

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

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

March 1, 2016 - 5:02 p.m.
Mills Falls at the Lake
Church Landing
281 Daniel Webster Highway
Meredith, New Hampshire

**IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2015-06
JOINT APPLICATION OF NORTHERN
PASS TRANSMISSION, LLC, AND
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF
NEW HAMPSHIRE d/b/a EVERSOURCE
ENERGY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF
SITE AND FACILITY.
*(Public Hearing of the
Subcommittee members held pursuant
to RSA 162-H:10, I-c)***

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

PRESENT FOR SUBCOMMITTEE:	SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:
Chairman Martin P. Honigberg <i>(Presiding as Presiding Officer)</i>	Public Utilities Commission
Cmsr. Kathryn M. Bailey	Public Utilities Commission
Craig Wright, Designee	Dept. of Environmental Serv.
Christopher Way, Designee	Dept. of Resources & Economic Development
William Oldenburg, Designee	Dept. of Transportation
Patricia Weathersby	Public Member
Rachel Whitaker	Alternate Public Member

COURT REPORTER: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 052
Susan J. Robidas, LCR No. 044

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

ALSO PRESENT FOR THE SEC: Michael J. Iacopino, Esq.
Iryna Dore, Esq.
(Brennan Lenehan)
Pamela G. Monroe, Administrator

COUNSEL FOR THE APPLICANTS: Barry Needleman, Esq.
Thomas B. Getz, Esq.
(McLane Middleton)

COUNSEL FOR THE PUBLIC: Peter C.L. Roth, Esq.
Sr. Asst. Attorney General
N.H. Dept. of Justice

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

***Also noted to be present at one or more
of the Joint Public Hearings in March
from the Applicants available to provide
the presentation* and answers
to questions:***

**William Quinlan, President NH Operations, Eversource
James Muntz, President of Transmission, Eversource
Kenneth Bowes, Vice President-Engineering, Eversource
Samuel Johnson, Lead Project Manager-NPT, Burns & McDonnell
Robert Clarke, Eversource
Lee Carbonneau, Sr. Principal Scientist, Normandeau Assoc.
Robert Varney, President, Normandeau Associates
Terrence DeWan, Principal, Terrence J. DeWan & Associates
Cherilyn Widell, Principal, Widell Preservation Services
Mark Hodgdon, Esq.
Jessica Kimball, Planner/Landscape Designer, Dewan & Assoc.
Lisa Shapiro, Chief Economist, Gallagher Callahan & Gartrell
James Chalmers, Principal, Chalmers & Associates
Mitch Nichols, President, Nichols Tourism Group
William Bailey, Principal Scientist, Center for Occup. and
Envir. Health Risk Assess., Exponent, Inc.*

I N D E X

	PAGE NO.
PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT (Mr. Quinlan)	10
QUESTION-AND-ANSWER SESSION TO PUBLIC'S QUESTIONS	23
PUBLIC COMMENT BY:	
Pam Vose	66
Paul Hausmann	68
Ralph Kirschner	70
Michael Stanek	73
Marc Brown	75
Kenneth Kimball	79, 108
Tiler Eaton	84
Manfred Hoertdoerfer	85, 110
Suzanne Steele	88
Brendan Finn	91
Donna Keeley	94
Susan Seitz	96
Jane Difley	98
Ryan Barber	100
Eileen Schulze	101
Greg Averill	102
Senator Jeanie Forrester	103
Jason Lauze	104

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. We're
3 going to get started. Good afternoon, everyone.
4 Welcome to a public meeting of the Subcommittee of the
5 New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee. It is the
6 Subcommittee considering a Petition by the Joint
7 Application of Northern Pass Transmission, LLC, and
8 Public Service Company of New Hampshire, which does
9 business as Eversource Energy, seeking a Certificate of
10 Site and Facility. We are doing a public hearing
11 today, and there will be a number of things that will
12 happen. We'll go over the agenda in a few minutes.

13 But, before going any further, I'm going
14 to ask the members of the Subcommittee to introduce
15 themselves, starting at my right.

16 MR. OLDENBURG: William Oldenburg,
17 representing the New Hampshire Department of
18 Transportation.

19 MR. WAY: Christopher Way, representing
20 the Department of Resources and Economic Development.

21 MR. WRIGHT: Craig Wright, with the
22 Department of Environmental Services.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm Martin
24 Honigberg. I'm the Chairman of the Public Utilities

1 Commission.

2 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Kate Bailey,
3 Commissioner at the New Hampshire Public Utilities
4 Commission.

5 MS. WEATHERSBY: Patricia Weathersby,
6 public member.

7 MS. WHITAKER: And, I'm Rachel Whitaker,
8 the other public member.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Seated to my left
10 is Counsel to the SEC, Mike Iacopino. At my far right,
11 your left, at the end of the table is Pam Monroe, who
12 is the Administrator of the Site Evaluation Committee.

13 I think there's one other person with
14 sort of an official status that I will introduce, and
15 that's Peter Roth, who is Counsel for the Public. He's
16 an employee at the New Hampshire Attorney General's
17 Office, and he has a very specific role in SEC
18 proceedings.

19 I don't believe we have representatives
20 of other state agencies here today. Is there anyone
21 from any of the state agencies that needs to identify
22 him or herself?

23 *[No verbal response]*

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I

1 didn't think so. All right. We'll now open the public
2 hearing. And, you're going to hear me read for a few
3 minutes, and I apologize for that.

4 On October 19th, 2015, Northern Pass
5 Transmission, LLC, and Public Service Company of New
6 Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy, and
7 we'll collectively refer to them as "the Applicant",
8 submitted an application to the New Hampshire Site
9 Evaluation Committee for a Certificate of Site and
10 Facility to construct a 192-mile transmission line.
11 The transmission line is proposed to have a capacity of
12 up to 1,090 megawatts. It is proposed to run from the
13 Canadian border in Pittsburg, down to Deerfield, New
14 Hampshire.

15 On November 2nd, pursuant RSA 162-H, I,
16 as the Chair of the SEC, appointed a Subcommittee of
17 seven members of the SEC to consider the Application.
18 A number of the members acted, pursuant to their
19 statutory authority, to designate senior members of
20 their agencies. Mr. Way and the others to my right are
21 all designees of their agencies.

22 On December 7th, the Subcommittee met to
23 consider the status of the Application, and determined
24 that it contained sufficient information to satisfy the

1 application requirements of each state agency having
2 jurisdiction under state or federal law to regulate any
3 aspect of the construction or operation of the proposed
4 facility. The Subcommittee also made an independent
5 determination that the application contained sufficient
6 information to carry out the purposes of RSA 162-H.

7 A Procedural Order was issued by the
8 Subcommittee on December 22nd setting forth a deadline
9 for motions to intervene, which was set at
10 February 5th, 2016, and scheduling Public Information
11 Sessions in Franklin, Londonderry, Laconia, Whitefield,
12 and Lincoln. Those information sessions took place on
13 January 11th, 13th, 14th, 20th, and 21st, respectively.
14 By the deadline for motions to intervene, the
15 Subcommittee had received over 150 motions to intervene
16 and participate in the docket.

17 Today, we're here for a public -- what
18 is referred to in the statute as a "joint public
19 hearing", and the "joint" aspect of that refers to if
20 there are other state agencies that have
21 permitting/hearing requirements. There may be none.
22 It's not surprising, it's not unusual that there
23 aren't. So, the only people you have here today are
24 the SEC Subcommittee.

1 Under RSA 162-H:10, the Subcommittee is
2 required to hold at least one public hearing in each
3 county in which the proposed project is to be located.
4 This is the first such hearing, and the Belknap County
5 version, of what will take place in four other
6 locations. The public hearings must be held within 90
7 days after acceptance of the application.

8 Notice of this public hearing was served
9 upon the public by publication in the New Hampshire
10 Union Leader on February 10th of 2016. We will proceed
11 as follows: We will first here a presentation by the
12 Applicant. Following the presentation, the
13 Subcommittee members may have questions they will pose
14 to the Applicant. Thereafter, the public will be
15 permitted to have their questions posed to the
16 Applicant.

17 If you have a question that you want to
18 be given to the Applicant to answer, we would like you
19 to fill out one of these green sheets *[indicating]*.
20 They're available in the back of the room, or just
21 outside, and there are a number of people around who
22 can collect your green sheet, if you have questions.
23 We will try to organize the questions by subject
24 matter, and try to remove duplicates, so that the

1 questions get answered efficiently.

2 Once all of the questions have been
3 asked, we will then take public statements or comments
4 on the Application. If you wish to speak, we'd like
5 you to fill out one of these yellow slips of paper
6 *[indicating]*, and we'll basically take them in the
7 order in which they're submitted. Depending on how
8 many people ask to speak, we'll impose some reasonable
9 time limits on people's opportunities, give you an
10 opportunity to say what you need to say. We will ask
11 you not to repeat what others have already said. If
12 there's someone who said something that you were
13 planning on saying, you can say "I agree with the
14 person who was just in front of me" or "I agree with
15 Ms. Jones, who spoke a little while ago on a particular
16 topic".

17 If all you want -- if all you would like
18 to do is make a comment, a written comment, we have
19 blue forms for that. You can submit them to Ms. Monroe
20 at the end of the table. She has them scanned, and
21 they are all posted on our website as comments from the
22 public.

23 I believe the next item of business is
24 to turn it over to the Applicant for their

1 presentation. So, I will yield the floor.

2 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. Thank you very
3 much. My name is Bill Quinlan. I'm the President of
4 Eversource New Hampshire. I want to thank everyone for
5 being here tonight and showing an interest in the
6 Project that we're proposing. I'm going to give a
7 quick overview of the Project that we've applied for a
8 certificate, as well as highlight kind of some of the
9 issues that have been raised during its history, as
10 well as some of the impacts in New Hampshire.

11 I'm going to hit three topics. The
12 first is the energy challenge that is driving some of
13 the rationale and logic behind this Project, both in
14 New Hampshire and in New England; how are the states of
15 New England and New Hampshire dealing with it; and
16 then, ultimately, I'll conclude with what are the
17 benefits to New Hampshire from this Project.

18 So, what's going on in the energy
19 markets today? This is a topic I hear about regularly,
20 from businesses and residences across the State of New
21 Hampshire, and you could translate that anywhere across
22 New England. In essence, what you've got is a
23 situation where energy prices are higher than they
24 should be and they're more volatile than they should

1 be. They're subject to very wide swings. And, there's
2 a lot of reasons for that.

3 The primary driver is identified over
4 here on the left. This is a map of New England,
5 obviously, and we're all part of one power pool. The
6 power plants in blue, blue crosses, are power plants
7 that have closed, meaning retired, they no longer
8 operate, or will be retiring in the coming years.
9 Anything in red is a plant that the Independent System
10 Operator believes is at risk, either because of the
11 fuel type or the age or the economics. And, what you
12 see is that over 4,200 megawatts of generation has
13 retired or is known to be retired in New England, and
14 there's more to come. What does that mean? That's
15 about 15 percent of the fleet that has, for decades,
16 kept prices stable and kept the lights on across New
17 England. So, we are, in essence, a situation of
18 diminishing supply. And, that's creating some of the
19 market volatility that we're seeing.

20 As a result, what's happened is, this
21 transformation here, between the year 2000 and 2015,
22 you'll see this is a depiction of the generation mix in
23 New England. So, what are the power plants that are
24 used to generate electricity? And, you look at 2000,

1 very good fuel diversity, a nice mix of nuclear power
2 plants, coal plants, oil plants, hydro plants, natural
3 gas. The plants that have retired, and many of them
4 are in this area, are coal, nuclear, and oil. You
5 know, a good example of it is Vermont Yankee, which is
6 kind of a recent addition.

7 So, what's occurring is we're becoming
8 more and more dependent on a single fuel source for our
9 electric generation, and that fuel source is natural
10 gas. The coal plants, the oil plants, and the nuclear
11 plants, that have provided predictability and stability
12 in price, really have retired or are soon to retire.

13 So, that's what's occurring at a macro
14 level across New England, New Hampshire being part of
15 that power pool, we're very dependent on what happens
16 across the six-state region. Okay?

17 Here's an illustration of what I mean by
18 impact on prices. So, as demand rises, and supply
19 comes down, the surplus that we had diminishes. So, we
20 end up with a scarcity. As a result, you know, prices
21 begin to ramp up. This is a depiction of what's
22 referred to as "capacity". These are incentive payouts
23 that are made to generators, and the commitments are
24 made years in advance to ensure that those plants

1 remain in operation when we need them. So, these are
2 markets that have cleared out into the future, three
3 years in advance, all the way out to 2019. And, you
4 know, the takeaway is for a decade the capacity market
5 for all of New England has been about a billion
6 dollars. Because of the phenomena that I identified
7 earlier, where plants are retiring and supply is
8 growing, but not quickly enough to meet demand, that
9 billion dollar market will become a \$3 billion market,
10 a \$4 billion market, in three years from now, a
11 \$3 billion market. All of that translates into higher
12 electric rates across New England. And, it's really
13 due to the simple theory behind supply-and-demand, you
14 have a scarcity situation. So, we have visibility
15 three years out that prices are going to go higher
16 still than they are today.

17 Here's what's happening on the energy
18 side. So, your electric price is really made up of two
19 elements, one the capacity that I just referred to, the
20 other is the cost of energy. In essence, for any given
21 hour, customers across New England demand a certain
22 amount of electricity to keep the lights on. And, the
23 way that price is determined in the market is the
24 Independent System Operator dispatches generating units

1 until the supply is sufficient to meet the demand of
2 customers. And, they do it from the lowest cost
3 generation asset, to the one that just meets the
4 customer demand. When you have balanced the customer
5 demand, that last generating unit sets the price for
6 all of the generation across New England. Okay?

7 So, the way Northern Pass impacts this
8 in a positive way, which means to lower price, is that
9 it gets inserted into this bid stack at a very
10 relatively low price. So, the higher cost generation
11 assets that are setting the clearing price on any given
12 hour get displaced. They no longer have to operate.
13 And, the clearing price is then set by a lower cost
14 unit. So, Northern Pass plays a significant role in
15 setting -- will play a significant role in setting the
16 energy clearing price across New England.

17 So, that's the energy side of the price
18 of electricity. You take the energy side and the
19 capacity side, that's essentially the price paid by
20 businesses and residential customers. So, we have a
21 challenge today. Northern Pass could become a
22 significant part of the solution.

