22 MR. JOHNSON: Otherwise, -- I can, to
23 some. Otherwise, the 1-800 number or the e-mail
24 hotline gets funneled directly to me. And, so, I will

1 get it through there as well.

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

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

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, there

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

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

22 You know, as I said, we are willing to
23 talk to municipalities about an agreed upon
24 methodology, either before construction, during

1 construction, or after the Project is put in service,
2 when we have actual construction costs. We are open to
3 those discussions, and we're actually having them with
4 several municipalities.

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

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

18 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "Question
19 for Mr. Quinlan: Your estimate of economic benefits to
20 New Hampshire is focused one-sided on the supposed
21 benefits of Northern Pass. What are the net economic
22 impacts, taking into account the negative impacts,
23 including loss of tourism, loss of investment, loss of
24 property values and wealth, and associated loss of jobs

1 and GDP. Will Northern Pass actually create a positive
2 net impact?"

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

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

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

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

19 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, you know, one
20 of the things that we have announced is an
21 apprenticeship program. We've launched that in
22 collaboration with the IBEW. The purpose of that
23 program is to essentially train the electrical workers
24 of the future. You know, my hope and expectation is

1 that, through projects like Northern Pass and Northern
2 Pass, we're going to use that as the opportunity to
3 create job opportunities for folks interested in that
4 highly-skilled trade.

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

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

18 MS. SHAPIRO: Sure. Once the
19 permitting, once the Project will be operational,
20 there's a number of different avenues that would drive
21 permanent jobs. Mr. Quinlan just talked about the
22 direct, in terms of the apprentice program. But, first
23 and foremost is the reduction in energy costs. Energy
24 costs are a big drag for manufacturers in this state.

1 We've lost a lot of manufacturing jobs. It's a big
2 issue that you hear about a lot. And, you can see that
3 that's affected the jobs in that area.

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

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

18 MR. QUINLAN: And, just to wrap that up,
19 the numbers I was sharing in the apprenticeship, those
20 are permanent positions within Eversource. We employ
21 currently about 1,500 employees here in the State of
22 New Hampshire. And, you know, we expect the apprentice
23 program to be a feeder to permanent positions in our
24 company. What Ms. Shapiro are referring to are the

1 permanent jobs outside of Eversource, and now you're
2 into hundreds of jobs across New Hampshire, a good
3 percentage here in the North Country.

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

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

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This next

1 question has to do with your economic analysis. And,
2 it's a question that you're going to hear a lot. "Why
3 is an important analysis of economic costs and benefits
4 limited to one page, which is marked "confidential"?"

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

7 MR. QUINLAN: Okay.

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

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

21 Competitors of theirs would love to have
22 access to, you know, "What does London Economics think
23 the forward price of natural gas would be?" So, it is
24 the expert and the sensitive nature of their

1 information that's resulted in it being, you know,
2 sought protective treatment for. It's highly sensitive
3 to them.

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

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

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

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

21 MR. QUINLAN: ISO-New England being the
22 regional grid operator. So, for our Project to qualify
23 as a "reliability project", it, in essence, is required
24 to keep the lights on. That is not the case with

1 Northern Pass. While it's an important new supply of
2 energy into the region, it's going to help replace some
3 of the generation that's retiring, today it's not
4 required to keep the lights on.

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

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

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

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

23 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, is
24 that -- you have to go before a regulatory agency to

1 have that determination made, is that correct?

2 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, the regulatory
3 agency, again, transmission is, you know, energy
4 transmitted in interstate commerce, it's jurisdictional
5 to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. They will
6 look at whatever rate is determined, both for
7 reliability and non-reliability projects, and ensure
8 that they're reasonable.

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

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

24 The second part?

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And, "will
2 Northern Pass make the lease agreement between Northern
3 Pass and Bayroot public?

4 MR. QUINLAN: Does anyone on the team
5 know?

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

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

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

12 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: You're
13 expecting a break?

14 *[Laughter.]*

15 MR. JOHNSON: We will --

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

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

23 MR. QUINLAN: If you look at all
24 customers, you know, across New Hampshire, and I'll say

1 across New England, because the \$80 million is only
2 10 percent of the total savings. You know, that's
3 roughly New Hampshire's load share of all New England
4 load, it's about 5 percent. Whether you're a
5 residential customer or a business customer, on
6 average, it's 5 percent. That's for all of New
7 Hampshire, and you can look at, in essence, all of New
8 England as well.

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

11 MR. QUINLAN: Roughly.

12 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: "1,090" --

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

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

22 MR. QUINLAN: So, the Memorandum of
23 Understanding I alluded to earlier reserves
24 approximately 10 percent of that 1,090 megawatts for

1 New Hampshire. So, we have a commitment for
2 10 percent. That's roughly our load share for all of
3 New England. The balance of it is not committed at
4 this point. So, none of those other states, nor New
5 Hampshire, have locked in any additional supply. So,
6 to the extent New Hampshire is willing and interested
7 in increasing the amount procured for New Hampshire,
8 you know, I'm certain Hydro-Quebec would be willing to
9 entertain that.

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

13 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: This next
14 question addresses that 10 percent as well: "In
15 previous sessions hosted by Northern Pass,
16 representatives have asserted that they have no way of
17 knowing in which direction power flows over
18 transmission lines or what the source of the power is.
19 Can you explain how the 10 percent of hydropower which
20 Northern Pass asserts will be available to New
21 Hampshire residents would be made available to New
22 Hampshire residents, and if it can be allocated to New
23 Hampshire, why would it not simply displace other
24 (possibly lower priced) energy sources?"

1 MR. QUINLAN: So, you know,
2 electrically, all of the power gets delivered to
3 Deerfield, New Hampshire. So, all 1,090 megawatts is
4 delivered into the regional grid in Deerfield, New
5 Hampshire. At that point, it flows along the existing
6 lines based upon system conditions.