23 I'm going to transition to what's
24 referred to as the "Clean State RFP". So, this is what

1 New England is doing about that supply challenge. The
2 three southern New England states, Connecticut,
3 Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, in recognition of this
4 challenge, have gone out and solicited projects to
5 essentially increase the supply of electricity, clean
6 energy, into New England. It's for two primary
7 purposes: One, to address that supply situation I was
8 referring to, and replace some of those plants that are
9 retiring; and, two, help the region meet its
10 environmental goals. Those are the two principal
11 purposes of this solicitation.

12 Northern Pass, this Project was bid into
13 that three-state request for proposals in late January.
14 The Project we bid into that three-state RFP is
15 identical to the Project that we have submitted to the
16 SEC for consideration. It's the same route, and the
17 same project cost, with the same, in essence, benefits.

18 Our view is that our proposal is a very
19 strong one. It's a large volume. It's clean energy.
20 So, it's exactly the type of power those states are
21 looking for. And, from a price perspective, we expect
22 it to be very competitive.

23 The question I get often is "what's the
24 relationship between our Project, Northern Pass, and

1 our partner, Hydro-Quebec?" Okay? So, Northern Pass
2 Transmission, NPT, the Applicant in this case, is a
3 subsidiary of Eversource, the Company. Okay? It's a
4 direct subsidiary. Our partner is Hydro-Quebec.
5 Hydro-Quebec is the owner and operator of hydro
6 facilities in Canada. They basically control the
7 supply of that hydroelectric power.

8 It's a fairly simple relationship.
9 We've got a -- what's referred to as a "Transmission
10 Support Agreement" between Northern Pass Transmission
11 and Hydro-Quebec, under which we, Northern Pass
12 Transmission, will finance, construct, and own the
13 Project, the transmission line that we're talking about
14 here. In a sense, we will provide transmission service
15 to Hydro-Quebec, which will, in essence, give them a
16 transmission path to deliver their clean energy to
17 Deerfield, New Hampshire. Okay?

18 In exchange for that, they, in essence,
19 pay for use of the line, and then they have the ability
20 to sell their clean energy into the New England market.

21 That's the high-level summary of the
22 relationship between Northern Pass Transmission and
23 Hydro-Quebec. I know there have been a lot of
24 questions as to those relationships. But it's all

1 spelled out in that Transmission Service Agreement.

2 And, that agreement has been submitted and approved by
3 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Okay?

4 So, for the last 18 months or so, as
5 I've been involved in Northern Pass, we've been taking
6 a very hard look at this Project and listening to a lot
7 of stakeholders across the State of New Hampshire.

8 And, they range from businesses and residential
9 customers, who are struggling with those energy costs,
10 to landowners, to environmental organizations, elected
11 officials. And, really, what we've been trying to
12 identify is "what is the project that, in our view, is
13 balanced?" Meaning, it works technologically, it gets
14 the power from that source, which is the Hydro-Quebec
15 generation plants, down to Deerfield, New Hampshire.

16 It clearly has to do that in a reliable way. It has to
17 be affordable. Meaning, it can't be so expensive that
18 no one will pay for it. And, it has to be sitable,
19 which is where the SEC and the Department of Energy
20 come in. And, we have to have a project that meets the
21 requirements for being sited, both at a state and a
22 federal level. That's what we've been working towards
23 for the last year and a half.

24 We rolled out that Project last fall.

1 You know, we announced a new route. I've got a video,
2 a short video that we're going to show in a moment,
3 just to illustrate for you the progression that this
4 Project has taken over time. When it was first
5 introduced in 2010, it really has been changed
6 dramatically. And, it's been changed dramatically as a
7 result of input we've gotten from New Hampshire
8 stakeholders.

9 One of the things that we have heard
10 consistently, we continue to hear it, is with respect
11 to the impact on aesthetics. You know, so, you'll see,
12 as we walk through this progression, the changes that
13 we've made that are very fundamental changes to a
14 project of this size, in an effort to deal with that
15 issue that we know many in New Hampshire have.

16 So, Andrea, why don't you cue up the
17 video.

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

20 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. I thought that
21 would be a useful -- oh, excuse me -- a useful
22 illustration of the progression this Project has taken,
23 really to address one of the issues we've heard
24 consistently here in New Hampshire. If you think about

1 that progression you just saw, from a project
2 perspective, it's a very different project. It's
3 longer. It's been reduced in size by 15 percent. It's
4 going to cost about a half a billion dollars more than
5 originally envisioned. Sixty (60) miles of it will be
6 underground. And, a big portion of it is moved off to
7 the western side of -- the eastern side of the Coos
8 County. So, these are significant changes in this
9 Project.

10 We are now continuing to work at kind of
11 a local level, from a design and engineering
12 perspective, on all of the structures. You know, what
13 can we do to move a structure, lower a structure,
14 design a structure differently, so that it reduces
15 visual and aesthetic impacts? These are changes that
16 we're continuing to pursue as we get into the detailed
17 design. But, from a high-level perspective, that I
18 thought it important that you understand the evolution
19 that the Project has taken since its inception.

20 The other question I get frequently is
21 "what's in this for New Hampshire?" You know, the
22 original perspective around the Project was that "this
23 was all about getting power into southern New England."
24 So, what we prepared, as part of the ForwardNH

1 announcement, was a summary of the benefits to New
2 Hampshire. I'm not going to read it in its entirety,
3 but it's broken out at the top between "environmental"
4 and the "economic benefits". If you look at the
5 economic benefits over the foreseeable future,
6 approximately 3.8 billion. And, it ranges from the
7 impact on energy costs, when we evaluate the market
8 effects that I was referring to earlier, it's about an
9 \$80 million a year savings to New Hampshire customers.
10 We made a very significant commitment to the
11 establishment of a fund that will be invested locally,
12 a \$200 million ForwardNH Fund; \$30 million a year in
13 property taxes; some very strong commitments about job
14 creation in the state. When you look at the economic
15 benefits, they're quite significant, almost \$4 billion.

16 Beyond that, are the environmental
17 benefits. You know, we're talking about a clean source
18 of electricity. If you look at displacing the power
19 plants that we anticipate displacing, it's
20 approximately 3 million tons a year in reduced carbon
21 dioxide emissions. There are no projects that you
22 could envision that are going to have that kind of
23 environmental impact.

24 And, just as an aside, you know, 2015 is

1 the first year in a long time our carbon emissions went
2 in the wrong direction, meaning they went up, by
3 7 percent year-over-year. Why was that? It's because
4 some of the power plants that have retired are nuclear
5 plants, which are not carbon-emitting, and they're
6 being replaced by natural gas plants. So, if we, as a
7 region, we, as a state, are serious about achieving our
8 environmental goals, we do need power plants like this,
9 and investments like this, which are
10 non-carbon-emitting, are clean, and help us move that
11 in the right direction.

12 Okay. So, that's the overview. You
13 know, again, I appreciate all of your attention and
14 involvement and engagement on this. I thank the SEC in
15 advance for their consideration. And, we have
16 certainly worked to strike an appropriate balance.
17 We're mindful of the four statutory criteria that we
18 have to demonstrate. We think our Application has done
19 a good job in making our case around those criteria.
20 And, I look forward to your questions.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you,
22 Mr. Quinlan. The next item or the next phase of this
23 will be questions from Subcommittee members.

24 Before I allow any of them to ask

1 questions, for the benefit of those who have just
2 arrived, or just a reminder for those who have been
3 here, if you have a question that you want to be asked,
4 there's the green form. If you have -- if you want to
5 speak, when we open it up for speakers, we have the
6 yellow sheet. And, if you just want to submit a
7 written comment, it's the blue form.

8 Mr. Quinlan, I'm going to start, before
9 I allow anybody else, I'm going to ask you to introduce
10 the members of your team that you have here this
11 evening.

12 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, we have a
13 fairly large team. I'm going to introduce the members
14 who are at the table with me.

15 Starting from the far end, so, that's
16 Jim Muntz, he's the President of our Transmission
17 organization; Ken Bowes, who's the Vice President of
18 Engineering; Sam Johnson, who is an engineer and
19 project manager with the firm of Burns & McDonnell; and
20 Lee Carbonneau, from Normandeau Associates, she's an
21 environmental expert.

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Who
23 from the Subcommittee has questions for Mr. Quinlan or
24 his people?

1 *[No verbal response]*

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: There are no
3 substantive questions from members of the Subcommittee?

4 *[No verbal response]*

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I
6 assume people have been submitting written questions to
7 you, Ms. Monroe?

8 *[Documents handed to Chairman
9 Honigberg.]*

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I want to thank
11 those people who have submitted questions so far for
12 the lovely printing. You have done a great job in
13 making this possible for me.

14 All right. The first question is, "To
15 what extent is it a correct conception that new
16 technology will lead to highly efficient small power
17 sources that will serve local, not long distance
18 customers, and render your project sadly obsolete?"

19 MR. QUINLAN: So, there are technologies
20 that have been under development for decades, which are
21 local or distributed. You know, one example is solar
22 technology or fuel cell technology. These have been
23 technologies that have been in development now, you see
24 them being adopted to varying degrees. And, they

1 certainly serve a purpose. You know, they're generally
2 renewable, and they certainly bring a benefit by being
3 local.

4 We're a long way from them rendering
5 obsolete the transmission grid or large baseload
6 generation. One of the primary issues with the small
7 renewables is their ability to follow load, in the fact
8 that they are generally intermittent resources, which
9 means when the Sun is not shining or the wind is not
10 blowing, you still have to have a baseload source of
11 electricity to keep the lights on, as well as the
12 transmission system to deliver it.

13 So, there's certainly a place for
14 small-scale distributed generation today. And, for the
15 next several decades, my view is we still need a robust
16 and reliable transmission system, as well as a baseload
17 fleet to meet customers' needs.

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: A follow-up to that
19 question would be about storage. What's the state of
20 technology development in storage, for things like
21 solar and things where you could generate a lot during
22 the day, and how would you use it then?

23 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. Solar -- storage
24 technology, again, it's been under development for

1 decades. You know, I think just now you're starting to
2 see the first true commercial applications of it. Some
3 utilities across the country are making investments in
4 storage, either on a pilot or a small scale. There are
5 no large-scale dependencies on storage. And, it's for
6 two reasons: First, we have to, you know, prove it out
7 that it works technically, and it provides the benefit
8 that we hope to deliver; and the second is, again,
9 price. It is cost-prohibitive to rely on storage on a
10 large scale, in essence, to meet the demands of
11 customers.

12 But, like distributed technologies and
13 like small-scale renewables, you know, it's exciting.
14 I think, you know, it holds promise in the future. We
15 first have to prove it out technically, and then the
16 price point has to come down, so that customers still
17 have a affordable source of electricity.

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. New
19 topic. "How is the publicity and promotion of the
20 Northern Pass Project being funded? Is it coming from
21 ratepayers? Is Hydro-Quebec paying for? Eversource
22 shareholders?" How is that happening?

23 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, with -- for
24 Eversource customers, and this is certainly true for

1 the work we're doing today, but it's also true for the
2 Project itself, from the outset we've made a commitment
3 to New Hampshire that New Hampshire customers will not
4 pay for any aspect of Northern Pass. And, that remains
5 the case. And, that's certainly true for any costs
6 we've incurred to date. The costs we've incurred to
7 this point are really borne between our Company and its
8 shareholders, as well as our partner, Hydro-Quebec.

9 To the extent our Project actually is
10 constructed, and we put it into service, I showed
11 earlier the relationship between us and Hydro-Quebec,
12 that's how we will recover our costs, which is through
13 the Transmission Support Agreement, which has been
14 approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
15 That does not kick in until we have a project that's
16 been permitted and has been constructed.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next question has
18 to do with, it's a fairly simple question, "Why are the
19 transmission towers so high?"

20 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, I'm going to
21 defer to one of our technical experts, probably
22 Mr. Bowes, who could better answer that.

23 MR. BOWES: Thank you. This is Ken
24 Bowes, Vice President of Engineering for Eversource.

1 It's really down to the electrical safety codes that
2 are in place.

3 FROM THE FLOOR: Can't hear. Can you be
4 louder please?

5 MR. BOWES: It pertains to the
6 electrical safety codes that are in place, in this case
7 the National Electric Safety Code, which specifies the
8 clearance required between conductors, either AC or DC
9 transmission, and also the distance between the
10 conductors and the earth. So, it's really a safety
11 standard.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next two
13 questions relate to use of existing rights-of-way. As
14 worded, the first version of that question is "Can the
15 new lines use existing transmission paths, instead of
16 cutting new trails?" And, the second one is specific
17 to south of White Mountain National Forest, "to what
18 extent" -- actually, I guess along the whole line it
19 makes sense to ask you, "to what extent are you using
20 existing rights-of-way?"

21 MR. QUINLAN: So, in essence, and the
22 video depicted this, the far northern portion of the
23 route, which is basically from Pittsburg, at the
24 Canadian border, down to the Coos Loop, which is about

1 40 miles, that is the new portion of the route. That's
2 where we're either going underground, which will be for
3 eight (8) miles of that distance, or through the
4 working forest, which will be 24 miles of that
5 distance. And, then, there's eight (8) miles of new
6 right-of-way. Okay?

7 Once you've gotten to the Coos Loop,
8 which is in Stark, the balance of the Project follows
9 existing rights-of-way, all the way down to Deerfield,
10 with the exception now of the 52 miles of underground
11 construction around the White Mountain National Forest.
12 One of the important things to recognize is, from that
13 point in Stark, all the way to Deerfield, which is
14 approximately 142 miles, we have an existing
15 transmission corridor, with an existing line, that goes
16 right through the White Mountain National Forest. Our
17 plan is to follow that all the way to Deerfield, with
18 the exception of the 52-mile underground construction
19 around the White Mountain National Forest.

20 So, you know, the video indicated
21 80 percent of the line is either underground or on
22 existing transmission right-of-way, where there's an
23 existing transmission line.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Following up on

1 that, there's a question related to jobs and
2 construction. There's a series of questions buried in
3 here, not all of which I can read as clearly as some of
4 the others, but I'm going to do my best to get this
5 person's questions out there.

6 MR. QUINLAN: Sure.

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's really an
8 opportunity for you to expand a little bit on what
9 types of jobs, what kinds of skills are required for
10 some of these construction jobs, but I'll do my best to
11 read it. "The proposal you say will bring more than
12 2,000 jobs -- construction jobs to New Hampshire.
13 Questions about the variety of jobs, what training is
14 required, and what kinds of construction equipment will
15 be necessary for the different types of construction
16 that's going to be necessary along the route?"

17 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, there's a wide
18 range of jobs. So, it's a \$1.6 billion infrastructure
19 project. So, that's a large undertaking. The range of
20 jobs spans the gamut. It really starts from the
21 electrical workers, the highly skilled craftsmen who
22 will actually build the electrical line and do the
23 electrical work, whether it's in a substation
24 environment or the line itself. It is other physical

1 workers, who may have a role in, you know, creating an
2 access road, clearing a right-of-way, delivering
3 equipment. So, those might be truck drivers, loggers,
4 gravel suppliers. You know, the gamut of physical work
5 necessary to undertake a \$1.6 billion infrastructure
6 project.

7 If you look beyond that, you know, we
8 expect there to be very significant second order
9 effects to communities along the route, whether it's
10 hotels, who will house our workers, feed our workers,
11 you know, provide entertainment to the workers. You
12 know, these are all the effects that you see in these
13 large types of infrastructure projects.

14 How do we know that? We've got a lot of
15 experience building similar projects in other states,
16 whether it's in Connecticut and Massachusetts. There
17 was a recent similar project built in the State of
18 Maine, in which the job creation was quite dramatic.
19 It's -- you know, certainly, a portion of that is
20 highly skilled in the electrical work, but a portion of
21 it also is going to be sourced very locally.

22 So, one of the commitments we've made is
23 a "New Hampshire first" commitment. So, to the extent
24 possible, every one of those disciplines we will look

1 to New Hampshire residents and businesses and
2 contractors first. And, we're doing an extensive
3 outreach today up and down the route to identify who
4 are the local companies who can play a role. And,
5 we've been very impressed by what's available here in
6 the state. So, the vast majority of this investment is
7 going to be done locally.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "Is there any
9 chance that the Project could expand, to potentially"
10 -- the word here is "double the power delivery? With
11 such an abundance of hydropower north of the border,
12 shouldn't we take more advantage of this clean
13 renewable energy" is the question?

14 MR. QUINLAN: So, the short answer is
15 "no". In fact, we actually scaled down the size of the
16 Project, in what was originally going to be a
17 1,200-megawatt line, using a more conventional cable,
18 has been reduced to 1,090. Why did we do that? It was
19 to be in a position where we can commit to 60 miles of
20 underground construction. We were not comfortable with
21 the state of technology in doing that with a
22 1,200-megawatt cable. So, we actually changed the
23 cable technology, from a conventional cable to a
24 state-of-the-art cable. We think that technology is --

1 works at 1,090. It's not been used at 1,200 megawatts.
2 So, we've actually scaled back the size of this Project
3 so that we could address one of New Hampshire's big
4 needs.

5 And, I'll say this. You know, the
6 60 miles of underground construction using this cable
7 technology will be the longest underground construction
8 in North America. So, we're pushing the envelope
9 technologically to meet the concerns of New Hampshire.

10 You know, as far as, you know, would New
11 England or New Hampshire be interested in more clean
12 energy from Canada, if it were available and there were
13 a transmission path? I think it's a big part of the
14 future, I really do. I think, you know, if you look at
15 what's happening on the supply of generation here in
16 the region, for us to keep prices low and meet our
17 environmental goals, you know, we're going to have to
18 look to the future.

19 You know, so, I would say, as a market,
20 as a region, you know, new renewables are a key part of
21 the future, whether they're hydro, wind, or otherwise.

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Related is another
23 question that got submitted, which is that

24 "Hydro-Quebec already transmits some of its power into

1 the New England grid. Why can't they just transmit
2 more along their current lines?" And, I guess I'd like
3 you to speak, if you can, about what other sources of
4 hydro are coming into New England and along what
5 transmission lines.

6 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, there's
7 basically two sources of hydro in New England. You
8 have small-scale, generally, run-of-river hydro. So,
9 these are the small dams you see throughout New
10 England. They tend to be, you know, 20 megawatts or
11 less each. There are a lot of them. Those tend to
12 operate when the rivers are flowing.

13 There's another source of hydro in New
14 England, it's called "pumped hydro". So, this was a
15 technology that was in vogue back in the '70s and '80s.
16 Essentially, you pump water up a mountain at night,
17 when costs are low, prices are low, and you let it run
18 back through the turbines during the day, when prices
19 are high. You know, a good example of that is
20 Northfield Mountain, in western Massachusetts. That's
21 a second source of local hydro. So, it's either
22 run-of-river, which is generally small, or large pump
23 storage facilities. That's what you see locally.

24 Most of our rivers throughout New

1 England don't have a lot additional capacity to
2 generate electricity. Hydro-Quebec, on the other hand,
3 has vast reservoirs and the ability to generate
4 hydropower. So, you know, one data point, Hydro-Quebec
5 is about a 40,000 megawatt hydro generation fleet. All
6 of New England's generation combined is about
7 35,000 megawatts. So, they have more hydro today than
8 New England has across coal, oil, nuclear, hydro,
9 *etcetera*.

10 There are two existing lines that
11 interconnect hydroelectric -- excuse me --
12 Hydro-Quebec's grid with New England, one into New
13 Hampshire and the other into Vermont. Those, in
14 essence, are at capacity. So, there's no additional
15 ability to deliver large amounts of hydroelectric power
16 over those lines, hence the need for a third line.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We've got a couple
18 of more questions related to construction before
19 changing the subject. "In addition to the new
20 transmission lines, what major upgrades will take place
21 to improve the grid in the future?"

22 MR. QUINLAN: Can you repeat that
23 question please?

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "In addition to the

1 new transmission lines" --

2 MR. QUINLAN: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- "that you're
4 proposing, what major upgrades will take place to
5 improve the grid in the future?"

6 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, you know,
7 again, this project basically gets power to Deerfield,
8 New Hampshire. That's the end point for all of this
9 power, and it will all be delivered at that location.

10 Separate and apart from this Project,
11 we, Eversource, and other utilities across New England,
12 are reinforcing our transmission infrastructure. And,
13 why are we doing that? In essence, we're doing it to
14 make it more reliable. You can all remember some of
15 the storms that have come through over the last five or
16 ten years. So, we're building additional redundancy
17 and resiliency into our system. But, also, we're
18 making it more robust, in the sense of our ability to
19 move power seamlessly around the region.

20 You know, five years ago, customers were
21 paying hundreds of millions of dollars a year in what's
22 referred to as "congestion costs". That's because, if
23 you had generation in Maine, and you couldn't get it to
24 New Hampshire, it doesn't really do you any good. And,

1 the price differential between Maine and New Hampshire
2 was referred to as "congestion". And, that was a 100
3 million -- several hundred million dollar a year price
4 tag for New England customers. Over the last ten
5 years, and we've done a lot of this, we've built out
6 the grid, so that that power can move seamlessly around
7 New England, in essence, eliminating congestion. Those
8 were investments we've been making over the last decade
9 to allow that power flow.

10 There were a couple projects here in New
11 Hampshire, which will illustrate this point, one of
12 which is pending before the SEC, so, I won't speak
13 about it, but that's the Merrimack Valley Reliability
14 Project. The other is the Seacoast Reliability
15 Project. It's, in essence, a project along the lines
16 of what I just referred to. It's one that is -- will
17 allow power to flow into the Seacoast area in an
18 affordable way. The Seacoast is growing. There's a
19 lot of business development. Customer demands are
20 going up. And, our ability to get the lowest cost
21 power into that region reliably is tapped out. So, we
22 have a project, which will open up the grid to allow
23 power flowing into the Seacoast, so that area can
24 continue to grow.

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I have
2 a more technical engineering question here. It is the
3 question asker's understanding that "a natural gas
4 pipeline from Canada to Portland was built and buried
5 through the North Country of New Hampshire. What are
6 the logistical and engineering differences between
7 burying a pipeline and burying your transmission
8 lines?"

9 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. I'm going to defer
10 that to our technical team. Maybe, Ken, you could
11 start.

12 MR. BOWES: Yes. I'll start out, and
13 then I'll also defer to Sam on some of this.

14 Very familiar with constructing electric
15 transmission, including underground. And, the process
16 is normally not done on rights-of-way, it's normally
17 done in the public way, in city streets and state
18 highways. So, that's one difference between
19 constructing gas pipelines. They're typically in a
20 right-of-way either by themselves or, in some cases,
21 collocated with overhead transmission lines.

22 And, Sam, if you can go into some of the
23 construction methodology for gas transmission.

24 MR. JOHNSON: Sam Johnson, Burns &

1 McDonnell Engineering. Basically, the construction of
2 an underground trench for an electric line is really
3 similar to that of a gas transmission line, with the
4 exception of location. Gas transmission lines are
5 typically built in rural areas or away from urban
6 centers where possible. And, they are, by default,
7 also located next to transmission lines, again, to
8 minimize impacts from additional clearing and other
9 things. The one thing that will be noted is that,
10 because they are building a ditch, effectively, through
11 the countryside, there are significant wetland impacts
12 that occur, as well as significant amounts of
13 directional drilling that needs to be done to get
14 across watercourses, *etcetera*. But, effectively, the
15 construction is relatively similar in its scope.

16 MR. QUINLAN: And, just to expand a bit.
17 You know, it's very rare for there to be an interstate
18 natural gas pipeline put in the public way, basically,
19 in the roadway. It's -- you know, there's local
20 distribution lines, small-scale gas lines. But, from a
21 safety perspective, you know, burying a large
22 interstate natural gas pipeline through a residential
23 area in the public highways almost never occurs.

24 If you look at Northern Pass, in

1 contrast, when we worked to strike the balance, and we
2 said "let's develop an underground approach around the
3 White Mountain National Forest", you know, one of the
4 first areas we looked at is "should we build it right
5 through our right-of-way where the existing
6 transmission line is?" And, we quickly concluded that,
7 not only was it cost-prohibitive, but the environmental
8 impacts of us, in essence, blasting our way through the
9 White Mountain National Forest to bury a transmission
10 line defeated the purpose, it would have a very
11 significant environmental impact. That led to our
12 decision to go with underground construction in the
13 public way around the White Mountain National Forest
14 for 52 miles.

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think this is a
16 related topic. There's -- I will -- there are some
17 loaded questions on this sheet for you.

18 MR. QUINLAN: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Just I'll tell you
20 that. "How many people own property abutting Routes
21 116 and 112 where Northern Pass now proposes to install
22 underground lines?"

23 MR. QUINLAN: Sam, do you have that
24 answer readily available?

1 MR. JOHNSON: I can find it.

2 MR. QUINLAN: So, we will do a
3 calculation and figure that out.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The follow-up there
5 is "how many abutters are there along the alternative
6 routes along I-93 through Franconia Notch?" And,
7 then, --

8 MR. QUINLAN: You're right. It's a
9 loaded question.

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah. It gets
11 better. Because the follow-up is, "If you don't know,
12 why don't you know?"

13 But I think your people can figure that
14 out from what -- from the information you have,
15 correct?

16 *[Audience interruption.]*

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Please stop.
18 Please stop. Thank you very much.

19 MR. QUINLAN: So, I'm going to defer the
20 second question to Mr. Bowes, who's been evaluating
21 kind of route alternatives for us.

22 MR. BOWES: I think the essence of the
23 question gets to "why don't we build along the I-93
24 corridor?" I think that's the underlying question that

1 people are trying to get to. And, there's several
2 reasons that make that a nonviable option. The first
3 is public safety; the second is the environmental
4 impacts of building along I-93; the third is the
5 constructability; and the last is, ultimately, the
6 project costs.

7 There's a specific area that was
8 mentioned in that question, that is the Franconia Notch
9 area. And, I'd like Mark to actually address that.
10 He's very knowledgeable about that, and has spent many
11 years of his career working on the Franconia Notch
12 area.

13 MR. QUINLAN: And, Mark, if you could
14 introduce yourself please.

15 MR. HODGDON: Sure. My name is Mark
16 Hodgdon. I'm a private attorney. I spent 24 years in
17 the Attorney General's Office representing DOT. And,
18 for 14 years, I was the Bureau Chief of the
19 Transportation Bureau.

20 Franconia Notch is environmentally,
21 culturally, and legally not an option. It's nonviable.
22 If you think about -- in fact, I would say, without
23 hesitation, Franconia Notch is the most environmentally
24 and culturally sensitive place in this state. And, I

1 would say that, if you think about it, it's a notch, a
2 very confined area. And, in that notch, just off the
3 top of my head, you have Echo Lake, you have Profile
4 Lake, you have Canon Mountain State Park, you have the
5 Old Man historic site. You have several geologic
6 formations, including Boise Rock and The Basin. You
7 have a very fragile stone face up above, as the Old Man
8 would testify, if he was around. And, you have the
9 Pemigewasset headwaters, you have The Flume. In that
10 confined space, you cannot do this level of
11 construction without enormous impacts.

12 And, that I know just from common sense,
13 but I also know it as a matter of law. Because that
14 area, Franconia Notch Parkway, was the result of 20
15 years of litigation, resulting in a federal court
16 consent decree. And, that consent decree, which
17 required, by the way, an Act of Congress to get passed,
18 the Norris Cotton Amendment to the Transportation Bill,
19 that allowed that to be constructed, to have two lanes,
20 one in each direction, which is historically unheard of
21 on the Interstate. And, that's because of the
22 sensitivity of that area.

23 Now, that agreement bars any further
24 construction in the Notch, period. And, to the extent

1 that, even when DOT last did an overlay of pavement
2 there, they weren't allowed to put in temporary
3 pavement for detours.

4 So, doing this level of construction in
5 the Notch is legally just not a viable alternative.
6 But, more so, just as a citizen, I would say,
7 environmentally and culturally, the impacts are just
8 too large.

9 MR. BOWES: Mark's statement, in my
10 mind, makes a very compelling case for not constructing
11 through Franconia Notch.

12 And, that leads us to the other two
13 routes that were mentioned, as well as a couple others.
14 We do have line lists and identified abutters for all
15 of those properties. Sam just does not have them, you
16 know, at his fingertips. We can certainly read those
17 into the record at a later time. But that is a viable
18 option, both technically feasible, and, you know, at
19 this level, of 60 miles of underground, economically
20 viable.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Talk about the
22 significance of the effect on property values to
23 abutters.

24 MR. QUINLAN: Could you introduce

1 yourself please.

2 MR. CHALMERS: Yes. My name is -- my
3 name is Jim Chalmers. My expertise is in the area of
4 real estate and appraisal. And, I've been looking at
5 studying property value effects of projects of all
6 sorts pretty much steadily since the 1970s.

7 I've been working here for the last two
8 and a half years doing research on a broadly focused
9 study, looking simply at the effects of high-voltage
10 transmission lines on property values in New Hampshire.
11 That study is independent of Northern Pass. It's
12 simply a broad-based study, asking the question "what
13 has been the effect of high-voltage transmission lines
14 on the purchase and sale of properties in New
15 Hampshire?"