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

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

21 If you take Northern Pass, and you put
22 that in to that bid stack, 1,090 megawatts of higher
23 cost, generally carbon-emitting, generation falls out
24 of the bid stack every hour. That's what drives the

1 economic benefit, is you are displacing higher cost,
2 carbon-emitting supplies, whether it's coal, oil,
3 natural gas. Those tend to be the plants that are on
4 the margin. Nuclear power, hydropower, wind power,
5 biomass, it's all in the bid stack down here
6 *[indicating]*. What's on the margin are fossil fuel
7 plants. So, that's what gets displaced, and that's
8 what drives the regional benefit.

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

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

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

24 So, you know, we mention, you know,

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

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

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

22 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, you know, if
23 you look at New England, and what are the -- where are
24 the sources of baseload power to replace the retiring

1 nuclear plants, coal plants, and oil plants? You know,
2 there are very few viable options for New England. You
3 know, we can build more natural gas plants with
4 domestic production. But we are already in excess of
5 50 percent dependent on natural gas for New England's
6 energy supply. So, you know, we are losing what --
7 something that, you know, energy planners have long
8 valued, which is supply diversity. We are highly
9 dependent on natural gas for generating electricity
10 now.

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

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

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

24 So, from a production perspective, we

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

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

18 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.
19 We're going to move on to some environmental questions,
20 public health and safety, wildlife. First one is:
21 "People in Massachusetts and southern New Hampshire are
22 hearing radio ads saying that Eversource is "bringing
23 hydropower" and green energy to those areas. What
24 transmission lines are those ads referring to? And, is

1 there any chance that those ads partially refer to the
2 Northern Pass?"

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

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

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

1 those needs as well.

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

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

11 I'm aware of one occasion in the last
12 decade where New England actually delivered power to
13 Hydro-Quebec. I believe that occurred in December of
14 2014, where they ran into an emergency situation
15 surrounding Montreal. And, for a period of a few
16 hours, we actually exported power to help Hydro-Quebec
17 and the City of Montreal get through a potential
18 reliability issue.

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

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr.
23 Quinlan, "Transmission cables are now proposed for the
24 length of Lake Champlain. Why can't you put

1 transmission cables down in the Connecticut River?"

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

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

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

23 And, I guess you might want to address
24 that for all abutters on the line.

1 MR. JOHNSON: That's an excellent
2 question. Typically, what we do, prior to
3 construction, is meet with landowners that have wells
4 and/or septic systems, and/or, in this case, artesian
5 streams that are a water supply source. During the
6 construction phase, we will be very careful not to
7 disturb these supplies. Obviously, it's critical to
8 have a house and have a water supply.

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

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

17 MR. SODERMAN: My name is Christopher
18 Soderman. I'm with Eversource Energy. And, Appendix
19 37 to the Application, which is available on the
20 website, is a summary of all of the studies that have
21 been done by a number of agencies, including the World
22 Health Organization; the Scientific Committee for
23 Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks, SCENIHR, in
24 Europe; ARPANSA, in Australia. All of these agencies

1 conduct these kinds of reviews.

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

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

15 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. This
16 next question is another question about the Pondicherry
17 Refuge. And, the question is: "Has Northern Pass
18 researched the" -- and you may have answered some of
19 this already, but I will ask the whole question,
20 because there are some parts that have not been
21 answered. "Has Northern Pass researched the
22 possibility of negative impacts on the 10 square mile
23 Pondicherry U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Refuge?
24 Northern Pass comes close to this Refuge at its

1 northwest corner. Has there been any contacts between
2 Northern Pass with this Refuge?" I assume they mean
3 "U.S. Fish & Wildlife". "Will the towers be seen from
4 locations in the Refuge? And, will the Northern Pass
5 corridor influence fragmentation of the wildlife
6 corridors? And, has there been any study by Northern
7 Pass regarding impact on wetlands in and around the
8 Refuge and on the potential introduction of invasive
9 species into the Refuge?"

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

21 The addition of new structures that are
22 spaced 700 -- 600 feet apart, on average, should not
23 affect the movement of wildlife through this corridor,
24 either flying wildlife or walking wildlife.

1 We have met with folks from the U.S.
2 Fish & Wildlife Service, and the Pondicherry Division
3 in particular, to discuss our project. They have asked
4 us to try and make sure that any construction methods
5 that are used are consistent with their management
6 plans. And, they have just issued a management plan in
7 2015. So, we will be checking that and making sure
8 that any of our avoidance and minimization methods that
9 are proposed are consistent with what they would like
10 to see during construction.

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

1 a manner that doesn't permit them to be spread in any
2 other locations.

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

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

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

18 *[Show of hands.]*

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

22 *[Show of hands.]*

23 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay. This
24 first question on this sheet has already been asked

1 about jobs after start-up. But the second question is:
2 "There are" -- "You are saying there are \$4 billion of
3 proposed economic benefits for New Hampshire. How many
4 billions of dollars will Hydro-Quebec get per year?"

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

7 *[Audience interruption.]*

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

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

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

23 *[Audience interruption.]*

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

22 FROM THE FLOOR: It's a biomass plant.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Oh. Okay. I will say, in
24 general, that we did do an exhaustive study early on

1 regarding right-of-ways throughout the entire state.
2 And, so, all the way from the international border
3 south to Deerfield, and evaluated different sets of
4 corridors, such as the Pine plant. The one corridor
5 that made sense is the one that we had originally
6 proposed as an overhead solution, using as much as
7 possible existing right-of-way. So, the right-of-way
8 that we've chosen through Bethlehem was because it was
9 the most direct route from the north to the south.

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

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

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

24 MR. QUINLAN: So, there were a lot of

1 factors in that decision. You know, I would say the
2 principal driver for it was feedback we received from
3 stakeholders in New Hampshire. You know, we also
4 factored in, you know, the Department of Energy's Draft
5 Environmental Impact Statement. But there are several
6 different factors.

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

10 MR. QUINLAN: No.

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

15 MR. QUINLAN: No.

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

20 MR. QUINLAN: So, that is largely the
21 intention. It may not be exclusive. There may be some
22 investments that -- and initiatives that are pursued in
23 other towns hosting the line. But I do expect the vast
24 majority of it to be directed towards communities where

1 the construction is overhead. And, again, we're
2 committed to having a particular focus on Coos County
3 and the North Country in deploying those proceeds.