16 And, that study has four major
17 components. It surveys the professional literature,
18 which is extensive on this topic. But, then, most
19 importantly, it undertakes three New Hampshire-specific
20 studies. The first of those is a set of case studies,
21 this is a study of 58 sales of properties that either
22 abut or are, in fact, crossed by a high-voltage
23 transmission line right-of-way in New Hampshire. Then,
24 there are 13 what we call "subdivision studies", which

1 are studies which look at the sale of lots. And, these
2 would be raw land, unimproved lots in subdivisions,
3 where some of the lots are either crossed by or abut a
4 transmission line easement, and other lots do not.

5 It's quite a -- it's a very revealing environment, in
6 which to see if -- what the effect of the transmission
7 line might be, because it's not confused with the kind
8 of house that's built on the lot.

9 And, then, the fourth initiative is
10 looking at some Multiple Listing Service data on the
11 length of time that properties are on the market,
12 days-on-market is the measure. And, also looking at
13 the ratio of sale prices to list prices for properties
14 at different distances from transmission lines.

15 The results of those studies are
16 basically very consistent. And, the implication for
17 the Northern Pass Project is that, it's my opinion, and
18 the implication of the research, is that there will be
19 no widespread, consistent property value effects of the
20 Project.

21 There's an exception to that. There
22 will be -- the studies have identified a unique set of
23 attributes of a property, essentially what they amount
24 to is properties that are very heavily impacted by a

1 transmission line corridor, where the Project may, in
2 fact, increase the likelihood that those properties
3 will sustain some kind of a value impact.

4 The number of properties that have those
5 attributes, however, is very small on this Project.
6 It's a handful, maybe a dozen properties. And, those
7 are very localized, very property-specific, and will
8 have no discernible effects on local or regional real
9 estate markets.

10 MR. QUINLAN: Thank you, Jim.

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. There's
12 a new topic, which is really about other -- another
13 renewable source, in solar. I'm going to read it
14 largely the way it's written, in three parts here.
15 "Why is New Hampshire not into the solar market the way
16 its neighbors to the south and west are, in
17 Massachusetts and Vermont?" "What are the deterrents
18 or obstacles to solar becoming a more significant part
19 of the mix", in your view? And, this may be a very
20 specific question to the person who's writing it, but
21 "what would it take to become involved in the purchase
22 of solar panels?" You may or may not have useful
23 information to offer on that.

24 MR. QUINLAN: So, on the first topic of,

1 you know, "why hasn't solar grown as quickly in New
2 Hampshire as it has in some other states, like
3 Massachusetts?" You know, and I would say New
4 Hampshire has taken a measured approach to encouraging
5 solar development. There is a subsidy that's provided
6 to solar developers, it's referred to as "net
7 metering", that is really a key to making a solar
8 installation economic. Some states have had a very
9 high adoption, because they, in essence, don't have a
10 limit as to the extent of that subsidy. So,
11 Massachusetts, for example, has seen a proliferation of
12 solar development, because they're allowing that net
13 metering subsidy to be able to a large number of
14 developers.

15 New Hampshire, on the other hand, has
16 taken a bit more measured approach. While we allow net
17 metering, we do provide a subsidy. The Legislature, in
18 its wisdom, several years ago, in essence, put a cap on
19 the net metering subsidy that it was going to allow,
20 while this technology was in its infancy. We are
21 approaching that cap. And, some utilities, like ours,
22 have now just recently hit the cap. So, the growth has
23 been a bit more modest. And, I think it was due to the
24 way the legislation was structured.

1 Now, the real issue becomes, you know,
2 how much of a subsidy do you want to provide to solar?
3 And, are other customers, who don't have solar panels,
4 willing to pick up that subsidy? So, for every dollar
5 of subsidy that's paid out as a result of net metering,
6 either a business or another residential customer, who
7 doesn't have a solar panel, have to pay that. And, the
8 question is, what's the right balance between promoting
9 an exciting technology, one that clearly has part of
10 our energy mix, and the subsidy, how far do you go?

11 And, there are several subsidies
12 available to solar developers. You know, there's a
13 Federal Tax Credit, there's a Renewable Energy Credit.
14 There is funding through New Hampshire's Clean Energy
15 Fund. So, those are three subsidies. There's a
16 fourth, which is the net metering subsidy, is the one
17 that really finalizes the economics and allows it to
18 work.

19 So, I know there is discussion right now
20 within the New Hampshire Legislature to relax that cap,
21 so that this industry continues to grow in a measured,
22 affordable way, without putting too large a burden on
23 other customers. So, you know, I think the subsidy
24 structure in New Hampshire, my own estimation, is about

1 right. It's not inhibiting the growth, it's allowing
2 it to be done in a measured way.

3 You know, I've read recently, in the
4 industry publications, that, from a solar developer's
5 perspective, New Hampshire rates very highly with
6 respect to the things that it's doing to promote solar.
7 I think it was the fourth highest rated state in the
8 Union. And, that seems odd for a state like New
9 Hampshire, you know, as compared to a state that is in
10 a sunnier climate.

11 So, you know, my view is New Hampshire
12 has done it well, I think the Legislature will take a
13 look at that and determine how far they want to go.

14 And, the second question, I'm sorry,
15 Commissioner?

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes. It's really a
17 question about "how one would get into purchasing solar
18 panels?" There are installers all over the state
19 involved in that.

20 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. There are installers
21 and developers statewide who could better answer that.
22 You know, our obligation, as a utility, in essence, is
23 to allow for the interconnection of those installations
24 to our grid. Because, back to the earlier point, there

1 needs to be a reliable backup for instances where the
2 Sun is not shining.

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. The
4 sheet I have in my hand has a question at the bottom,
5 but what is really a comment at the top that I'm going
6 to turn into a question.

7 And, that is that "anyone who's driven
8 in southern Quebec, on the way to Montreal, has seen
9 the transmission lines that are along the road and
10 cross the road in various places. How will the view of
11 the towers in this state compare to what you see along
12 the road to Montreal?"

13 MR. QUINLAN: Yes. So, just an
14 interesting point on this. You know, I talked earlier
15 about Hydro-Quebec, and the fact that, you know, they
16 have a large generation fleet, hydroelectric fleet.
17 One of the things that has to happen for this Project
18 to work is they need to build another transmission
19 line, from northern Quebec down to the U.S. Border, to
20 interconnect with Northern Pass. That's something that
21 Hydro-Quebec is pursuing. They will be paying for it.
22 It will be an all-overhead project, similar to the ones
23 that you've seen.

24 And, I'd say there are significant

1 differences from that project and what we're proposing
2 here in New Hampshire. And, I think the video did a
3 nice job of highlighting some of the things that we are
4 doing to address aesthetic concerns. You know, we've
5 now put 60 percent -- 60 miles underground, and we
6 selected those areas based upon feedback from New
7 Hampshire stakeholders. What are the areas that we
8 heard from consistently, from stakeholders across the
9 state, should we be addressing? So, that's was a --
10 that's a big difference.

11 You know, as I said earlier, we're
12 working now at a design level. We are actually
13 changing the structure designs and using, in many
14 instances, what's referred to as a "monopole"
15 structure, to replace the lattice structures that you
16 would see north of the border. Lattice structures tend
17 to be more imposing. They look like large erector
18 sets. They have four legs, as the video showed. A
19 monopole looks more like a conventional telephone pole.
20 It's a single pole, and it holds all three conductors.
21 There's, obviously, an additional cost in doing that,
22 but it is another step that we're taking in our portion
23 of the line to address New Hampshire concerns.

24 And, then, finally, I'll say, as far as

1 location, you know, the changes we've made to move the
2 line from the western part of Coos County, to the
3 eastern part of Coos County, were driven, in essence,
4 to address the aesthetic issue. So, we're trying to
5 demonstrate a real sensitivity to that question. And,
6 we know it's top-of-mind for many in New Hampshire, and
7 we're working really hard to address it.

8 Ken.

9 MR. BOWES: One addition to that is, is
10 Hydro-Quebec also operates a system that is at 765 kV.
11 They're one of the few utilities in North America that
12 do that. So, that may be part of the -- again, not
13 seeing the structures that the person is speaking to,
14 so that would be a much larger structure because of the
15 higher voltage. In New England, we operate a system
16 that's predominantly at 345 kV, so, approximately half
17 the voltage. That does not mean it's half the height.
18 But it is a considerably lower height than the 765
19 system.

20 MR. QUINLAN: So, back to Mr. Bowes'
21 earlier answer. The National Electric Safety Code
22 dictates the height of the tower, one of the key
23 drivers of that is the voltage of the line. The higher
24 the voltage, the taller the structure.

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The second question
2 on this sheet, I'm going to read as close to the way
3 it's written as I can, and you may need to do some
4 interpretation.

5 "Why does Eversource not consider a
6 lower voltage line to match the current footprint of
7 electrical transmission in New Hampshire? And, what
8 voltage line would match the current footprint in terms
9 of tower height?

10 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. I'm going to defer
11 that to Mr. Bowes.

12 MR. BOWES: So, the existing
13 Hydro-Quebec line is 450 kV DC. So, one of the design
14 parameters we looked at was exactly that. So, as part
15 of the evaluation process, we did select a lower
16 voltage, in this case, 320 kV DC, to do just that, to
17 make the structures lower and more compact than the
18 initial HVDC line through New Hampshire. This is also,
19 in comparison, approximately the same as the existing
20 the 345 kV AC system that is used throughout New
21 England. So, a couple design considerations were done.

22 Now, the existing right-of-way that
23 we're talking about, much of the part of the North
24 Country is at 115 kV AC. That is considerably lower

1 voltage than the 320 kV DC. And, the real issue we
2 went to the higher voltage for the DC line is the
3 amount of capacity needed, the amount of transport for
4 over a thousand megawatts. That is not capable on a
5 115 kV line, which would then have the same structure,
6 dimensions, and heighth.

7 MR. QUINLAN: Right. And, importantly,
8 once we've gotten to Franklin, and we converted to 345
9 kV AC, that's a consistent voltage throughout New
10 England. The bulk transmission system that controls
11 power flows, long-distance power flows, large capacity
12 around New England generally is 345. So, it is a
13 consistent voltage, once you've gotten to Franklin.

14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We have a couple of
15 questions related to reliability. But, before I do
16 that, I'm going to circle back to a question that was
17 on -- there were two questions on one sheet, and they
18 were unrelated. And, this question is really directed
19 to the Subcommittee.

20 And, the question is "Why doesn't the
21 Subcommittee have any questions?"

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: There are probably
23 different answers for different people. I'll give
24 mine, and I'll ask some of the other members of the

1 Subcommittee to weigh in.

2 There are a few reasons. One is that we
3 received the full Application from the Applicant. And,
4 I've forgotten the exact number of binders, but I think
5 it might be 17 binders constitutes one application, and
6 we get on a thumb drive, and we have the opportunity to
7 read it at our leisure. I cannot tell you, I certainly
8 would not represent that I have even read half of
9 what's been given to me. But I've looked at a lot of
10 this. And, I've looked to see what's there. I've
11 looked to see what is the thing -- are the things I'm
12 going to need to concentrate on. So, we've had the
13 opportunity to look at this Application for many months
14 now.

15 Second, this isn't the only time we have
16 the Applicant and others in front of us. We will see
17 them again four more times through hearings like this.
18 But, more significant, they're going to have to come in
19 front of us at a hearing on the merits of their
20 Application. And, they're going to have to make
21 detailed presentations and be subjected to questions
22 from others who are participating in this matter. They
23 will answer questions from us at that time on the
24 record. Their witnesses will be under oath. So, we

1 have many opportunities to interact with the Applicant
2 throughout this process.

3 That's -- those are probably the two
4 major reasons why I prefer to step back at events like
5 this and allow the public's questions to spend -- to
6 have the feature role in an event like this.

7 Others want to weigh in? Please?

8 *[Laughter.]*

9 MR. WAY: I mean, I think I'd echo that.
10 I mean, part of the reason for being here is we
11 obviously want to hear from the Applicant, we want to
12 hear from the public. And, we've been looking at this
13 for quite a long time, and we're seeing a voluminous
14 amount of documents.

15 Questions are forming even as -- through
16 the presentation that we've had tonight. And, I might
17 very well end up having some more questions, if they're
18 not answered. But, I think, primarily, we want to hear
19 from everyone in the room.

20 MS. WEATHERSBY: I would echo that. I
21 look at this primarily as a listening session. I'm
22 here to learn more about the Project, but mostly to
23 hear about your concerns. And, from that, I develop my
24 own list of questions. I have a number of them that I

1 may ask tonight, or they may get answered as we go
2 along. And, if they're not answered tonight, they
3 certainly will be answered at the time we have the full
4 hearings.

5 So, just because I have no questions at
6 the beginning of the process here tonight, doesn't mean
7 that we won't have a lot of questions for the
8 Applicant.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. The
10 next two questions or the next two sheets have a number
11 of questions that are related to reliability on both
12 sides of the border.

13 Starting on our side of the border,
14 there's a question about "what kind of redundancy of
15 the transmission lines will be in place, should there
16 be something that happens along the line in New
17 Hampshire?"

18 And, I guess I would add to that, what
19 kinds of protections are in place to prevent problems
20 or damage to the line here in New Hampshire?

21 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. I'd defer that to
22 Mr. Bowes.

23 MR. BOWES: So, this Application is for
24 a single line. So, it is -- there's a single point of

1 failure along that line. So, there is not, by itself,
2 redundancy built in. But, in the design itself, there
3 are many things that are taken into consideration,
4 including, you know, impacts from external factors,
5 such as trees off the right-of-way and within the
6 right-of-way, so that that will be managed over the
7 life of the Project. The design itself is to a higher
8 class of construction than normally. It's called
9 "Class B construction", which means that it is built to
10 withstand more extreme conditions, as we are starting
11 to experience more and more as the climate changes.
12 So, both wind and ice loading are at a higher level
13 than the traditional construction techniques.

14 For the portions that are underground,
15 there will be a protective cap for portions of it, in
16 the public way. So, a concrete-encased, as well as it
17 will be clearly identified on street maps, so the
18 chance of an external excavator hitting the underground
19 line, it will be clearly marked, both on the call or
20 DigSafe maps, as well as with markers laid into the
21 trench area itself.

22 So, those are some of the things that
23 are done to enhance the design and operation of the
24 line to make it the most reliable that it can be.

1 MR. QUINLAN: Mr. Muntz.

2 MR. MUNTZ: Yes. I would also add, as
3 part of the design of any project like this, you need
4 to submit an application to the Independent System
5 Operator, and the project needs to be evaluated for its
6 impact on the system, and other generators and other
7 transmission elements in the system, under all types of
8 system conditions, various loads, weather patterns and
9 so forth. You are evaluated and issued a certificate
10 that says "You're allowed to build this project. It
11 will do no harm to the system." And, oftentimes,
12 that -- what's called an "I-39 Evaluation", specifies
13 some other system upgrades that you need to do.
14 Those -- basically, we've gotten through that process
15 with the ISO. We're waiting for the official review.
16 We've identified those upgrades, and those are included
17 in the Application. And, we would intend to build them
18 as part of the Project.

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Reliability north
20 of the border is the subject of this sheet. The sheet
21 says, and I guess I'll ask you to comment on the first
22 part before following up with the question, it says
23 here that "When Northern Pass was introduced, there was
24 a chart on either the Northern Pass or the Hydro-Quebec

1 website that showed that Hydro-Quebec might not be able
2 to guarantee electricity during the three winter
3 months." This says that "that chart has disappeared
4 from the website." Is that -- can you comment on that
5 or verify that at all?

6 MR. QUINLAN: I can. So, I earlier
7 referred to the "three-state RFP", and I talked about
8 Hydro-Quebec's delivery commitment. One of the things
9 that they have committed to is to deliver six terawatt
10 hours of electricity, which is a lot of electricity, to
11 New England, into Deerfield, New Hampshire, during the
12 winter months and during the hours that New England
13 needs it most. So, that is their formal commitment
14 now. And, if we are selected to -- under that request
15 for proposal, that will be a binding commitment on
16 Hydro-Quebec to, in essence, address the issue. And,
17 they will be commercially and contractually obligated
18 to deliver the power when we need it most, which is
19 during those critical on-peak hours during the winter
20 months.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think then you
22 may have answered the question as it followed up on the
23 premise, which is that "if there is extremely high
24 demand due to extreme weather in Quebec, will there be

1 a problem with their transmission of the full 1,090
2 commitment?"

3 MR. QUINLAN: There is no exception to
4 the delivery commitment that they're making. So, it
5 exists irrespective of what system conditions are in
6 Canada. And, if you look at the history of
7 Hydro-Quebec, and the deliveries that they have made in
8 New England, they have been delivering large amounts of
9 power to this region for decades. When they have a
10 formal delivery obligation under a contract, they very,
11 very rarely are in a position where they can't meet
12 that obligation. Almost universally, they have been in
13 position to deliver even during the coldest winters and
14 the highest demand times in Quebec.

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. The
16 last question that I have in all these sheets relates
17 to your right to use land you do not own. I'm going to
18 read it as it's written, and you answer however you
19 feel is appropriate.

20 MR. QUINLAN: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: "How is it legal to
22 drill under land that you do not own or have a
23 right-of-way across?" And, there's a reference to the
24 "Washburn Family Trust in Pittsburg and Clarksville".

1 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So, that's a
2 particular area in northern Coos County, where we've
3 made a commitment to, in essence, have underground
4 construction under the public right-of-way. We think
5 we, as a utility, are entitled to use the public way
6 for that purpose. Our belief is based upon centuries,
7 over 100 years of legal precedent here in the State of
8 New Hampshire, standing for the premise that running
9 utilities, such as this, to transmit electricity is an
10 appropriate use of the public way.

11 There is a currently pending lawsuit on
12 this very issue. We have -- we're in the process of
13 seeking the court's resolution of that. We feel very
14 strongly about the legal basis for our ability to do
15 so. And, hopefully, the court's going to address that
16 expeditiously.

17 But it's really a right that is granted
18 to utilities. And, it's based on decades of
19 precedent.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I have
21 no other green sheets. Is there a question that
22 someone thinks they submitted that I didn't, at least
23 in some way, deal with?

24 *[No verbal response]*

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. The
2 next phase of this proceeding is an opportunity for you
3 all to speak. I'm told we have 15 of these yellow
4 sheets, which means we won't have to impose draconian
5 limits.

6 But, before we get started with that, I
7 think it would appropriate to take about a ten-minute
8 break, to give people a chance to stretch their legs
9 and use the facilities. So, we're going to go off the
10 record and come back in ten minutes.

11 *[Recess taken at 6:25 p.m. and the*
12 *public hearing reconvened at 6:39 p.m.]*

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. We're
14 going to pick up again. Before I call the first member
15 of the public, there was one green sheet that got
16 handed in just as we were ending. And rather than me
17 trying to interpret what was written, I've given it to
18 Mr. Quinlan. I'm going to allow him to do his best to
19 interpret the question and provide some perspective on
20 the topic.

21 MR. QUINLAN: Okay. So there were two
22 questions. The first is: "If Hydro-Quebec owns the
23 line, who is paying for it?"

24 So let me just clarify what I said

1 earlier. There's a Canadian portion of the line that
2 will be built by and owned by Hydro-Quebec. That
3 essentially would get the power to the United States
4 border. We, Northern Pass and Eversource, will build
5 the line in the U.S., and we will own the line in the
6 U.S. In essence, what Hydro-Quebec will do is pay us
7 for use of the line. It, in essence, gives them a
8 transmission path to deliver their electricity to
9 Deerfield, New Hampshire. So if I wasn't clear about
10 the ownership, the U.S. portion will be owned by our
11 company, and Hydro-Quebec will, in essence, pay for it
12 through use, okay.

13 Second question: "Hydro-Quebec is owned
14 by Quebec. What difference do our laws make?"

15 So, it's true that Hydro-Quebec is, in
16 essence, a crown corporation; so they're owned by the
17 Canadian Government. But for purposes of siting the
18 Northern Pass line in the U.S., it's entirely governed
19 by U.S. law. Here at the state level, it's the law
20 that gives jurisdiction to the Site Evaluation
21 Committee for the New Hampshire siting. There's also a
22 federal permit that we have to seek and receive. The
23 lead agency there is the Department of Energy, and
24 that's under U.S. Federal law. And then, even the

1 contractual agreement between Hydro-Quebec and Northern
2 Pass, whereby they pay for the line, is governed by
3 U.S. law. That's governed by the Federal Energy
4 Regulatory Commission. So, for all U.S. aspects, the
5 siting of the line, the use of the line, the
6 reimbursement of costs, that's all governed by U.S.
7 laws jurisdictional to the United States.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Thank
9 you very much. We're going to start the public
10 comment. We're going to ask people to limit their
11 comments to four minutes, and we will be timing up
12 here. If you have more to say, after everyone else is
13 done we will circle back to those who say that they
14 needed more time, but we're going to ask people to
15 limit themselves to four minutes. I'm going to largely
16 call people in the order in which they signed in, with
17 one exception. We do have a local elected official.
18 We're going to start with her.

19 When you come up to speak, there's a
20 couple of ground rules that will really be helpful for
21 us and for the stenographers. First, if you could
22 spell your last name, your first and last name if
23 there's some ambiguity about your first name. If you
24 have something written that you're going to be reading

1 from, two things about that: The first is read slowly
2 and evenly, or the stenographers, either their machine
3 or their hands will blow up. And if you could give a
4 copy to the stenographers, they will rely on that to
5 make sure that they've got your comments correctly
6 recorded. Does everyone understand that? Good.

7 All right. So we're going to start with
8 Pam Vose. And after Ms. Vose, we'll call Paul Hausmann
9 and then Ralph Kirshner. So those are our first three.
10 So, Ms. Vose.

11 MS. VOSE: First of all, bear with me
12 because I'm very nervous. I'm here tonight to read a
13 statement from the New Hampton Board of Selectmen --

14 (Court Reporter interrupts.)

15 MS. VOSE: I'm sorry. It's V-O-S-E.
16 Our town is the only town in Belknap County where this
17 project will be located.

18 Albert Einstein famously defined
19 insanity as "doing the same thing over and over again
20 and expecting different results."

21 Since October 2010, when the Northern
22 Pass Project was first revealed to the public, the
23 people of New Hampshire have repeatedly rejected the
24 overhead option for the Northern Pass transmission

1 line. They have shown up at hearings. They have
2 called and written letters and e-mails to their
3 representatives at the state and federal level. They
4 have filed their opinion with both the Department of
5 Energy and now the state Site Evaluation Committee.
6 They have participated in the process with an
7 unwavering message. As currently proposed, the
8 Northern Pass demands too high a price from the people
9 and the communities being asked to host the line. They
10 have also offered a reasonable compromise since day one
11 of this journey. If the project is to be sited in New
12 Hampshire, then it should be buried in its entirety,
13 that disruption, convenience or financial burden be
14 borne by the Applicant for this participant-funded
15 merchant project. The Committee has the opportunity to
16 solve what may appear to be an intractable problem by
17 requiring the Project to be burden in its entirety. By
18 imposing this solution on the Applicant, the Committee
19 will, amongst many other benefits, protect the scenic
20 landscape that is the backbone of our tourist economy
21 and the property values of properties adjacent to the
22 transmission line, while allowing for the short-term
23 and permanent job creation and tax revenue for the
24 local taxing jurisdictions, promised by the Project's

1 sponsors.

2 So our question to you is: After five
3 years, who is insane? The Applicant who refuses to
4 amend their application to a full burial option,
5 despite the constant and consistent voice of the people
6 of New Hampshire, or we, the people, for believing that
7 our elected representatives and the bodies they create
8 will represent the well-documented, constant and
9 consistent participation of the people of New
10 Hampshire? Bury the lines. Regards, Neil G. Irvine,
11 Nathaniel H. Sawyer, Jr., Kenneth A. Mertz, Board of
12 Selectmen in the Town of New Hampton. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you, Ms.
14 Vose. If you could give your written comments to the
15 stenographers.

16 So the next speaker is Paul Hausmann,
17 and he will be followed by Ralph Kirshner and Michael
18 Stanek.

19 MR. HAUSMANN: Hausmann is spelled
20 H-A-U-S-M-A-N-N. I've worked for Eversource for 14
21 years as an account executive. And during that time
22 I've worked with the largest accounts in mostly the
23 western side of the state up to the Laconia, down to
24 Hinsdale, Newport, Claremont, Peterborough. So that's

1 my territory where I work with the large accounts. And
2 what I do is I consult on energy-efficiency projects.
3 I respond to power quality issues, assist in
4 construction, give advice, and many, many other topics.
5 But I can honestly say that with all these accounts,
6 the No. 1 concern that surfaces is the high cost of
7 energy, also, the need for stable energy prices,
8 because of what we've seen with volatile prices in the
9 last couple years. For these large accounts,
10 electricity is a big part of their budget, including --
11 let's talk about one account -- well, I have three ski
12 areas. And during the winter, during the volatile
13 prices, their energy costs go up to easily \$200,000 a
14 month. I work with other accounts that annually
15 they're \$3 million a year. In New Hampshire, I know
16 the electric rates in the industrial sector are nearly
17 double the national average. Commercial business
18 electric rates are 40 percent higher. These are
19 critical issues for the future well-being of our
20 state's business and industry.

21 Another interesting thing I've seen more
22 and more is the accounts I deal with are more
23 interested in Green Power. Becoming "green" has moved
24 into the forefront of business and industries, and it's

1 increasing much more every year.

2 It's for these reasons that I support
3 the Northern Pass. I believe it can help reduce energy
4 prices for the state businesses and industries that I
5 serve every day, keeping them in business, from
6 relocating elsewhere, and at the same time introducing
7 more Green Power. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. The
9 next speaker is Ralph Kirshner, to be followed by
10 Michael Stanek and Marc Brown.

11 MR. KIRSHNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12 I'm Ralph Kirshner, K-I-R-S-H-N-E-R, from New Hampton.
13 I've spent 10 years as the chairman of the New Hampton
14 Conservation Commission, until 2014, and I was on the
15 boards of several environmental organizations in the
16 state. Due to some annoying health issues, I am no
17 longer on any of them, so I can take my own position,
18 which contradicts a lot of them, including the New
19 Hampton Selectmen.

20 To me, the aesthetics of the line,
21 whether it's buried or not, are relatively unimportant.
22 The environment is more than scenery. R.S.A. 162 says
23 that this Committee is supposed to consider all
24 environmental, economical and technical issues in an

1 integrated fashion. That means you have to look at
2 more than just the transmission line. You have to look
3 at both ends of it. This is a two-headed viper. You
4 don't just look at the body of the snake. You look at
5 the whole snake and see what's going on at both ends.

6 This line amounts to murder for profit
7 at both ends. Let's not fool ourselves. They're not
8 building this for the sake of the consumer. They're
9 building it for profit. And it's renewable energy, but
10 it's not clean energy. If the Canadian Hydro-Quebec
11 has flooded a watershed bigger than New England, the
12 rotting vegetation is creating all kinds of methane
13 releases that are contributing to climate change.
14 According to Hydro-Quebec's own statements that are
15 available online, mercury is being released into the
16 environment from Rupert Dam that will be in the
17 ecosystem for the next 30 years, approximately, and is
18 further magnified up the food chain.

19 Now, I've spent weeks and hundreds of
20 miles canoeing in the James Bay Lowlands. I know the
21 area. It's an unforgiving environment. The Crees who
22 live there have little choice. They don't have
23 supermarkets. They live off the land. Their food
24 comes from the land. And mercury has insidious effects

1 on the brains particularly of children. And one small
2 mistake in the winter, they have no choice. We're
3 playing Hunger Games with their kids in order to
4 generate the power that's coming down from
5 Hydro-Quebec.

6 I testified before this Committee
7 decades ago for the existing Hydro-Quebec interconnect,
8 and we have the same problem with Northern Pass that we
9 had then. This is a two-way line. What Northern Pass
10 doesn't include in any of their propaganda is the fact
11 that we have to ship back as much power to Quebec as
12 they are shipping south. Quebec's power peaks in the
13 winter when they use it for home heating, and it costs
14 their consumers about a third of what we pay for
15 electricity in New Hampshire. We peak in the summer.
16 Good deal for both utilities, not such good a deal for
17 the environment. You won't find that in any of
18 Northern Pass's propaganda. It's buried on Page 26 of
19 a 172-page annual report for Northern Utilities --
20 excuse me -- yeah, Northeast Utilities in 2009, where
21 they call it a hydro -- they don't even call it
22 Northern Pass. But it's clearly that project because
23 there is only one interconnect. At the end of the line
24 we have to produce that power from fossil fuels and

1 nuclear power. We don't have enough renewables to
2 produce that amount. So we are polluting just as much
3 or more for the supposedly clean power that we're
4 importing. The ISO says this power is not necessary.
5 It's unreliable. We saw what happened in the 1998 ice
6 storm. And essentially, if we approve this kind of
7 project rather than going to the kind of clean power
8 that is truly available, we are telling our kids and
9 Canada's kids in the future, well, sorry, but may the
10 odds be always in your favor. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next speaker is
12 Michael Stanek, followed by Marc Brown and Kenneth
13 Kimball.