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

8 (Recess taken at 8:56 p.m. and the
9 public information session resumed at
10 9:05 p.m.)

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

22 In addition, as I've indicated on
23 several occasions tonight, the Site Evaluation
24 Committee takes written comment throughout our

1 proceedings. There is no different weight generally
2 given to written comment versus an oral statement made
3 at these proceedings. So that, if you feel, by the
4 time that you get to your -- whatever number you might
5 be in my stack of people who wish to speak here, if you
6 feel you'd rather just speak your piece by writing it
7 out, there are blue sheets that are available. I'm not
8 trying to discourage anybody from speaking, but I'm
9 just trying to let you know that there are options that
10 are available.

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

21 The first speaker, I'm going to read out
22 the first -- I'm going to go three at a time, with the
23 hopes that, if we stick to three minutes each, it will
24 only be about an hour and half or so before we're done.

1 So, the first three speakers will be
2 Representative Brad Bailey, Representative Leon
3 Rideout, and Alan McLain. And, if those three would
4 come up to this microphone here in that order, we'll
5 hear from them.

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

10 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: What
11 district is that, Representative?

12 REP. BAILEY: Grafton 14. I wanted to
13 just mention, and I will be brief, and we've talked a
14 lot about figures and burial and so forth, but, back in
15 1978, my father and I took a fishing trip up to Canada.
16 It was a while ago. We used to go fishing every
17 summer. And, my dad wanted to go up to Quebec. And,
18 he wanted to go to the north shore of the Saint
19 Lawrence seaway. And, he said "I want to go fishing up
20 along the Manicouagan River." So, it was a long trip.

21 And, when we got up to the Village of
22 Baie-Comeau, which is right on the water, we had to
23 drive another 100 miles up this river to get to the
24 Manicouagan Dam. Now, the Manicouagan Dam, for people

1 that don't know its size and the scope of it, which was
2 built by Hydro-Quebec, is absolutely enormous. We've
3 never seen anything like it before, also known as the
4 Daniel Johnson Dam. It was built between 1959 and
5 1970. That dam is 700 feet tall, 4,300 feet long.
6 It's the largest dam of its type in the world. And,
7 the reservoir is the fifth largest in the world.

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

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

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

24 So, here we are. And, it looks like

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

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

14 *[Audience interruption.]*

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

21 Representative Rideout.

22 REP. RIDEOUT: Good evening. I'm
23 Representative Leon Rideout. I represent Coos 7, which
24 encompasses ten towns within northern Coos County.

1 Every single one of those towns are impacted by
2 Northern Pass. And, as I travel about the North
3 Country and I talk to people that live here, every
4 single one of them are concerned.

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

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

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

24 So, I ask you to seriously consider

1 burying the line, getting the Project going, hopefully
2 creating the jobs you're saying it's going to. And,
3 let's get moving and move on. Thank you.

4 *[Audience interruption.]*

5 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
6 Representative.

7 Next speaker is Alan McLain, from
8 Berlin.

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

11 COURT REPORTER: Can you spell that?

12 MR. McLAIN: Excuse me?

13 COURT REPORTER: Can you spell that?

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

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

23 Our involvement in these large energy
24 projects allowed us to grow in size and position --

1 excuse me, and positioned us to build other projects,
2 like switch stations, control houses, and other
3 projects for utility companies. As a result, my
4 employees are buying homes, buying trucks, and other
5 products and services that support our local economy.

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

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

11 *[Audience interruption.]*

12 MR. McLAIN: Thank you.

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

18 So, Mr. Placey would be first.

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

22 COURT REPORTER: Can you spell your name
23 please?

24 MR. PLACEY: Spell my name?

1 COURT REPORTER: Please.

2 MR. PLACEY: Landon, L-a-n-d-o-n, and
3 Placey, P-l-a-c-e-y.

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

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

1 there's a shortage, they always go higher.

2 So, I show up here. I usually get --
3 I've been booed and heckled. But that is all right.
4 Everybody has got a right to feel how they want. But I
5 think it's my own right to have my own say here. And,
6 so, I appreciate very much you allowing me to.

7 *[Audience interruption.]*

8 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
9 sir.

10 MR. PLACEY: Thank you.

11 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Bob Baker.

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

23 The second person who's asked me to
24 speak for them, and I have his typed comments, and I

1 think they have already been sent to Mrs. Monroe, is
2 Larry Rappaport. Larry is our Representative from Coos
3 District 1, which includes the northern tip of Coos
4 County and the towns there. This is Larry's typed
5 statement, and I'm reading it exactly as he sent it to
6 me.

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

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

1 Canadian carbon sink is being destroyed. (C) A large
2 portion of Canadian tribal lands will be destroyed.

3 (4) There will be no lower cost of power benefit to
4 New Hampshire residents. The Project has existed for
5 over seven years yet there is no power purchase
6 agreement. [5] Any benefit will accrue to the
7 southern New England states relieving them of their
8 obligation to produce clean power. (6) Eversource has
9 publicly claimed this Project will lower electric rates
10 yet has failed to prove it or offer any evidence to
11 establish it. (7) Eversource claims that the Project
12 will produce economic improvement for the area. They
13 cite tax revenue, yet they offer nothing about the
14 offsets produced by other property owners getting
15 lowered assessments. They cite increased employment
16 yet they have not provided any evidence that jobs
17 produced will go to New Hampshire residents.

18 Historically, specialized companies located in other
19 states were used. (8) The Company recently agreed to
20 bury the line through the White Mountain National
21 Forest, proving the viability of burial, yet it
22 steadfastly refuses to bury the line elsewhere; burial
23 is a compromise position that would be accepted by many
24 opponents. (9) The Company has never provided a

1 formal analysis of the costs inherent in burying the
2 Project, resorting instead to random guesswork, such as
3 "the cost of burial is 10 times the cost of aerial",
4 which has since proven to be entirely fallacious. [10]
5 Most of us remember the ice storms of a few years ago.
6 The transmission towers to the east of the city,
7 Montreal, buckled under the ice leaving Montreal
8 without power for several weeks. Would the proposed
9 towers be invulnerable to this? I think not.