14 MR. STANEK: How you all doing? I
15 wanted to provide a little bit more of a positive tone
16 here.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Stanek, please
18 spell your last name.

19 MR. STANEK: S-T-A-N-E-K.

20 I want to take the chance to go on
21 record here with my overwhelming support for this
22 project. And at the top of my list of many positive
23 attributes associated with this project is linking the
24 Northeast with an abundant supply of clean, renewable

1 energy created by water. In my opinion, this is a
2 monumental step not only for New Hampshire but for New
3 England to continue to cut ties with dangerous,
4 inefficient energy production models like Vermont
5 Yankee and other antiquated fossil fuel plants. I feel
6 this is an opportunity to continue, enhance and add to
7 a network of right-of-way systems that foster and
8 support biodiversity in the state. We live in one of
9 the most forested states in the United States, to the
10 tune of 89 percent tree cover, that a century ago this
11 state was thriving with farms, fields and brush land.
12 The right-of-way now offers a last refuge for a rich
13 array of plant, animal and reptilian life. Amongst
14 them are rare species sometimes not found anywhere else
15 but the right-of-way, like the New England cottontail,
16 Karner blue butterfly, frosted elfin butterflies, brown
17 thrashers, yellow-breasted chats, Blanding, box and
18 wood turtles.

19 In terms of jobs, this will not just
20 create jobs with linemen and construction personnel.
21 Eversource will be working in conjunction with many
22 organizations, Fish and Game, to support these
23 relationships with animals that call the right-of-way
24 home.

1 In my opinion, this is an opportunity
2 not only for the state but for the region to say yes to
3 renewable energy, to move progressively away again from
4 the dependence on foreign subsidiaries, inefficient and
5 inevitably dangerous methods of energy production.
6 This is also an opportunity for this region to grow,
7 for the towns to grow, for business to grow and for
8 families to grow. Ultimately, this will lay the
9 groundwork for our children and their children's
10 children to appreciate a new dependence on renewable
11 energy. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. The
13 next speaker is Marc Brown, to be followed by Kenneth
14 Kimball and Tiler Eaton.

15 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Marc Brown.
16 M-A-R-C, B-R-O-W-N. My name is Marc Brown. I'm the
17 executive director of the New England Ratepayers
18 Association, a non-profit, social welfare organization
19 which advocates for policies that lower the cost of
20 electricity to families and businesses in New Hampshire
21 and throughout New England. The high cost of
22 electricity to New Hampshire --

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Slow down a little.

24 MR. BROWN: Okay. Trying to make the

1 time limit here.

2 The high cost of electricity to New
3 Hampshire's families and businesses has been well
4 documented. We have the fifth highest electricity
5 costs in the United States. The recent and potential
6 retirement of 8,000 megawatts of coal, nuclear and
7 oil-fired electricity generation, has left New England
8 short of baseload power options and over-reliant on
9 natural gas-fired generation, with half of our annual
10 electricity produced by natural gas plants. This
11 over-reliance is exacerbated by the fact that New
12 England has insufficient pipeline capacity to meet the
13 demand of natural gas generators, especially in cold
14 winter months. With an electricity market that hasn't
15 induced any natural gas generators to subscribe to firm
16 capacity from any of the proposed pipeline projects,
17 and the fact that natural gas generation sets the
18 wholesale market rate 80 percent of the time, electric
19 ratepayers are increasingly held hostage to the
20 volatility of natural gas markets. Yes, it is true
21 that wholesale electricity prices have softened over
22 the past twelve months. The policymakers should not be
23 lured into a false sense of security. New England
24 experienced a similar softening of wholesale prices in

1 2012, which was then followed by 55 percent and
2 13 percent increases in wholesale electricity prices
3 the following two years, sending shock waves to the
4 budgets of both businesses and households. These high
5 and volatile energy prices are crimping our economy and
6 putting future job growth at significant risk.

7 Our organization has been very clear in
8 its position that public policy decisions made over the
9 last 10 to 20 years have made it a veritable certainty
10 that New England will not be building new nuclear, coal
11 and oil-fired generating plants, which have
12 historically provided the region with the bulk of its
13 baseload generation. We have also warned that
14 continued subsidization of expensive, intermittent and
15 non-dispatchable renewables would lead to retirements
16 of valuable, price-taking power plants as we have seen
17 in the recent retirement of Vermont Yankee, the
18 soon-to-be retired Pilgrim nuclear power plant in
19 Plymouth, Mass., and the 1500-megawatt Brayton Point
20 generation plant in southeastern Massachusetts. With
21 one quarter of the region's capacity retiring or
22 expected to retire by the end of the decade, new,
23 reliable baseload power will be vital to provide
24 stability to the New England power grid. Policymaker

1 decisions have seen to it that natural gas and
2 large-scale hydroelectricity are the only remaining
3 options to provide substantial baseload power to the
4 region.

5 It's extremely difficult to accurately
6 calculate the savings that a project like Northern Pass
7 will provide ratepayers. However, Northern Pass will
8 no doubt compensate for some of the scheduled
9 retirements and will provide ratepayers some relief,
10 especially in the capacity markets. New England's
11 ratepayers will pay an additional \$1.5 billion in
12 capacity payments to electricity generators in
13 2016-2017. Moreover, as a result of the most recent
14 capacity auction for 2019-2020, electric ratepayers
15 won't be seeing relief from those numbers anytime soon.
16 New Hampshire's ratepayers, who represent 10 percent of
17 the New England load, will pay an additional
18 \$150 million in capacity just for next year. Those
19 numbers will be even higher in 2018. Keep in mind that
20 these increases have yet to be reflected in our current
21 electricity bills, bills that are already among the
22 highest in the nation.

23 Northern Pass is far from perfect, and
24 its merits and flaws are certainly open to debate.

1 What isn't debatable is the fact that New England's
2 electricity grid is seeing its baseload power options
3 decrease while its electricity rates experience extreme
4 price volatility as a result of our over-reliance on
5 natural gas for electricity generation. A perfect
6 solution to our region's energy woes that will please
7 everyone does not exist. Can a state that has seen
8 35 percent of its manufacturing jobs, and a region
9 which has lost half a million manufacturing jobs in the
10 past 25 years, really afford to make the perfect
11 project the enemy of this very good project? That's
12 it.

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You really did need
14 to go just that fast.

15 MR. BROWN: I tried, I tried.

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next speaker is
17 Kenneth Kimball, to be followed by Tiler Eaton, and
18 then a name I was looking forward to trying to
19 pronounce, Manfred Hoerltoerfer.

20 MR. KIMBALL: My name is Kenneth
21 Kimball. And having just learned that I have four
22 minutes, I've tried to reduce my testimony here to much
23 shorter. So if I trip up here a few minutes, that's
24 the reason.

1 I'm here to represent Appalachian
2 Mountain Club, which is one of the oldest conservation
3 and recreational organizations in the United States,
4 has 100,000 members, with 12,000 who live here in the
5 state.

6 In our 140-year history, AMC has helped
7 to protect the region's open spaces, including from
8 poorly sited energy projects and proposals like
9 Northern Pass that request to use high-impact, old
10 technologies to maximize profits at the expense of New
11 Hampshire's iconic landscape. Yes, parts of this
12 project are proposed to be buried and parts of it are
13 to go into existing right-of-ways, but we would note
14 that when it goes into existing right-of-ways, all of
15 the transmission structures in those right-of-ways
16 today are at tree height or less. These proposed
17 transmission towers are two to three times the height
18 as to what's there currently, which makes a marked
19 difference.

20 There's also numerous competing projects
21 already bid into the New England Clean Energy RFP that
22 was mentioned earlier, as well as Northern Pass. One
23 of these competing bids in this three-state PPA even
24 includes Hydro-Quebec Power, and that bid has full

1 burial using 21st century technology, like two other
2 projects recently permitted in New York and Vermont.
3 Full burial technology is affordable, available, being
4 applied elsewhere in the region, is must less
5 threatened by solar flares, such as the 1988 ice storms
6 and in 1998, or the terrorist bombings of Hydro-Quebec
7 towers in 2004, which brought Hydro-Quebec's overland
8 thousand-mile umbilical power cord to its knees.

9 The choice before the SEC is far from
10 Northern Pass or nothing. It is whether you will
11 accept yesterday's technologies at the expense of New
12 Hampshire's landscape, knowing that other competitors
13 are using full burial. Northern Pass to date has
14 worked diligently to get to "no" on full burial to
15 protect the expected large profit margins. These
16 out-of-state shareholder profits are short term
17 relative to the long-term value of New Hampshire's
18 landscape. And Northern Pass in its waiver request on
19 Friday on decommissioning even argues that these towers
20 may never go away. AMC will have additional comments
21 as these proceedings move forward, but we do have some
22 serious procedural concerns, and I want to go through
23 those quickly.

24 First, these hearings we believe are

1 premature. The Applicant hurried up and tried to
2 submit its revised, required application on Friday.
3 Some of those files you cannot even still open on the
4 SEC web site today, which talks about fair process; and
5 yet, here tonight we're supposed to talk about these
6 things intelligently. Northern Pass will surely claim
7 that materials were submitted before the start of these
8 hearings, whose legal purpose is to receive comments
9 from the public on a complete application. Am I and
10 many others in this room tonight, with less than 24
11 hours to review the materials, supposed to
12 substantively comment on them? The SEC has not even
13 yet determined whether the Application materials
14 submitted on Friday are complete. It would be polite
15 to call this a travesty. Paralleling this, Northern
16 Pass's lawyer -- I would note a former PUC commissioner
17 and SEC member, no less -- filed for partial waivers of
18 some of the new requirements imposed by the new rules.
19 AMC will request that the SEC hold another series of
20 public meetings once those materials are truly complete
21 and available to the public. We will also ask that you
22 restart the time line for the review process to catch
23 up with these materials. We also question whether the
24 Applicant's request for waivers of the new SEC rules

1 are fair. They had plenty of time to prepare, and they
2 spent most of that time engaged in trying to fight the
3 new rules as they were being developed.

4 Third, the SEC is moving forward without
5 evidence that the Applicant has full site control. As
6 previously mentioned this evening, their court case is
7 about whether they do or do not. The Applicant's
8 request to the New Hampshire PUC for status as a public
9 utility and the rights that accrue with that status,
10 including powers of eminent domain, speak volumes about
11 the Applicant's unease as to whether it truly has full
12 control of the right-of-way.

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kimball, how
14 much more do you have?

15 MR. KIMBALL: I should be two minutes at
16 max.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm going to make a
18 suggestion that you do one of two things: Either
19 circle back at the end to finish your remarks or submit
20 them in writing.

21 MR. KIMBALL: How much time do I have
22 left?

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Zero.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He can have my time

1 that I had for making a comment.

2 MR. KIMBALL: I mean, in all fairness,
3 we learned here that we only had four minutes. If I'd
4 have known that, I would have prepared --

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No, you have as
6 much time as you want if you want to circle back after
7 everyone else has had their four minutes.

8 MR. KIMBALL: Okay. I will close at
9 that point.

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, we'll circle
11 back to you when everybody else has had a chance.

12 So the next speaker is Tiler Eaton, to
13 be followed by Manfred Hoertdoerfer and Suzanne Steele.

14 MR. EATON: Good evening. My name's
15 Tiler Eaton. I'm from Nottingham, New Hampshire. I'm
16 a journeyman lineman, and I am here in full support of
17 Northern Pass as the way it is laid out right now. I
18 believe Eversource has compromised greatly with the
19 amount of underground, and I think, as you heard Mr.
20 Quinlan say earlier, this amount of underground will be
21 the longest stretch of this type in the country. So I
22 believe we need this. We need to bring jobs to New
23 Hampshire, and we especially need to bring jobs to the
24 North Country. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Next speaker is
2 Manfred Hoertdoerfer, followed by Suzanne Steele and
3 Jennifer Tuthill. And yes, you are going to have to
4 spell your name.

5 MR. HOERTDOERFER: Thank you. You done
6 it pretty well with my name. Manfred Hoertdoerfer from
7 New Hampton. It's spelled H-O-E-R --
8 E-R-T-D-O-E-R-F-E-R. I am engineer by professional
9 background. And instead of getting to a lot of these
10 kind of large statements of propaganda, from my own
11 training I like to get into the details and just make
12 some comments on some particular issues.

13 Was a lot of talk about all the jobs
14 that are going to be created here that confronted me at
15 the last meeting in Laconia. And I thought, well, I
16 wonder how that really works for all the local people,
17 that they're promised all these jobs, and how did they
18 come up with a number of 2600 in the first place, which
19 seems to be pretty large.

20 Now, knowing a little bit about
21 construction, being an engineer, civil engineer, I
22 would always anticipate that this is a very special
23 project. It's huge. It has significant structures and
24 facilities. It requires special equipment and

1 specially trained people to make all these
2 installations. The way I see it, no such missionary
3 here in this state and not the trained people. So most
4 of that work will be done by companies from somewhere
5 out west, wherever these big companies are that do that
6 work. And they bring their trained people with them.
7 So how many jobs are really left, except for a few
8 laborers and a few truck drivers here at the end? And
9 then, low and behold, as part -- and I give the
10 Commission credit in the revised requirements for the
11 submission because that's what I looked at first and
12 said, well, they're supposed to tell you who their
13 contractors are and suppliers, and it was not submitted
14 in the original submittal. It's not in the
15 supplemental that was submitted on the 26th. And the
16 companies come: Quanta Services from Houston, Texas;
17 Par Electric from Kansas City; Longfellow Drilling from
18 Iowa; M.J. Electric from Michigan; Underground
19 Construction from California; Crux Surface, Inc. from
20 Spokane, Washington. Does that tell you something? It
21 tells me happening here. It's also primarily, and I
22 say this for that reason, a reflection of the big
23 statements that get made by Northern Pass here all the
24 time, general statements with nothing behind it. This

1 is their story. It's propaganda. And I say the same
2 goes for some studies that are mentioned for effect on
3 our business of -- and the White Mountains. They just
4 say it is so. Or on the real estate, just the fact
5 that loss -- no loss in value, only increases they
6 could find in a so-called study. Well, bullshit, right.
7 But that's fine.

8 What I resent is -- and I hope you are
9 smart enough as the Commission to see that as strictly
10 propaganda. And unless they have provided documents
11 that show that, and they're here for us the public to
12 scrutinize, they should be discarded. So half the
13 propaganda even on their display should be discarded.
14 And --

15 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How much more do
16 you have?

17 MR. HOERTDOERFER: I have my -- my major
18 point I actually was going to get to. I got
19 sidetracked here.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So why don't we
21 circle back to you after Mr. Kimball --

22 MR. HOERTDOERFER: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- because there
24 are a number of other people who want to speak, and I

1 don't want to make people sit and wait their turn.

2 So the next speaker is Suzanne Steele,
3 followed by Jennifer Tuthill and Brendan Finn.

4 MS. STEELE: Suzanne Steele.

5 S-U-Z-A-N-N-E, S-T-E-E-L-E.

6 I want the Commission to first know that
7 I am, first, open and supportive of change. And in
8 fact, this building where we're in is Church Landing.
9 This is where I went to church and where I got married.
10 So when things are good for the public, it's a great
11 thing. But I am not in support of Northern Pass. I
12 grew up in this town of Meredith, graduated from
13 Inter-Lakes, and I've now lived in Deerfield for the
14 last 23 years.

15 Some of the reasons I am not in favor of
16 this project: First of all, New Hampshire is known for
17 its natural beauty of countryside, lakes and mountains.
18 And this beauty is an integral part for generating
19 hundreds of thousands of dollars in our economy through
20 tourism. This tourism provides a living for the
21 population in our state as well. This project, if it
22 goes through, would forever scar our great state,
23 potentially impacting that revenue. Hundreds of miles
24 of our Granite State would be permanently altered, thus

1 changing the many vistas that are currently free from a
2 hundred-plus foot towers.

3 I am also a wellness consultant and
4 concerned with the health impacts of Northern Pass.
5 Although we're not abutters to the proposed path, I am
6 concerned for the families who are and who would be
7 constantly exposed to the dramatic increase of
8 electromagnetic pollution from these proposed lines.
9 Burying the line seems to be a better option, however,
10 according to Eversource, not feasible due to the cost.
11 Another health concern I have is the potential
12 long-term negative impacts from these buried lines to
13 the surrounding land, human and animal life.

14 I moved to Deerfield in '93 because of
15 the beauty of its area, as well as history of our town.
16 Coincidentally, we are celebrating our 250th
17 anniversary this year, a community steeped in history.
18 We have a number of important centers in our town,
19 several very near the new proposed expanded lines. I
20 am not sure our forefathers envisioned 150-foot towers
21 within view from our town hall. This would threaten
22 our historic places. During the open forum in
23 Deerfield with Eversource, it was asked a number of
24 times how much larger the Deerfield terminal would be

1 and how much more electromagnetic power would be
2 surging from this building. Neither Bill Quinlan nor
3 any other spokesman answered any of these questions.
4 As a Deerfield resident, that raised a red flag for me.

5 Another concern is the forecasted number
6 of jobs have ranged from 600 to 2500, few of them being
7 outside of the construction phase. So I ask the
8 Committee: How much would that be a long-term benefit
9 for the state of New Hampshire?

10 One thing that was shared also at the
11 fall forum was the potential savings for us as the
12 users of electricity. Mr. Quinlan said that the
13 savings might be 3 to 5 percent. However, how is that
14 possible without a secured contract? He also said it
15 was undetermined whether there may be any savings at
16 all. This is definitely not a big enough benefit for
17 me to support this project.

18 One of the biggest reasons why I don't
19 support Northern Pass is that this electricity is not
20 going to be used by our residents. New Hampshire is
21 currently a net exporter of electricity. It's going to
22 be used by southern New England, just like the existing
23 Northeast Utilities transmission line that runs through
24 our state. We are just being used up by Hydro-Quebec

1 and Eversource to help them earn more money by scarring
2 our beautiful state. Please do not allow this to
3 happen. Thank you for your time.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The next speaker is
5 Jennifer Tuthill, to be followed by Brendan Finn and
6 Daniel Heyduk.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: My comments have been
8 pretty much covered by the New Hampton folks. I would
9 like to give my four minutes to Mr. Kimball as well.

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Are there other
11 people who want to speak a first time? I really don't
12 think it's fair to those people. I appreciate your
13 willingness to cede your time. I'm sure he does as
14 well. But there are people who are sitting patiently
15 for their first crack. If you feel your comments have
16 been covered, then we appreciate your saying that. So,
17 thank you.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (inaudible)

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Brendan Finn,
20 followed by Daniel Heyduk and Donna Keeley.

21 MR. FINN: Good evening. Brendan Finn,
22 F-I-N-N. Thanks very much for the opportunity to speak
23 with you tonight. I am a Manchester resident, so I've
24 come up here amongst these, I assume mostly residents

1 of the Lakes Region to offer a couple comments.

2 My wife and I moved to New Hampshire
3 this year after I got out of the Marine Corps. And we
4 moved here not because of Manchester's beauty, as
5 lovely as it is, but because of -- some people are from
6 Manchester here it sounds like -- but because of the
7 beauty of the Lakes Region, the North Country and the
8 Seacoast. And we've loved it up here, every minute
9 since we moved up here. The beauty of those sections
10 of the state are a big reason why. The one thing
11 that's really surprised me is how much we pay in
12 electricity costs relative to what we used to when we
13 lived in Maryland and North Carolina and Virginia and
14 everywhere else the Marine Corps took us. And I looked
15 into it, and I found out the big reason why is because
16 this is the only region of the country that doesn't
17 have a supply of natural gas. So we could ship it in.
18 Of course, there are those concerns with continuing our
19 reliance on fossil fuels. So that puts us in a bit of
20 a bind. I also looked into the state's energy policy
21 and found out that the previous governor, Governor
22 Lynch, set a goal to establish 25 percent of the
23 state's source of energy as renewables by the year
24 2025. It's very ambitious, and I think that this

1 project would help us get there. So on the one hand
2 we've got conserving what makes New Hampshire New
3 Hampshire, on the other hand we have got reducing rates
4 for consumers and meeting our long-term energy goals.
5 How do we tip the scale there so we can make the
6 decision?

7 Part of my research was into the Site
8 Evaluation Committee and the services that they provide
9 to the state. The evaluation process seems exhaustive,
10 comprehensive, and I think that we can rely on it to
11 make the decision for us in a way. In no way do I want
12 to see responsibility away from the citizens. But with
13 the citizenry we have up here, I don't think that
14 that's ever going to happen. I can't believe how
15 engaged the citizens of New Hampshire are in this
16 debate and every other. I just went through my first
17 New Hampshire primary and it blew me away. So I am --
18 what I'm saying is I think we can trust this committee
19 of professionals to make a decision that we can count
20 on. And I'm sure I can count on you, my fellow New
21 Hampshire citizens, to be engaged every step of the
22 way. Thanks for your time.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Next
24 speaker is Daniel Heyduk, to be followed by Donna

1 Keeley and Susan Seitz. Did we lose Mr. Heyduk?

2 (No verbal response)

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Seems so. Donna
4 Keeley, to be followed by Susan Seitz and Jane Difley.

5 MS. KEELEY: Hi. Thank you. My name is
6 Donna Keeley. I live in Pittsfield, New Hampshire. I
7 am a 29-year-plus -- and I count every minute and every
8 day -- proud employee of Eversource, formerly PSNH.

9 During this time I've worked my way up through the
10 company, starting my career in customer service, then
11 as a business account executive, and now in community
12 relations, working directly with New Hampshire
13 communities throughout the Lakes Region and the Conway
14 area. I've heard firsthand from our customers what
15 matters to them, and their top issues have long been
16 having access to reliable energy and lowering costs.

17 To give you an idea of how much of an
18 issue this is, as we all know, New Hampshire has the
19 seventh highest electricity rates in the country.
20 Working in the energy industry, I understand New
21 Hampshire's energy market. And I think we all need to
22 be part of the solution when it comes to supplying our
23 needs for energy. Our state and country rely on
24 highways and power lines and other infrastructure to

1 keep our economy going. Building infrastructure
2 projects like Northern Pass is about the bigger
3 picture. It's about providing for our society as a
4 whole, not just ourselves.

5 I am a long-time New Hampshire resident
6 who's active in my community. I am a Rotarian. I
7 previously served on my town's board of selectmen and
8 planning board and conservation commission. I am also
9 a nature lover, sometimes to a fault. I am a former,
10 long-time member of the Society for the Protection of
11 New Hampshire Forest and current member of Bear Paw
12 Land Trust. I understand people's love of our land,
13 and I believe in preserving New Hampshire's natural
14 beauty. I also understand the need for balance when it
15 comes to responsible growth, economic development, the
16 environment and natural resources. I am proud to work
17 for a company that currently, for the past several
18 decades, has supported New Hampshire communities,
19 promoted economic development, helped customers
20 understand the energy market, and supported community
21 efforts and many, many local nonprofits. I believe
22 there must be a balance with the needs of our region,
23 the economy and our history that will serve the greater
24 good, not just me. I support Northern Pass because it

1 has tried to achieve this balance with this project and
2 the many benefits that it's offering our state. Thank
3 you.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Susan Seitz, to be
5 followed by Jane Difley and Ryan Barber.

6 MS. SEITZ: Susan Seitz. And the last
7 name is S, as in Sam, E-I-T-Z. I'm from Deerfield.

8 We are here tonight to discuss an
9 incomplete application by a company who's under
10 investigation by the Federal Energy Regulatory
11 Commission. This scares me. This application was
12 turned in on Friday and it's still not complete. But
13 it is also incomplete because it ends at the Deerfield
14 substation. This power can't stay in Deerfield. We
15 don't need it. It needs to leave Deerfield. And how
16 that's going to happen should be part of this proposal.
17 I live in Deerfield at the end of the line. Not only
18 will we have towers, no matter if this is buried or if
19 this is above ground, we'll have a huge substation and
20 more power lines leaving our town in the other
21 direction. Applications to fill in wetlands have
22 already been applied for, and we're being told it has
23 nothing to do with Northern Pass - it's just a
24 coincidence. Sitting here listening to you talk, I'm

1 concerned. We have been told by you at all meetings in
2 the past that we might, and it was stated very clearly
3 "might," get a 5 percent decrease on our electric
4 bills. This means every three months I can buy a
5 frozen pizza and make it at my house. I cannot see how
6 a 5 percent "possible" electric savings is going to
7 bring business to New Hampshire. Maybe I'm wrong, but
8 it's not going to change anything I do. Now I'm being
9 told by you tonight that we will be paying electric
10 rates at the highest transmission charge, depending on
11 what is online. So tell me again, how does this
12 benefit me and not just Eversource?

13 You plan on -- you also mentioned
14 tonight that you plan on protecting the line by looking
15 at the trees along the route. Does this mean any tree
16 on any property that might now or sometime in the
17 future fall down on your line be cut? If that's the
18 case, that means your power lines are a whole lot
19 further than you had your power or whatever it is, the
20 corridor. It's a whole lot wider than you're stating.
21 And it also means that I'm going to see it from my
22 house over a mile away, and I live down a hill. These
23 towers will be big enough that I can see them from my
24 yard if you cut more trees down. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jane Difley, to be
2 followed by Ryan Barber and Eileen Schulze.

3 MS. DIFLEY: Good evening. I appreciate
4 your attentiveness and your being here. My name is
5 Jane Difley, and I am the President Forester at the
6 Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests.

7 The Forest Society was founded in 1901
8 as a nonprofit conservation and forestry organization,
9 and our mission is to perpetuate the forests of New
10 Hampshire through their wise use and their complete
11 reservation in places of special scenic beauty. Today
12 we have over 10,000 member families. We are one of the
13 largest private landowners in the state. We own and
14 manage some 54,000 acres in more than a 100 New
15 Hampshire municipalities. Our forest reservations
16 include three properties directly affected by Northern
17 Pass: The Washburn Family Forest in Clarksville, with
18 more than 6 miles of frontage on the Connecticut River;
19 the Kauffmann Forest in Stark, with more than a mile of
20 right-of-way through it; and the Rocks Estate in
21 Bethlehem, with one of the most scenic views of the
22 Presidentials. We also hold over 700 conservation
23 easements, conserving more than 125,000 acres in
24 partnership with landowners. More than a dozen of our

1 conservation easements would be directly affected by
2 Northern Pass.

3 We conserve land to protect natural
4 resources, including vegetation, surface and
5 groundwater, working forests, recreation lands and
6 wildlife habitat, and we conserve scenic views of and
7 from the land. These conserved lands are held in
8 private trust. We have a legal and ethical obligation
9 to defend these lands from private commercial
10 developments like Northern Pass.

11 We believe that the Application before
12 you should be rejected. A hundred and thirty miles
13 would host towers well above mature trees. Nearly all
14 of the adverse impacts of above-ground towers on
15 aesthetics, on historic sites, on natural resources, on
16 private property values could be avoided if the entire
17 line were buried along an appropriate transportation
18 corridor. Northern Pass acknowledges that such burial
19 is technically feasible, but says it's too expensive to
20 bury the entire line without providing any evidence to
21 defend this claim. Eversource seeks to subsidize its
22 project through adverse impacts to land owned by others
23 and landscapes cherished by all. It is a subsidy
24 rejected by thousands who commented to the Federal

1 Government. It is a subsidy rejected by most of the 31
2 communities directly affected. It is a subsidy
3 rejected by a large majority of the intervention
4 petitions presented to the Site Evaluation Committee.
5 It is a subsidy the Site Evaluation Committee should
6 reject. The public interest is served by protecting
7 landscapes, not needlessly scarring them. We believe
8 natural landscapes are among New Hampshire's most
9 significant assets. We believe that there is no need,
10 nor any compelling reason to allow a private
11 transmission line to degrade these assets. We have not
12 objected to the idea of bringing hydropower from Quebec
13 through New Hampshire to consumers to the south of us.
14 We believe that the Site Evaluation Committee should
15 consider the full burial projects proposed in other
16 states when determining whether the Northern Pass
17 proposal represents an unreasonable adverse impact on
18 aesthetics and natural resources. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ryan Barber, to be
20 followed by Eileen Schulze and Greg Averill.