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

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

23 Thank you very much.

24 *[Audience interruption.]*

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.
2 Carl Martland and Nancy Martland.

3 MR. MARTLAND: Good evening. My name is
4 Carl Martland. I'm here as the Chair of the North
5 Country Scenic Byways Council. We have approximately
6 45 members representing all the towns where there is a
7 scenic byway. And, every major road in the North
8 Country is, in fact, a scenic byway. I have submitted
9 a 12-page document today, and I will not go into the
10 details of that. But I would like to develop thoughts
11 based on the slides that Mr. Quinlan was kind enough to
12 show.

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

24 Second, we saw the picture of the key

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

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

23 So, I'll leave my comments on the byways
24 to the more detailed comments I've submitted. This

1 will be a devastating impact to the byways. And, the
2 byways are there to serve the back roads and the scene
3 spots of northern New Hampshire.

4 *[Audience interruption.]*

5 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.
6 Nancy Martland.

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

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

22 And, it is not right to divide us into
23 the saved and the damned, the burial towns and the
24 tower towns.

1 The opening segment of your promotional
2 video that you showed this evening I think symbolizes a
3 fundamental flaw that has been present in your Project
4 from the beginning. It represents New Hampshire, and
5 we all saw this, as an animated sequence of lines
6 connecting dots on a map. I think some of the anger
7 and frustration that you see and hear in this room is
8 because that is what the North Country is to you and
9 your partners: A series of dots to be connected on a
10 map, beginning at the dams in Quebec, and ending in
11 southern New Hampshire, so that power can be sold into
12 the apparently bottomless electricity sinkhole of
13 southern New England.

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

24 Early on you made the mistake of

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

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

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

20 *[Audience interruption.]*

21 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: The next
22 four speakers are Katie Rose, Jim and Sandy Dennis --
23 Dannis, I'm sorry, Colles "Stohl" -- or, Stowell, and
24 Mike Stirling.

1 Now, Ms. Rose has told me she will keep
2 under the three minutes. And, so, we're going to allow
3 her to perform her musical piece for her comment.

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

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

11 To the powers that be: do you not see?
12 Can you not hear? Or are you just acting out of fear?

13 The fate of our land is resting in your hands.
14 The people have spoken. Please prove to us that the
15 system's not broken.

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

19 How can you stay blind to the devastation left
20 behind once you have taken of what we love?

21 Will it ever be enough?

22 Or once you have taken, will you just rape us again
23 & again? You never once asked our permission. You just
24 continue to force your own mission.

1 Well, this is all we have left. And there is no
2 turning back once the damage is done. The loss for us is
3 much greater than the gain might be for anyone.

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

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

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

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

14 *[End of lyrics.]*

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

17 MS. ROSE: Thank you.

18 *[Audience interruption.]*

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

21 MR. DANNIS: My name is Jim Dannis,
22 D-a-n-n-i-s. And, I live in Dalton. One of the
23 principles of good government is, to borrow some words
24 from Katie Rose, to give voice to people who don't have

1 a voice. Tonight's proceeding did not do that. And, I
2 address my comments to the SEC.

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

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

22 Second, you had -- you had an
23 environmental -- I'm sorry, a historical resources
24 expert stand up and assert to this crowd that "Burying

1 the line under Route 93 may or may not have similar
2 effects on historical resources as the proposed route."
3 Patently ridiculous. Do you think all of us checked
4 our commonsense at the door? Do you think we're hicks
5 in orange with no teeth? We're not so dumb. We know
6 how the world works.

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

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

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

21 *[Audience interruption.]*

22 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Colles
23 Stowell.

24 MR. STOWELL: My name is Colles Stowell.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: I'm sorry.

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

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

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

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

19 Let's be clear, the residents and
20 property owners of the North Country opposed to this
21 Project, and we are legion, gain nothing but headaches,
22 plummeting property values and future nostalgia over
23 what once was. Under the proposed plan, high-tension
24 wires strung on towers reaching up to 130 feet through

1 Coos, Grafton, and Carroll Counties will permanently
2 scar the landscape. These scars will be both visible
3 and hidden, and will be much more expensive and painful
4 to try and heal in the future.

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

8 MR. STOWELL: Okay. Sure.

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

12 MR. STOWELL: All right. The irony in
13 this equation is Shakespearian in scope. Hydro-Quebec
14 and Eversource broker a mutually beneficial deal that
15 will make them hundreds of millions of dollars over
16 several years but "spare" Eversource customers north of
17 the notches the benefit to the lower cost energy being
18 transported across their front lawns. During the
19 presentation tonight we heard a lot about several
20 claimed benefits, including "clean energy", which is a
21 bit of a misnomer. Because if you flood several
22 thousand acres of peat bogs and wetlands, you're
23 covering a carbon sink. So, the carbon sequestration,
24 which would minimize greenhouse gases, is prohibited by

1 flooded it with water to create this. So, it's not
2 really "clean energy" in that term.

3 *[Audience interruption.]*

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

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

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

18 I'm going to go out on a limb, and I'm
19 going to say that probably most of the people in this
20 audience don't care about the profit margins for
21 Eversource. They don't care about the profit margins
22 for Hydro-Quebec. What they care about is what makes
23 the North Country the North Country, the beauty of the
24 landscape.

1 So, I'm going to go out on a limb also,
2 and I'd say that I'm probably not the only person here
3 that would prefer that you take your \$4 billion
4 ForwardNH Plan and bury it. Bury it, and the tidal
5 wave of opposition will likely dissipate. Bury it or
6 bag it.

7 *[Audience interruption.]*

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

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

18 And, what I'd like to say is how
19 significant the impact of this Project could be in
20 Groveton. We lost a mill eight years ago that employed
21 over 750 people in a town of only 2,200. Those jobs
22 have not returned. This is an aging community that
23 every year sees young families pick up and move
24 elsewhere, because they cannot find local employment to

1 support their families. And, this trend has depleted
2 the tax base, raised taxes significantly per capita and
3 decreased property values, because the supply seeks
4 demand.

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

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

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

24 *[Audience interruption.]*

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
2 sir.

3 Mr. Grenier.

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

6 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Good to see
7 you.

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

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

24 The fact remains, however, that future

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

11 The City of Berlin potentially stands to
12 lose a lot of property tax revenue if the Northern Pass
13 Project and the Coos Loop upgrade is not built. The
14 City and Berlin Station signed a PILT Agreement in
15 August of 2011 under authority of R.S.A. 72:74. In the
16 agreement, Burgess Biopower is required to pay to the
17 City 15 percent of gross revenue of all RECs produced
18 over the 400,000 REC threshold that Eversource is
19 required to purchase. Since the plant has the ability
20 to produce upwards of 100,000 of additional unsold RECs
21 it can put to the open market, the loss revenue to the
22 City is estimated to be in the \$9.7 million range. The
23 plant has to operate at or near capacity for that to
24 occur. Burgess Biopower has already faced some

1 production curtailments because the Coos Loop cannot
2 handle the export load. The Northern Pass Project as
3 presented addresses that problem and allows for still
4 further renewable energy development.

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

15 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
16 sir.

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

20 (No verbal response)

21 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Harry
22 Brown.

23 MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My
24 name is Harry Brown. I live at Diamond Pond in

1 Stewartstown, New Hampshire, with my wife Susan of 44
2 years. I'll be speaking for both of us tonight.

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

7 (Court Reporter interrupts.)

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

13 I have noticed lots of rhetoric in the
14 press, more specifically the Society for the Protection
15 of New Hampshire's Forest campaign, "Trees Not Towers:
16 No Northern Pass," indicating that the above-ground
17 transmission lines will have an impact on tourism and
18 recreation, thusly affecting Coos County and the
19 economy. An example of this not being the case is in
20 Steamboat Springs, Colorado. In 1960, the population
21 was 1843; in 1960 -- in 1990, it was 6,695; and in 2013
22 it was 12,100. Guess what? During that same period of
23 time, a power line was erected right to the northwest
24 corner of Mount Werner, the ski area constructed in the

1 late 1950s and directly over the south residential and
2 commercial area of the town, even directly over
3 McDonald's, with, quote, obviously no adverse effect
4 with continued development of a resort town. By the
5 way, it can be seen from all areas of the town and from
6 the trails on the mountain itself. The towers are
7 steel erector-set-type and are over 150 feet tall. The
8 good news is that they're so high, no trees have to be
9 cut.

10 In our opinion, a substantial portion of
11 Coos County's economy relies on OHRVing,
12 wheeled-vehicle motorized recreation, and snowmobiling
13 and will not be affected by the Northern Pass
14 transmission lines. As a matter of record, we're
15 allowed presently, OHRV and snowmobile recreationists,
16 to utilize the many miles of trails that cross under or
17 run over -- under current power lines throughout the
18 northeast, the rest of the United States and the
19 Canadian Provinces. This is without any negative
20 effects to the participants otherwise concerning their
21 pursuits. Quite the opposite. It allows them access
22 to trails that would not be otherwise available. The
23 state of New Hampshire clearly recognizes that OHRV and
24 snowmobiles are greater than a billion-dollar-a-year

1 industry and is especially important to Coos County, as
2 it has lit a new life for many current and new business
3 owners, an economic stimulus where many could not see
4 the light through the tunnel previously.

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

23 Snowmobiling and OHRV in Coos County --

24 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr. Brown,

1 could you wrap it up, please? You've gone over your
2 three minutes.

3 MR. BROWN: I will.

4 Yes, we voted at the Stewartstown
5 meeting on March 3rd, 2011, to oppose the
6 1200-megawatt, high-voltage direct current -- I'm using
7 my wife's time now -- direct current transmission line
8 as presently proposed. This is important. This is at
9 the Stewartstown town meeting on March 3rd, 2011. This
10 was almost five years ago, and much has changed, with
11 all the line being buried in Stewartstown except for on
12 land that Northern Pass owns. Once again, "Live Free
13 or Die."

14 Susan and I are retired and living on
15 entitlements such as Social Security. We look forward
16 to the day when the Northern Pass transmission line
17 passes through Stewartstown on the latest route
18 proposed, thusly affording us all nearly 50 percent in
19 property tax relief. Many of my fellow citizens look
20 forward to that day when the Northern Pass transmission
21 line passes through Stewartstown on the latest proposed
22 route, thusly affording us all nearly 50 percent in tax
23 relief. Many of my fellow citizens in Stewartstown are
24 economically challenged. This would be --

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr. Brown,
2 you've got to stop --

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

5 *[Audience interruption]*

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

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

10 MR. BROWN: I have one paragraph left.

11 This would be a true economic incentive.
12 Maybe some businesses might even fill up all their
13 empty store fronts in the area. Just think, Northern
14 Pass would pay huge property taxes annually without any
15 buildings, or requiring EMS and no bigger schools.

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

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

24 *[Audience interruption]*

1 MR. BROWN: One sentence left.

2 *[Audience member interrupting]*

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

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

7 *[Audience member interrupting]*

8 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Please --

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

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

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

21 *[Audience interruption]*

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

24 *[Audience interruption]*

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: -- from
2 Whitefield; Jason Lauze, L-A-U-Z-E, from Farmington;
3 John Wilkinson from Lancaster, and Peter Powell from
4 Lancaster.

5 Charles Maser?

6 (No verbal response)

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

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

13 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: First name?

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

21 (Court Reporter interrupts.)

22 MR. LAUZE: I know there's been a lot of
23 talk about whether or not there's any of these jobs
24 that are actually going to be permanent in nature. In

1 fact, I can speak to that, in that they absolutely will
2 be. We take our New Hampshire residents and put them
3 to work in permanent positions every day. Anyway, I
4 can assure you that there will absolutely be numerous
5 new jobs created that will both be manned by New
6 Hampshire residents and permanent in nature, as I
7 mentioned.

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

21 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
22 sir.