21 MR. BARBER: Hi, I'm Ryan Barber. I'm a
22 graduate of Plymouth State University. I live in
23 Runney, New Hampshire. I'm also an apprentice with the
24 Electrical Training Alliance, sponsored by the

1 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

2 A lot of what I was going to say has
3 actually been spoken. But to make it briefly, I
4 believe now is the time with cheap fossil fuels to be
5 creating sustainable infrastructure. The Northern Pass
6 represents one means through which a stable
7 infrastructure can be acquired throughout America, and
8 New England particularly. Also, as an affiliate with
9 the skilled trades, a lot of people don't realize that
10 unionized skilled trades in New Hampshire, keeping them
11 working and moving, represents a large part of our
12 economy, as well as a large part of the strength of the
13 middle class of the state. Keeping them moving,
14 keeping them working and productive keeps New Hampshire
15 productive. I look forward to using my own sweat, my
16 blood, my sacrifice to build this transmission line and
17 to keep your project moving, to keep sustainable energy
18 moving now and in the future. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Eileen Schulze, to
20 be followed by Greg Averill and Senator Jeanie
21 Forrester.

22 MS. SCHULZE: Thank you. Eileen Schulze
23 from Northfield, spelled E-I-L-E-E-N, S-C-H-U-L-Z-E. I
24 will summarize some comments that I submitted in

1 writing back in 2013, attempted to read at a comment
2 meeting earlier at Grappone Center. I was cut short
3 and not allowed to complete it, so I will just
4 summarize some of my wording here. And I want to thank
5 those here that oppose Northern Pass. I agree with the
6 comments and details they have given at all of the
7 different meetings I've attended.

8 I oppose Northern Pass in any form. I
9 don't agree it should be allowed for a foreign
10 company's greed alone. We don't need Northern Pass in
11 New Hampshire, nor do we need a significant negative
12 impact against the welfare of our citizens, local
13 tourism, real estate, property, local energy economies
14 and natural resources. Also, I am concerned about the
15 national security risk of these high towers. I also
16 believe that all of New Hampshire is beautiful. Do not
17 rape our landscape with the towers. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Greg Averill, to be
19 followed by Senator Jeanie Forrester and Jason Lauze.

20 MR. AVERILL: Greg Averill,
21 A-V-E-R-I-L-L. I just wanted to go on record. I'm a
22 resident of Canterbury, New Hampshire, and I'm opposed
23 to the Northern Pass Project.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Senator Forrester,

1 to be followed by Jason Lauze. And last call for
2 Daniel Heyduk.

3 SENATOR FORRESTER: Good evening. Thank
4 you all for coming to Meredith this evening, Site
5 Evaluation Committee, and giving us an opportunity to
6 tell you how we feel. I am the senator for District 2.
7 Forrester F-O-R-R-E-S-T-E-R. I happen to live here in
8 Meredith, so it was a nice a commute for me. Thank
9 you.

10 I guess there's a lot's been said, and I
11 agree with a lot of what I've heard. And I would say
12 this: I'm just so disappointed that we're here, now
13 five or six years later. And it appears to me that
14 PSNH-Eversource is tone deaf. You're not hearing. It
15 concerns me that there is no benefit for the state of
16 New Hampshire. You're talking about a project that's
17 going to the southern states, southern New England
18 states. It's not going to benefit New Hampshire. And
19 I know PSNH-Eversource is better than this. I was a
20 Main Street manager in Meredith and in Plymouth. I
21 worked with local communities. I know what's important
22 to communities. And I know back then when I did that,
23 PSNH, at the time, was very involved. You heard it
24 earlier. Contributed greatly to communities. I know

1 of all the good things they have done. So this really
2 disappoints me. I just -- I don't understand it.
3 Because it's about New Hampshire. It's about what's
4 good for New Hampshire. And this is not good for New
5 Hampshire. All the communities that I represent that
6 run through my district oppose this; 31 communities
7 oppose this project. Now you've heard people say that
8 if you bury it underground, that's the compromise that
9 we're willing to give. And I wish and I hope that the
10 Site Evaluation Committee, when you look at this and
11 you weigh the pros and cons and advantages to New
12 Hampshire, that you will, I guess, reject this
13 application as it's submitted to you.

14 And I would just leave you with this one
15 thought: I don't think New Hampshire should be the
16 energy doormat to the rest of the New England states.
17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Jason Lauze.

19 MR. LAUZE: Very close. Good as it
20 gets, really. I actually had a lot of things from the
21 Whitefield meeting --

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Why don't you give
23 us the correct pronunciation and spell it for the
24 stenographers.

1 MR. LAUZE: It's Lauze, L-A-U-Z-E. So
2 you were very close, which is basically as good as it
3 gets with this last name. Nobody ever actually
4 pronounces it right.

5 So at the Whitefield meeting, amongst
6 others, you know, I had a lot of thoughts, and I wrote
7 a lot of them down. And the more I listen to people,
8 the less I actually want to read the things I've
9 written down. Right now my current role work-wise is
10 training director for the Northeastern Apprenticeship
11 and Training Program. So we have 675 apprentices or
12 so, and we span from, you know, Maine to Maryland. So,
13 basically the entire apprenticeship program for all the
14 area concerned is what we deal with. You know, a lot
15 of people like to stand up here and like to talk about,
16 you know, temporary jobs, and they like to talk about
17 how, you know, we're going to just run this program
18 through and nobody's actually going to have jobs. We
19 create jobs. We create permanent jobs every day. But
20 a job of this scope creates, you know, numerous jobs,
21 permanent jobs. And they're not permanent jobs so much
22 as they are careers, because you take, you know, a
23 program of this scope or a job of this scope -- and we
24 provide hundreds of jobs throughout the program -- and

1 it's not like when the Northern Pass ends all those
2 jobs go away. They don't. They move somewhere else or
3 they move to another program.

4 Regardless, the other thing beyond that
5 that I always hear at all of these meetings refers to
6 tourism and, you know, how a project as unsightly as
7 this is going to make, you know, monumental issues with
8 tourism in New Hampshire. This is the first meeting
9 that I can actually stand up here and say, you know,
10 I'm a resident of this county because I bought a
11 property knowing full well that the Northern Pass -- or
12 hoping fully that the Northern Pass is coming to this
13 area. I didn't do so thinking, you know, maybe I
14 should wait until Northern Pass comes and maybe I can
15 get a better deal because everybody's going to be
16 scared of the Northern Pass. I bought a property in an
17 area that is tourism-based. I bought a property that
18 is -- you know, that I'm looking at as a rental
19 property, amongst other things. I'm looking at it as a
20 place to enjoy with my family. And I bought it
21 midstream with Northern Pass because I don't feel like
22 any of the things that these people talk about, you
23 know, any of these things that they think are going to
24 be detrimental to New Hampshire, I don't feel like

1 those are legitimate. I'm looking at it from my
2 standpoint, you know, not only as a resident and
3 taxpayer and a person raising a family in the state,
4 and not only do I feel like it's good and viable from
5 that standpoint, but also on the flip side of things I
6 look at it as, you know, the training director for an
7 apprenticeship, and look at it as, you know, a lot of
8 people will be put to work. You know, a lot of these
9 guys that I'm pushing to Connecticut and to
10 Philadelphia and those areas, a lot of those guys that
11 are New Hampshire residents will go to work tomorrow
12 here if this thing starts.

13 I mean, I understand, I guess, the fact
14 that these people that are less familiar with how our
15 work goes are scared of the, you know, short-term
16 duration of the project. But, I mean, I'm standing up
17 here, and I'm trying to make sure that everybody
18 understands that this is not a short-term project for
19 us. This is not a short-term thing in scope. This is
20 a stepping stone on some level. They look at it as
21 though it's, you know, a very short-term project in
22 nature. But for us, it's a stepping stone on careers,
23 on a lot of levels.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How much more do

1 you have?

2 MR. LAUZE: I really don't have anything
3 written, so that's...

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Thank
5 you for your comments.

6 MR. LAUZE: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is Mr. Heyduk here?

8 (No verbal response)

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. No.
10 We'll put him aside.

11 Mr. Kimball for round two.

12 MR. KIMBALL: Thank you, and I
13 appreciate your willingness to let me complete my
14 testimony.

15 I would just want to point out two
16 points before I move forward. The first is there's
17 been a lot of discussion about jobs. But if you look
18 at the draft EIS, it looks at the full burial option.
19 There's actually far more jobs with full burial than
20 there are with this proposal that we have in front of
21 us.

22 The second is a little fact checking.
23 This has been described as the "longest project in
24 North America." If you look at the Champlain-Hudson

1 Project, which I believe has finished its permitting
2 both with the U.S. Department of Energy and the State
3 of New York, it actually has considerably more burial
4 proposed. And that is also a 1,000 megawatt line. And
5 that burial I'm talking about is terrestrial, not the
6 aquatic component. There's a lot of it that has to
7 move out of the Hudson River because of PCBs. So
8 there's actually far more burial in that project than
9 what's being proposed here.

10 Getting on to AMC's concerns about this
11 process right now, the fourth point that I was going to
12 point out is the SEC does have responsibility for
13 taking a look at historic resources and the impacts;
14 and yet, from what we understand, the Section 106
15 Programmatic Agreement, which is part of that process,
16 will now be extended out five years. You as a board
17 could be making a decision before that process is even
18 completed. And yet, when you take a look at the
19 avoidance, minimize, mitigate strategy that's the norm,
20 you can minimize this impact by burial; and yet, your
21 process is moving in front of one of the key components
22 that you'll have to take a look at if we understand
23 that Programmatic Agreement correctly.

24 The fifth point I would make is the

1 Applicant's Forward New Hampshire Plan is really just a
2 skeleton plan. There's been requests previously to see
3 the real details to that. They haven't been provided
4 yet; and yet, you're being told this is how New
5 Hampshire is going to have some of the impacts
6 remedied, and we don't even have the full details. We
7 have a one-page or two-page glorified summary.

8 The last point I want to make is the
9 Applicant is proposing to consolidate a lot of the
10 intervening parties, including AMC. It's clear that
11 this suggested consolidation of our intervention with
12 others is really intended to limit expert testimony,
13 cross-examine discovery requests from organizations
14 that publicly oppose the project. We also kind of feel
15 it's rather manipulative, because if you take a look at
16 the few interventions that actually came in favor of
17 this project, Northern Pass did not ask to have those
18 consolidated.

19 Thank you very much for your time.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hoertdoerfer.

21 MR. HOERTDOERFER: Thank you for letting
22 me continue.

23 The other issue I wanted to talk about
24 is the buried line in the state highway. When I first

1 looked at the submittal, I was surprised how few
2 details were provided for the typical installation of
3 this system in the roadway. And in the presentation
4 hearing in Laconia on January 14th, and it's in your
5 file, I made some comments about this. And looking at
6 it as an engineer, I was worried about, well, if you
7 dig up the road, and everybody knows, then you have a
8 trench and it gets filled eventually, and then you
9 patch it in and then it settles and then it gets
10 uneven. And I made some suggestions on how that should
11 be restored in the best way for the public, for the
12 people, so we don't have something that you see when
13 you go through downtown Manchester on Elm Street. And
14 this is my typical approach from engineer. There's a
15 problem. You look for solution to get it under control
16 to minimize shortcomings and defects and make sure the
17 end product somehow is adequate. Since -- and if you
18 find my suggested recommendations for -- and we
19 suggested requirements for more information in that
20 sheet that I submitted at the time.

21 In the meantime, I've given it much more
22 thought and said, well, there's some issues involved
23 that has to do --

24 (Court Reporter interrupts.)

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hoertdoerfer,
2 she didn't get what you said.

3 MR. HOERTDOERFER: Other issues involved
4 which has to do with safety. And one, I don't know
5 whether DOT is -- which it's a public works project
6 from the Department of Transportation, if they have
7 come to any resolution, whether they accept, grant
8 permission to do that or not.

9 But what came to my mind is the --
10 anything that happens when you have these restored
11 trenches that get filled back in, then the earth,
12 regardless how well it's compacted, still settles over
13 time, and you get these cracks and distortions and what
14 I refer to as, you know, urban areas where this is
15 common. Then it gets pretty treacherous sometimes
16 driving there because it cracks and tilts, and potholes
17 open up. And I said that's a given in urban city where
18 you drive, the speed limit is 25 or 30 miles an hour.
19 Now, when you do this in an open highway where the
20 speed limit is 55, and you drive at that speed and you
21 have those conditions, that becomes unsafe. And this
22 happens over time, and you only find out about it when
23 an accident happens.

24 Further, I thought: Well, what's the

1 DOT going to do? They might have a detail for a
2 open-trench pipe installation, but that's normally only
3 for crossing a highway. To put that open trench the
4 whole length for 50 miles or 60 miles is unheard of.
5 Nobody's done it before, and I don't think the DOT
6 would want to go to be the first one to test it out and
7 find out how it works.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How much --

9 MR. HOERTDOERFER: So by my judgment,
10 they should outright reject it. And the Commission
11 might have an obligation to find out where they stand
12 because --

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sir --

14 MR. HOERTDOERFER: -- if they turn that
15 down, then this whole system is not doable that is
16 submitted on record.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How much do you
18 have, sir?

19 MR. HOERTDOERFER: Couple minutes.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We're going to hold
21 you to two minutes, all right.

22 MR. HOERTDOERFER: Okay. So now I
23 wondered: What is Northern Pass doing trying to put in
24 a submittal where when they get turned down by DOT for

1 installation of the underground in the state highway
2 the project is dead because then there is nowhere to
3 go? Well, surprise, surprise. In a supplemental
4 submittal of last Friday, there is an alternate No. 1,
5 an alternate plan which shows just for that alternate
6 to bring back the original power line through the White
7 Mountains as an alternate in case, I assume, the DOT
8 turns them down. Are they arrogant or stupid? Or
9 what's going on?

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Thank
11 you all very much. Is there anyone who wishes to add
12 anything briefly that hasn't already been said?

13 (No verbal response)

14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. We're
15 going to close the public hearing in just a moment. I
16 will tell you, for those who have not been to their
17 e-mail or been on the Internet this afternoon, there
18 was an order issued this afternoon on the motions that
19 were filed regarding this hearing and the four
20 subsequent hearings. As you can see, we are here
21 holding a hearing. However, the order provides for two
22 additional public hearings to be held at a time to be
23 scheduled, that are being scheduled because of the
24 supplemental filing. We'll determine locations as

1 necessary. I will not go beyond some speculation that
2 there's likely to be one north of the Notch and one
3 south of the Notch to accommodate as many people as
4 possible to discuss whatever supplemental information
5 the Company filed last week.

6 I will ask my counsel and my
7 administrator if there's any other business we need to
8 transact before we close the hearing.

9 (Off-the-record discussion)

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: With that, we'll
11 close the hearing, and I thank you all for your
12 respectful participation this evening.

13 **(Whereupon the public hearing was**
14 **adjourned at 7:53 p.m.)**