23 John Wilkinson from Lancaster, and
24 following him will be Peter Powell from Lancaster.

1 MR. WILKINSON: My name is John
2 Wilkinson. I live in Lancaster, and I'm a lifelong
3 resident of New Hampshire. Over the past five-plus
4 years I've followed the possible approval of this
5 electrical transmission project. I've never witnessed
6 greater public opposition or outrage to anything here
7 in New Hampshire like there is to the Northern Pass.
8 That said, there is finally a solution to end this
9 conflict and move the project forward, if that's what
10 Mr. Quinlan and the designers of the Northern Pass
11 truly want. Northern Pass is nothing more than an
12 extension cord for a private company. They want
13 permission to stretch it over the state of New
14 Hampshire, allowing it to zigzag from Canada to the New
15 England grid. But since it is the state of New
16 Hampshire, they're try to pass this extension cord
17 project through. It is finally time to completely bury
18 it along New Hampshire's railroad, highway and, yes,
19 interstate rights-of-way, just like it's being done in
20 projects in our neighboring states. New Hampshire and
21 its citizens deserve to be respected, and the state of
22 New Hampshire must remain unspoiled by all proposed
23 private projects, including the Northern Pass. Thank
24 you.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
2 sir. Peter Powell.

3 MR. POWELL: I'm going to be as brief as
4 I can. I wrote -- my name is Peter Powell. I live in
5 Lancaster. I've been for 42 years in service to Coos
6 County primarily as a real estate broker. And that's
7 piling up a lot of experience in a large rural area.
8 I'm going to submit some pages online. I'm going to
9 address specifically, when I have a chance to consume
10 it, some of the reports you undoubtedly have about how
11 this project will not harm values.

12 My main point this evening is simply
13 that this project will impact negatively homeowners,
14 property owners, property investors and others
15 throughout the county, throughout the region,
16 throughout the state in some ways that they may never
17 be able to recover from. To put ugly objects -- it is
18 simply a truth that, if you put an ugly object on a
19 beautiful landscape, those who are forced to look upon
20 it will experience the reduction in the value and the
21 marketability of their home. And you cannot dress one
22 of these things up to the point where it becomes
23 acceptable to those who are forced to see it instead of
24 that which they've come to enjoy. People, when they

1 come here, the market that we have for our properties
2 here, will not accept in this location what you may
3 accept in yours or what they may accept in their homes
4 in Connecticut, Massachusetts or Southern New
5 Hampshire. Here you start from a higher level, a
6 pristine environment. And when that environment is
7 attacked by something like this, the drop in value is
8 precipitous and critical and severe. It isn't starting
9 with someone who is already looking out at traffic and
10 industrial development and pollution of one sort or
11 another and other power lines and subtracting a lesser
12 amount because you're already degraded. Here, that
13 degree of degradation amounts to a large drop in value,
14 and a consequence not only to the property owners, but
15 also to businesses.

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

24 Anecdotally, Wheeler Clark, 25 years

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

13 I stood in Randolph, in front of a home
14 on beautiful land with a beautiful view of Adams and
15 Madison last summer, with a couple from out of New
16 Hampshire who looked at the view and saw the simple
17 little residential line across the street about
18 400 yards -- 400 feet away and said, "Isn't it a shame
19 that you have to look out at that power line." There
20 are countless examples throughout the region where
21 Northern Pass has already had a negative impact on
22 property, disposition of property values. The outcome
23 of this thing would be devastating.

24 The balance has not been arrived at yet.

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

10 *[Audience interruption]*

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

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

24 I've done a back-of-the-envelope

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

1 in your boardroom.

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

6 MR. BOUTHILLIER: My name is Allen
7 Bouthillier. First name is A-L-L-E-N, last name is
8 B-O-U-T-H-I-L-L-I-E-R. I'm a resident of Lancaster,
9 New Hampshire. My family and I own AB Excavating. I
10 started out -- I was born and brought up in Coos
11 County. I started out with a chainsaw and a desire to
12 raise a family and make a living in Coos County.
13 Eventually, I started my own company. I grew from one
14 cable skidder, and I've diversified into an operation
15 that logs, trucks, does land clearing and is heavily
16 diversified and invested into construction. Major part
17 of our business is land we own. We own over
18 3,000 acres in the North Country.

19 I'm here today to tell you that I
20 support Northern Pass. Northern Pass is the type of
21 project that helps companies like ours to grow and
22 prosper. We hope to be able to land some of those
23 local jobs that we've talked about. I've met with Bill
24 Quinlan, Sam Johnson and many others from Eversource.

1 They've introduced many of us local contractors to some
2 of the largest contractors in the United States. I
3 feel very confident that they want local contractors
4 working on this project and will meet their stated goal
5 of New Hampshire workers first.

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

16 I've hired more workers. They have
17 located here, bought homes here, bought vehicles here
18 and raised their families here. As a landowner, I
19 applaud Northern Pass for taking the time and the money
20 to work with private landowners in developing their
21 right-of-way. As a large landowner, let me assure you,
22 each year it becomes harder to pay the taxes and
23 justify tieing up capital on large tracts of land in
24 Coos County. Whether you were hiking, hunting, fishing

1 or snowmobiling, I am sure that some people in this
2 room take for granted the ability to freely cross
3 private land for their own recreational enjoyment. And
4 many of us who own these large tracts of land value our
5 ability to provide these free access. This isn't the
6 case in many states across the country, where people
7 pay to have access to private land. However, when
8 these same people, our state-elected officials and
9 others, want to restrict our ability as private
10 landowners to generate income from sources like this
11 transmission line and force it to be buried in roads
12 and on public land only, we have no other alternative
13 but to start charging for the use of our private land.
14 And in order to do that, we will raise capital by
15 charging for fees for access to snow machines, hunting,
16 fishing, leasing it, which is something that is now for
17 free.

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

20 MR. BOUTHILLIER: Yup. Coos County is
21 1831 square miles, 1,171,000 acres; 594 acres of it is
22 Northern Pass; 13.5 acres of it's underground; 436
23 acres of it is on Wagner Forest and 145 acres is on
24 land owned by Northern Pass. So, in the grand scheme

1 of things, it's a small impact on the total acreage of
2 Coos County.

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

9 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Sir, time's
10 up.

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

15 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

16 Ms. McPhaul.

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

22 Five years ago, Northern Pass came to
23 New Hampshire. The residents didn't want it; however,
24 we have been stuck with it. You have used low-down

1 business practices to force the Northern Pass the way
2 you want it through New Hampshire. You have lied to us
3 repeatedly. One of them, you recently said that there
4 was a study done that showed tourism would not suffer
5 because of the Northern Pass. Well, I beg to differ.
6 One hundred thirty-five-foot towers -- or 85- to
7 135-foot towers every 5 to 700 feet through 120 miles
8 of New Hampshire, most of which is beautiful scenery,
9 is not going to affect tourism? You need to ask some
10 tourists. I've done it. They said they wouldn't come
11 back. Second homeowners who don't have affiliations to
12 the area said they would be out of here, that they came
13 here for the beautiful views and the lifestyle. They
14 did not come out here to look out their windows and see
15 steel towers.

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

20 And then there's the WOKQ fine of over
21 \$500,000 by the FCC for putting forth 178 pro-Northern
22 Pass notices, failing to mention that they were paid
23 ads, paid by Northern Pass.

24 I would like to go on, but I changed my

1 mind because of something you have dwelled on tonight,
2 Mr. Quinlan, and that's your desire for a balance. As
3 I see it, on one side we have the Northern Pass; on the
4 other side we have thousands and thousands of people,
5 and town after town after town. So I don't see the
6 balance. And as I see it, you lose. Thank you.

7 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mark.
8 McCulloch. And could you spell your name for us,
9 please.

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

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

21 Five years ago, remember when we were
22 going to get our land taken away by eminent domain by
23 these exceptionally good business folks, that they're
24 so tried and true to us? You lost. New Hampshire's

1 Green Energy portfolio includes small hydropower, not
2 large hydropower. You tried to change it, and you
3 didn't.

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

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

13 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Just doing
14 my job, sir.

15 MR. McCULLOCK: Yeah, I noticed.

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

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

21 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
22 sir.

23 Okay. The next four speakers will be
24 Robert Van Vlaanderen from Millsfield, Luke Wotton or

1 Wotton from Whitefield, K. Lee Dube from Berlin and
2 Will Abbott from Holderness.

3 Mr. Van Vlaanderen from Millsfield?

4 (No verbal response)

5 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Mr.
6 Wotton.

7 MR. WOTTON: I'm Luke Wotton,
8 W-O-T-T-O-N, and I'm a resident in Whitefield, New
9 Hampshire.

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

1 Stop saying it's for us. It's for the southern folks.
2 It's not for us. God...

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

5 (No verbal response)

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

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

18 As we've noted in other forums, we have
19 a legal and ethical responsibility to defend these
20 conservation lands. We also have a long history of
21 protecting scenic views in New Hampshire statewide.
22 And our opposition to Northern Pass as opposed is
23 based, in part, on the visual scars that the Project
24 will cut across 132 miles of the state, including the

1 newly proposed corridor in northern Coos County. The
2 current proposal includes burying an underground
3 stretch in Clarksville through land that we own. It
4 also involves burial over 7 miles along municipal roads
5 in Clarksville and Stewartstown through privately owned
6 lands on which the Forest Society holds conservation
7 easements that prohibit above- or below-ground
8 transmission lines. Truth be told, Northern Pass is
9 not proposing this 8 miles of burial because you
10 somehow got religion on landscape conservation; rather,
11 you're proposing this 8 miles of burial because there's
12 no other way to connect the dots for what was
13 originally intended to be an entirely above-ground
14 project. The Forest Society has no intention of
15 allowing our Washburn Family Forest in Clarksville to
16 facilitate 132 miles of new overhead lines that would
17 create totally unavoidable scars on landscapes.
18 Because the SEC is not authorized to resolve property
19 rights disputes, only the New Hampshire Superior Court
20 can do this, we have filed a petition in Coos County
21 Superior Court to defend our property rights in
22 Clarksville.

23 As Attorney Iacopino noted in his
24 presentation earlier this evening, there are four

1 findings the Site Evaluation Committee must make before
2 it can decide whether or not to issue a Certificate of
3 Site and Facility. We have filed a motion to
4 intervene, and we plan to litigate the Northern Pass
5 Application as proposed. We believe it fails to meet
6 even the minimum thresholds for three of the four
7 required findings, and the SEC only needs to find that
8 one of these four thresholds is not satisfied in order
9 to say "No" to an application. On the fourth finding,
10 we don't contest that Northern Pass has the financial
11 and technical capability to build what they propose.
12 In fact, as others have suggested this evening, we
13 believe you have the financial and technical capability
14 to do more than what you propose. We believe you have
15 the capacity to bury the line completely. And we think
16 you've taken a good step in the right direction by
17 adopting the HVDC Lite technology and by acknowledging
18 that burial is possible through the White Mountains.
19 Mr. Quinlan earlier this evening acknowledged the broad
20 public concern about scenic impacts and has said that
21 there is still work to be done in this regard. We
22 heartily agree. The only difference is we think that
23 the way to refine the design is to completely bury it.
24 Thank you.

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
2 sir.

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

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

8 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

9 MR. SEPE: Most of us in this room twice
10 a year hear from our towns when we get our property tax
11 bill. That property tax is dependent on the property
12 record, the assessment we have. That assessment for me
13 and a lot of people in this room includes our view. On
14 that view we pay a property tax twice a year. That
15 view is there for our property. The state has said so
16 repeatedly. The view is part of our property. The
17 Fifth Amendment to the U.S. constitution says,
18 "Property shall not be taken without just
19 compensation." Where is the just compensation for the
20 taking of my property, my view? I live about a half a
21 mile from the route. I would look out the window and
22 see towers about a quarter of the height, apparent
23 height of Mount Washington. In your bribes -- I mean,
24 in your whatever you call the \$200 million to the North

1 Country, I don't see any mitigation of what you call
2 "minimal view impacts." You haven't mitigated. You
3 haven't set aside any money for people like me who will
4 lose tens of thousands of dollars on our property.
5 Now, if you're so confident that the destruction of
6 views is so minimal, why have you not -- or this is not
7 a question time. I would suggest that you set aside
8 some money in your list of bribes for property owners
9 like me and like thousands of others in the North
10 Country who are going to lose property. And I also
11 address this to the state reps who may or may not still
12 be here. I suggested this to some of them. The State
13 of New Hampshire should protect us from this. We
14 should be made whole when we lose our property. But
15 there is no provision in state law or the Northern Pass
16 Project to do that. Thank you.

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

19 MR. KEENEN: Good evening. My name is
20 Joseph T. Keenan, Ph.D. I live in Northumberland.
21 K-E-E-N-A-N. I'm a child psychologist. I came here 20
22 years ago because one day I drove through Lancaster,
23 and I liked the way it looked. I could have gone
24 anywhere. I was at the University of Pennsylvania

1 finishing my doctorate, and I wanted to be a child
2 psychologist in a rural area. I wanted to be someplace
3 where there already wasn't somebody doing what I wanted
4 to do. I decided to come here because of the way it
5 looked.

6 I now own 280 acres of land in the Lost
7 Nation section of Northumberland which I bought about
8 10 years ago, and I have a 50-kilowatt hydro electric
9 power plant on my property. As I'm standing here right
10 now, I'm generating 22 kilowatts into the grid with an
11 arrangement that I have with Eversource. I'm part of a
12 group net metering project. I have 10 people who buy
13 power supposedly through me, and I have renewable
14 energy credits that I sell every quarter of the year.

15 I have an outstanding, outstanding view
16 to the west of the Vermont horizon right across the
17 presently invisible right-of-way because those towers
18 are below the tree line. I look out toward Vermont
19 between Paige Hill Road and North Road. I see the sun
20 go down every day. I've had my property reappraised
21 for refinancing purposes twice in the past five years.
22 On each reappraisal report it described the negative
23 impact potential of the Northern Pass Project to my
24 property value each time it was reappraised. It's in

1 writing. I have filed to be an intervenor. I have
2 intervenor status on the basis of this project's
3 financial impact on me. I support the Forest Society's
4 legal fund with automated monthly contributions that
5 will continue as long as necessary.

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

1 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
2 sir.

3 Jared Booth from Berlin?

4 (No verbal response)

5 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Okay.

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

9 Mr. Vannatta.

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

12 (Court Reporter interrupts.)

13 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Your name.

14 MR. VANNATTA: Oh, sorry.

15 V-A-N-N-A-T-T-A.

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

22 You know, there's a lot of jobs being
23 created here in New Hampshire, a lot of support of the
24 New Hampshire economy. Create construction jobs for

1 New Hampshire residents. I, along with many, are
2 tired, you know, leaving the state to make a living for
3 our family. And that's really all I wanted to say.
4 So, thank you for your time.

5 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
6 sir.

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

8 (No verbal response)

9 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Jeanne
10 Menard from Deerfield. Just remember to spell your
11 name for us, ma'am.

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

14 Thank you for the opportunity to comment
15 tonight.

16 Northern Pass Transmission has
17 represented that Deerfield is the terminus of this
18 project. Since 2010, Deerfield residents have obvious
19 concerns about the current right-of-way impacts due to
20 Northern Pass, but we also have concerns about impacts
21 to outgoing lines and for future expansion projects to
22 route incoming electricity. I've been told by Northern
23 Pass representatives that Northern Pass has nothing to
24 do with the outgoing lines, that this will be handled

1 by Eversource. Our Deerfield Conservation Commission
2 recently received a handout entitled, "Northern Pass
3 Transmission Project, Summary of Water Resource
4 Impacts," and this was dated January 12, 2016. And on
5 this list of towns -- and again, I'd like to repeat
6 that the heading on this handout, and I will submit the
7 handout, is "Northern Pass Transmission Project."

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

24 I am disappointed that a member of the

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

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

16 Ms. Farrell.

17 MS. FARRELL: Attorney Weatherbee --

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

22 MS. FARRELL: Thank you.

23 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: And could
24 you spell your name, please.

1 MS. FARRELL: F-A-R-R-E-L-L.

2 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you.

3 (Court Reporter interrupts.)

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

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

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

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

1 are *ipso facto* rude.

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

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

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

18 SEN. WOODBURN: Thank you. Jeff
19 Woodburn. I am the senator from District 1,
20 representing all 58 communities, 27 percent of the
21 state's land mass, an area larger than two states and
22 17 foreign countries.

23 And I just have to tell the story -- and
24 I wasn't intending to, because I love Rita -- because

1 someone -- I was complaining about this process, and a
2 friend who supports Northern Pass said, "Well, Senator,
3 this is your process. You introduced legislation,
4 along with our friends that were anti-Northern Pass,
5 and many of the senators who oppose Northern Pass."
6 So, you know, I appreciate this process. No process is
7 perfect. But the opportunity to listen, to take
8 criticism, and I think this is a good process. So I
9 just wanted to start with that.

10 But I want to focus my comments on a
11 piece that I believe hasn't been dealt with -- and many
12 areas have been dealt with -- and that is the imbalance
13 that I see between part of my district in the south,
14 the Grafton County area, and the part in the north,
15 Coos County. And the current proposal falls short and
16 must be changed to meet the needs of the North Country,
17 particularly Coos County. I've long said that Northern
18 Pass needs to provide tangible local benefits. And
19 progress has been made back from 2010 when this process
20 started, to see the changes in this more recently, the
21 burial in the White Mountain region, and importantly,
22 starting a large mitigation fund to expand economic
23 opportunity and compensate communities impacted by this
24 project.

1 But an imbalance still exists. And we
2 cannot in the North Country divide ourselves into
3 winners and losers. I remain concerned about the
4 impact of this project in Coos County, especially in my
5 hometown, the place my family has lived for three
6 generations, where four out of five entry points to my
7 hometown are impacted by these overhead lines. And
8 quite frankly, more needs to be done to target and
9 clearly define benefits for this region and to fix the
10 imbalance.

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

16 PRESIDING OFFICER IACOPINO: Thank you,
17 Senator.

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

20 Please remember, if you believe that you
21 have an interest, a substantive interest that would
22 support your intervention, such motions have to be
23 filed by February 5th. We're going to be having our
24 final public information session tomorrow night at the

1 Mountain Club at Loon in Lincoln, New Hampshire, at
2 6 p.m. Thank you. We're adjourned.

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

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